

**THEME 6: A CITY WITH AN ENRICHED COMMUNITY LIFE  
PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION FOR CONSIDERATION**

**9th April 2018**

The comments have unique codes as follows:

- EQ = electronic questionnaire response
- Q = paper questionnaire response
- EM = email response
- WC = web comment

However, no personal details have been provided.

The letters making comments relevant to this theme are coded as follows:

- L4: Campaign to Protect Rural England
- L8a: Durham City Cricket Club Response
- L8b: Durham City Cricket Club Development Plan 2017-2022
- L9b: Durham County Council Appendices ABC
- L10: Durham Miners Association
- L11: Durham Pointers
- L12b: Durham University
- L23: Nevilles Cross Community Association
- L27: The Empty Shop

The codes for categorising the comments are as follows:

- c1: outside the remit of the neighbourhood plan
  - c1a: outside the Plan area
  - c1b: planning issue that has to be dealt with by the Council or by other bodies not by a neighbourhood plan
  - c1c: not a planning issue
- c2: a generic style comment of praise, blame, opinion etc not requiring a response just an acknowledgement
- c3: suggesting changes to the policies
- c4: suggesting changes to the projects
- c5: suggesting changes to the other text of the Plan

The issues for consideration are listed under a general section and then under each policy. For clarity, under each section only the relevant text in the columns is included. Similar comments have been grouped together as far as is possible.

## Contents

	Page No:
<b>General comments about theme, or relevant across policies</b>	3
• Other	3
• Parks, sports fields etc.	5
• Text	7
• Projects	9
<b>Policy C1: Community Arts Facilities</b>	11
• Venues	11
• Other	14
<b>Policy C2: Information Hub</b>	18
<b>Policy C3: Provision of New Community Facilities</b>	22
<b>Policy C4: Protection of an Existing Community Facility</b>	24
<b>Policy C5: Protection of Urban Open Spaces</b>	25
<b>Policy C6: Health Care and Social Care Facilities</b>	27

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	COMMENT CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION TO BE CONSIDERED
<b>General comments about theme, or relevant across policies</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other</li> <li>• Parks, sports fields etc.</li> <li>• Text</li> <li>• Projects</li> </ul>		
<b>Other</b>		
Q29 D.C.C. guided walks should be reduced in price pref. free!! Health benefits would be money well spent.	c1c Price of community facilities, DCC guided walks etc outside remit (not a planning issue)	No action. Possibly pass comment to Council
Q68. Attachment [provided as a scanned pdf document] Access to Buildings. Making places and buildings accessible to all makes lie easier for everyone. You just have to look how many customers use the automatic doors at Marks and Spencers compared to those using the other doors. It helps the mother pushing the pram or someone with both hands full of shopping as well as the disabled. It is important with new builds and refurbishments for the plans to [be] checked by a qualified access consultant rather than an architect who thinks he knows. After the work is completed it is difficult and expensive to rectify mistakes. Copied from theme 4	c5 Promoting easier access	Consider adding to supporting text for policies C1 to C4, and relationship to Policies T1 and T2. Policies T1/T2 need to cover disabled access to buildings adequately and cross-reference from themes 3, 4 and 6.
EQ20 This theme cannot be accepted without recognition of and a policy to collaborate with Durham University (especially its colleges) which has won awards for its community outreach activities and student community action programme, and makes a huge contribution to the City through its multiplicity of cultural and sporting activities most of which are open to members of the local community, e.g. theatrical and operatic groups, orchestras, choirs, museums, regatta, the Lumière and illuminate festivals, public lectures, etc.	c1c Outside remit (not planning issue)	Although a policy to collaborate with Durham University is proposed, this cannot be expressed as a planning / land use policy. It may be a matter the Town Council could pursue. But, ensure that role of University in cultural life of city and as a stakeholder in the projects is covered.

EQ52 Public art and public facilities including seating and toilet facilities (including for disabled) are important. Copied from theme 1	c3,c4 Public seating.	Consider where public seating is covered in the plan, e.g. Theme 5, projects.
Q48 If the Council persist in the lunatic plan to move the bus station the vacated space could be used to a Community Centre to revitalize North Road. All developments must be easily accessible by public transport. Copied to Theme 5	c1b Other comments outside remit (for various other bodies)	But consider coverage of bus station in Plan
WC85 Durham needs more toilet facilities in the centre, more seating that can be sat on i.e. wooden benches (and not stone blocks as per the market square, which are truly uncomfortable), including more seats along the river bank, ... Also, the area outside the Gala Theatre should be redesigned, instead of 'windy city' we should have a beautiful area with pleasant seating etc.	c2. Toilet facilities addressed in Project 14  c2. Seating/	Consider coverage of seating in Plan, e.g. Theme 5
L4 CPRE supports proposals for the increase of leisure, cultural and other community facilities provided they are not (in the main) in the Green Belt.	c2 Support for Policies C1 to C3	Support (with caveat) noted
L9b The council has identified several instances where the DCNP approach deviates from and conflicts with that of the council's existing and evidence relating to emerging plans and strategies. Examples of this include: [...] g) Approach to tourism: which fails to adequately recognise the key challenges facing the visitor economy of Durham, and as such this is a missed opportunity for the DCNP to add value to the existing policy context for the area. Furthermore, the DCNP which advocates the provision of a visitor centre which is an approach which has proved unsuccessful in the past and conflicts with Visit Durham's existing approach. In light of the above the county council is concerned that the plan is deficient in this respect in the context of the requirement to meet the relevant Basic Condition relating to this matter. It is firmly urged that this situation is remedied as the plan prior to the plan advancing to Submission stage.	c2 Concern that the Plan fails to meet the relevant Basic Condition	Noted. This is not to minimise the significance of these comments, but they will be addressed as the detailed accounts in the Council's Appendix C are considered.

<p>L12b Referring to para 4.217: “it seems reasonable to infer that some expansion...” NPF should speak to medical practices and NHS Care Commissioning group and ascertain whether there is capacity in current practices to expand. Update growth forecast to 2016/17 figures.</p>	<p>c5 Suggests evidence rather than inferences needed</p> <p>c5 Suggesting figures be updated</p>	<p>Need to check if evidence available Note have contacted practice and CCG</p> <p>Update figures</p>
<p>L23 We acknowledge the good intentions behind this theme but must emphasis, as we have done earlier, that the Plan is asking for facilities previously taken from the City by the DCC and unlikely to be returned to the City in the foreseeable future. While we see this as a consequence of the failure by the DCC to address the City as a tourist destination or for residents use; declining numbers of the latter will also remove any justification for their re-statement. Further we also note the use of many of the existing council and other facilities by the increasing student population alongside residents. We note in a recent University planning application for Maiden Castle sports facility that approval of the application would benefit the University and the wider community (DM/17/02697/FPA; para 109) and we would hope that this would mean a much greater reciprocal use of such facilities. [...] Overall, we feel that this theme should reflect a much more joined up, reciprocal and shared approach. We consider that the Plan should explicitly acknowledge the contribution other organisations should be making and to provide substantive provision that reflects how their rhetoric on community engagement and partnership is to be delivered in practice.</p>	<p>c2 Concern about achievability / necessity for Policies in Theme 6</p> <p>c5 Suggestion for change to supporting text</p>	<p>Consider concerns</p> <p>Consider including these points But note the various projects in Appendix A and all the stakeholders identified in para A2</p>
<p><b>Parks, sports fields etc.</b></p>		
<p>EQ15 There must be a policy of green lungs, community play space, fields and parks. Copied from theme 2b</p>	<p>c2. Need for community play space, fields and parks</p>	<p>Has this been adequately covered by Theme 6?</p>

<p>Q13 Could the racecourse area incorporating the bowling green be developed as a park. Apart from Wharton Park, which is badly inaccessible, there are no play areas for children in the city. The old swimming baths could be converted into museum or display space &amp; could provide toilet facilities which are missing from this part of the town. For visitors – this area could introduce them to the lovely walks around Durham – Maiden Castle, Houghall &amp; Pelaw Woods all within striking distance of the city centre. Copied from Theme 2b</p>	<p>c2. Inclusion of Racecourse as a park</p>	<p>Consider how to cover in Theme 6 Also included in Policy C1</p>
<p>Q38 The argument that the former bowling green, near the former baths, cannot be a park because of the diminishing permanent population is spurious. It is a recreational green space on the riverbank – which is much used by people from around the City, and beyond, on a daily basis. It is in the lee of the Cathedral and W.H.S. with magnificent views across it from both sides of the riverbank. It is an ideal place to house some good quality play equipment, a green gym, a refreshment kiosk, maybe a sensory garden etc. etc. All over the country are such places which are protected from damage in imaginative ways, I quote this area as an example as it was so readily threatened not that long ago by inappropriate development when it should have been protected. I am sure this is true of other areas in and around our neighbourhood too. Copied to Theme 6</p>	<p>c2. Consider developing old bowling green as a park</p>	<p>Consider coverage in Theme 6</p>
<p>Q57 School playing fields will NO longer be sold off for development? Is that a Vision and Objective for Durham? Durham city needs those open spaces. Copied to Theme 6 from Theme 2b</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding potential for school playing fields to be sold off.</p>	<p>Consider policy changes to protect school playing fields as open spaces. Consider relationship with Theme 2b policies.</p>
<p>WC104 Comment on your post "Policy G1" The SRA [Sidegate Residents Association] was fully supportive of all the Green policies. It suggested that fitness parks could be a good idea for using some green spaces. There is one in Wharton Park and there could be others. Copied to theme 6</p>	<p>c5. Need for fitness parks.</p>	<p>Consider covering in justification for policies to C3 to C5</p>

<b>Text</b>		
EQ31 Slightly amending of the wording of the vision statements to provide consistency of wording with the overall vision would be helpful. For Theme 6: Durham City will have a proactively supported community life, including health and well-being, with an enriched artistic and cultural life for the benefit of residents and visitors alike. Residents will be supported and encouraged to be active citizens with a keen interest in their neighbourhood and how it develops.	c5 Suggested change to other text	To consider rewording vision statement along lines suggested.
EQ43 A definition of community may be helpful in this section or more appropriate what constitutes a community facility.	c5 Suggesting change to other text	Consider
Q69 Perhaps some of the existing buildings which contribute to Durham's social problems might be considered as community facilities. The redundant premises (former Miners Hall) in North road might make a suitable performance and practice venue?	c5 Suggesting changes to other text	Policies C3 and C4 don't have any supporting text as yet. Possible venues for Theme 6 policies

<p>EM15. 4.215</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Durham Street Festival needs removing as the last one was in 2015</li> <li>• Distinction is needed regarding commercial spaces and local community venues facilities – I recommend the following changes to the text.</li> <li>• I wish to add the TESTT space in North Rd – a temporary artist studio group and contemporary gallery which started March 2017</li> <li>• I wish to add to this section the work of the County Durham Cultural Partnership (CDCEP)</li> </ul> <p><i>Text should now read:</i> Durham City has a strong cultural identity. The City is rich with cultural activities such as the annual International Brass Festival, the Durham Miners' Gala, the Book Festival, the Folk weekend and the biannual Lumiere light festival. In terms of infrastructure the City has one large, two small theatres and an open-air stage in Wharton Park. It has a cinema, (soon to be three), small commercial gallery spaces in different locations across the City, commercial arts and craft studios at Fowler's Yard and a small number of art and crafts courses and hirable event spaces in local community venues. TESTT Space, a temporary artist studio group and contemporary gallery, is situated above the soon-to-be demolished Durham Bus Station. Residents and visitors have access to some University facilities, such as The Oriental Museum, Palace Green Library, and The Wolfson Gallery. The Cathedral is used on a frequent basis throughout the year for cultural events and now offers the new Open Treasure Gallery as well as the World Heritage Site visitors centre.</p> <p>In order to improve cultural education for children and young people in County Durham, the County Durham Cultural Partnership (CDCEP) has been formed (see Terms of reference)</p> <p>4.216 <i>Comment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I wish to add TESTT space as an example of studio space in the City</li> </ul> <p>Text should now read There are many visual artists creating ceramics, drawing, painting, sculpture, printmaking, design, crafts, photography, video and filmmaking. Most work from home. A small number have studio space (e.g. in Fowlers Yard, TESTT Space) but most have no ongoing commercial outlet. There also many residents and visitors who take great interest in experiencing the</p>	<p>c5 Suggesting change to other text</p> <p>Suggesting change to other text</p>	<p>Consider</p> <p>Consider. Would need to spell out what TESTT is – see <a href="https://emptyshop.org/#testt">https://emptyshop.org/#testt</a></p>
--	--	--



<p><b>L8a</b>  In respect of Theme 6 “A City with an Enriched Community Life” we consider that community sporting facilities should be included within the cultural and community realm. Durham City Cricket Club is at the forefront of coaching of young boys and girls. During summer 2017 we were the most successful club in the region in registering 75 children between ages 5 and 8 on a Sunday morning as part of the All Stars Programme. Add to that the 30 or so 9-11 year olds taking part in our Comets programme and we had 100 youngsters on the field. The importance of the club in making a real contribution to the local community should therefore be recognised in the Plan, for example at paragraph 4.6.2.1</p>	<p>c5 Proposed addition to supporting text about DCCC e.g. in para 4.6.2.1</p>	<p>Consider adding to the supporting text. Should we also consider Durham University in this respect, as evidenced in their planning application for Maiden Castle?</p> <p>Consider how sporting facilities covered in Theme 6</p>
<p><b>L23</b>  [...]  Overall, we feel that this theme should reflect a much more joined up, reciprocal and shared approach. We consider that the Plan should explicitly acknowledge the contribution other organisations should be making and to provide substantive provision that reflects how their rhetoric on community engagement and partnership is to be delivered in practice.</p>	<p>c5 Suggestion for change to supporting text</p>	<p>Consider including these points  But note the various projects in Appendix A and all the stakeholders identified in para A2</p>
<p><b>Projects</b></p>		
<p><b>Q13</b> Visitors &amp; residents could surely expect an art gallery or museum or both in the town centre.</p>	<p>c2. Need for art gallery/museum in the City centre. Addressed by Policy C1 and to some extent Project 14</p>	<p>Consider including art gallery/museum in Project 14 and relationship of this to Policy Implementation Project 3</p>
<p><b>EQ42</b> I fully agree with this section of the plan. The university, cathedral, gala, venues and not-for-profit organisers such as Empty Shop should be able (and encouraged) to upload event information to a TIC easily to make the most of such a facility and attractive/useful to the largest possible section of residents and visitors. It should be mirrored by an up-to-date website/app where the same information can be easily accessed from anywhere.</p>	<p>c5. c4. Ideas for how to run TIC</p>	<p>Consider changing supporting text for Policy C2 and Policy Implementation Project 4  Visit Durham has a website with what's on information at <a href="https://www.thisisdurham.com/whats-on">https://www.thisisdurham.com/whats-on</a>  Also included under Policy C2</p>

<p>EQ43. We would ask the forum to make a commitment to identifying appropriate spaces for community facilities - and possibly event establish partnerships through which these facilities could be identified and developed.</p>	<p>c1c Outside remit (not planning issue). For a project?</p>	<p>Consider coverage in projects and any need for new project</p>
<p>EM15 4.233. This needs changing. The Forum is not identifying one facility, but any future body (such as The Parish Council) might support projects identified by a range of partnerships. This will be identified in Policy Implementation Project 3 in Chapter 5</p>	<p>Suggesting change to other text</p>	<p>Consider Also included under Policy C1</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	COMMENT CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION TO BE CONSIDERED
<b>Policy C1: Community Arts Facilities</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Venues</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>		
<b>Venues</b>		
Q13 The old swimming baths could be converted into museum or display space & could provide toilet facilities which are missing from this part of the town. For visitors – this area could introduce them to the lovely walks around Durham – Maiden Castle, Houghall & Pelaw Woods all within striking distance of the city centre. Copied from Theme 2b	c5. Consider inclusion of old swimming baths as a venue for Policy C1	Consider changes to accompanying text for Policy C1 Also included in General
Q48. C1 The old cinema in North Road should be a prime target	c5 Suggesting change to other text	Consider
Q54 It would be ideal if the DLI could return to its use as an Art Gallery and the surroundings maintained. It has a wonderful family space much appreciated by my grandchildren.	c1b Reopen DLI. Outside remit (for Council)	But consider as venue in C1
Q60 Agree with the suggestion that DLI Museum should be brought into use again.	c1b Reopening DLI outside remit (for Council)	But consider as venue in C1
Q63 Para 4.230 could include Dunelm House, re-purposed.	c5 Suggesting changes to other text	Consider changing supporting text under Policy C1 (Dunelm House)
Q69 Presumably the section on the DLI grounds will have to be rewritten. While the idea of a reprovided Arts facility is supported there also needs to be proposals for the reestablishment of a modern museum for the County Regiment in a more accessible location with adequate parking. Copied from theme 2b	c5. Reconsider inclusion of the DLI Museum building for a Policy C1 venue but c1b reopening outside remit (for Council)	Consider changes to supporting text for Policy C1

<p>Q69 It would be totally unacceptable to re-use the DLI Museum given the reasons set out for its closure – including asbestos problems. An alternative provision is needed urgently. As a DLI volunteer I am familiar with the Collection at Spennymoor and this has some benefits for researchers, but the Collection needs proper display, not the pathetic arrangement at Palace Green.</p>	<p>c5. Reconsider inclusion of the DLI Museum building for a Policy C1 venue</p>	<p>Consider changes to supporting text for Policy C1</p>
<p>Q75 The County Council should support the refurbishment of the Redhills Miners Centre as an artistic hub to the memory of our mining heritage, art works and replacement of the DLI museum. This facility has more than enough space inside and outside to house such exhibits. Also development should be considered of the old baths building by the river into a community facility.</p>	<p>c5 Suggestions of venues for community facilities  c1b Refurbishing old baths building outside remit (Action for University)</p>	<p>Consider venues for Policy C1</p>
<p>WC114 and WC115 We certainly recommend the use of the DLI Grounds once more, as a valuable public place, as well as a place of remembrance due to the ashes of Ex DLI Soldiers and families. We would welcome the use of the building to be used as an Art Gallery once again, but to also include the building back into a DLI Museum, which was originally why it was built. DCC will have us believe the building was not fit for purpose, we have the results of a survey they carried out in 2015 and it is. The amount of money that has been spent on displaying the few items from the Collection, the storage, the travelling exhibition is a disgrace and could have easily been spent on the original building. We are in a constant campaign and have had several meetings with DCC, to get justification for what has gone on between DCC, The Trustees of the Museum and now The University, to obtain a building where the whole collection is under ONE roof and not scattered around the County, and as the Museum still stands, it makes absolute sense, as well as solving a number of problems. We have met with Trustees, and Cllrs, ..., but unfortunately they do not see what the public is crying out for. This group seems to be wanting the same as our group, perhaps working together, we may convince the powers that be to listen to the public, instead of feeding us a load of rubbish. ON BEHALF OF THE FAITHFUL DURHAMS</p>	<p>c1b. Reopening DLI outside remit (for Council)</p>	<p>Consider inclusion as venue in Policy C1</p>

<p>WC118 ... development of the Miners' Hall as some form of visitor reception or other service point would make good use of its position.</p>	<p>c5 Addition of Miners Hall as venue for Policy C1 or C2</p>	<p>Consider addition to supporting text for Policies C1 or C2, plus addition as stakeholder to Policy Implementation Projects 3 and 4. Also included under Policy C2</p>
<p>WC125 It amazes me, and visitors alike, that a heritage city such as Durham City has no museum to illustrate its rich history from the period of early Christianity to the present day, including the period of the Norman Conquest, the 'Prince Bishops', the mining industry, ship building etc. ... Has anyone thought of using the former miners' hall at Redhills as the venue for a Durham Heritage Museum?</p>	<p>c2. Miners Hall as a heritage Museum</p>	<p>Consider including Miners Hall as a venue under Theme 6 Also included under Policy C2</p>
<p>WC167 Comment on your post "Policy C1" We support the proposal to bring the former DLI Museum and Art Gallery back into use. It was accessible to all visitors, with nearby car parking, and access to public transport.</p>	<p>c1b Reopening of DLI outside remit (for Council) but considered as a possible venue in Policy C1</p>	<p>Consider inclusion of DLI as a venue</p>
<p>L10 The Durham Miners' Association (DMA) has recently announced an ambitious five-year plan to preserve the Miners' Hall at Redhills and bring it to the point where people can celebrate, practice and display the living heritage and culture of the North East. The DMA urges the Forum to support this project in any way possible. Redhills is an essential asset to be retained for the community of Durham city and the county as a whole. It has a vital role to play in creating much-needed performance and practice space for all forms of artists, musicians and actors. We are delighted that the draft plan recognises the importance of adapting existing buildings and facilities to open up new facilities for the community. We also welcome the recognition of the city's diverse heritage assets as integral to the character of the Neighbourhood. The city has a real need for such facilities and Redhills could provide this while safeguarding the heritage of the coalfield.</p>	<p>c5 Addition of the Miners Hall as a venue for Policy C1</p>	<p>Consider addition to supporting text for Policies C1, plus addition as stakeholder to Policy Implementation Projects 3 and 4.  Contact the Durham Miners Association for further discussions</p>

<b>Other</b>		
Q24 C1: Policy?	c3 Query if Policy C1 is actually a policy	Consider wording of Policy C1
EQ13 Miners Hall land in North Road is only large enough for a small project. Key parts of DLI Museum could be shown in the Information Hub, while the remainder kept in their present locations. An art gallery should be a major project and include sufficient parking space to encourage visitors from other regions. Apart from the Bowes, no art gallery in the N-E can be considered a real success, though for varying reasons. MIMA could be a success, but suffers from poor transport links and almost no parking. There is the potential for Durham to produce something much better. Management should be independent of university and county council, though with close links. I am convinced it should prove possible to find a substantial benefactor if their name was linked to the gallery.	c1b Outside remit (for other bodies) except ... c4 comment about parking	Need to address parking issue under Policy C1 (but possibly explaining why it would be limited!). Consider relationship to Policies T1 and T2
EQ21 Visitors frequently ask where our art gallery is. It's expected in a city of our standing.	c2. Need for an art gallery. Addressed by Policy C1	Possibly need to re-evaluate as Council is now proposing art gallery in former TIC. And University plans also
EQ25 Policy C1 needs to be expanded to include supporting existing arts and cultural venues/projects like testt, redhills and empty shop, but I know this is being worked on and I'm really excited to read the re-draft!	c5 Suggesting change to other text	Consider
EQ43. Re Policy C1. Whilst we wholeheartedly welcome the spirit of this proposal we feel further definition is required of what constitutes a 'community arts facility'. We would specifically welcome provision for supporting 'affordable and accessible' arts facilities in addition to community arts facilities.	c5 Suggesting change to other text	Consider
Q47 Community Arts Centre needs to be within the City itself	c5 / c3 Suggesting change to other text	Consider under Policy C1. Or is this a proposed policy change?

<p>EM15. <i>Comments</i> I have had some interesting and informative conversations about the title and description of this policy in terms of what is defined as a 'community arts facility.' It has been suggested that Fowler's Yard etc. are private, commercial spaces which don't fit into the overall title of Community Arts. I have been asked if commercial propositions equally benefit from this proposed policy? One online definition of Community Arts is that it 'refers to artistic activity based in a community setting. Works from this genre can be of any media and is characterized by interaction or dialogue with the community. Often professional artists collaborate with people who may not otherwise normally actively engage in the arts. 1. As this is a planning policy I think it should encompass facilities that could be used for 'community arts' as well as private and commercial facilities. I therefore think that the title of Policy C1 should be 'Provision of Arts Facilities' 2. The planning conditions for Policy C1 should be expanded in line with Policy C3 – Provision of New Community Facilities – i.e. not on Green Belt, well related to residential areas, not adversely affecting amenity of nearby occupiers, allows access to people with disabilities, not contributing to traffic hazards and is accessible to users of all modes of transport <i>Comments on 4.230/ 4.231/ 4.232/ 4.233</i> These sections need changing. 4.230 To date the Forum has not identified sites or buildings that have potential for accommodating community arts facilities. (need to change 'community arts facilities' to 'arts facilities') Policy C1 has been written to ensure that if other interested bodies come forward with a planning application the Policy will support it, subject to certain planning conditions The potential use of the DLI for example as an art gallery, came out of the first public consultation events at the Town Hall, but all attempts by the Forum to discover future uses for the DLI building from the County Council have fallen on stony ground. Not enough progress has been made in terms of the Forum's knowledge about the DLI or indeed The Miners' Hall in North Rd (which is owned privately) to identify them as 'preferred options'.</p>	<p>c3 Suggesting change to policies</p> <p>Suggesting change to other text</p>	<p>We should consider inviting the author of this comment to join us when we are considering the Communities policies.</p> <p>Consider</p>
--	--	--

<p>4.231 If the DLI is removed as a preferred option this paragraph should be deleted</p> <p>4.232 Certainly the community has a right to bid for assets of community value. This would entail the community asking the council to list certain assets as being of value to the community. If an asset is listed and then comes up for sale, the new right will give communities that want it six months to put together a bid to buy it. This gives communities an increased chance to save much loved shops, pubs or other local facilities. However, at this time we are not in a position to take the DLI forward as an asset of community value.</p> <p>4.233. This needs changing. The Forum is not identifying one facility, but any future body (such as The Parish Council) might support projects identified by a range of partnerships. This will be identified in Policy Implementation Project 3 in Chapter 5</p>	Suggesting change to other text	Consider Also included under Projects
<p>WC39 Copied to Theme 5</p> <p>POLICY C 1. I support this Policy very strongly, and wish to give emphasis to matters of access to possible venues, having regard to the important need for bands/performers to conveniently off-load instruments/equipment etc and the need to maximise audience attendance/participation through adjacent,(preferably free),car-parking. This is essential to assist financial sustainability.</p>	c5 / c3 Suggesting change to other text, or possibly the Policy itself	Consider whether Policy or supporting text need changing



<p>L9b The county council notes that the plan includes text which relates to specific site proposals which are not contained within a policy and that it is stated that the Forum is at the first stage of identifying buildings. If it is the intention to identify specific land for this use then this should have been included within a policy in this version of the plan for consultation. Alternatively, if it was not possible to identify a site at this stage a full scope of criteria for judging the suitability of a site should have been included within the policy. The council is concerned that the policy as drafted does neither. Furthermore, the county council considers that this policy would benefit from being reworded. The term 'and should be accessible' is superfluous as the policy is written at present as a development that relates well to the modes of transport referred to would by definition be accessible.</p>	<p>c3 Objection to wording of the policy</p>	<p>Consider the points made and the possible rewording of the Policy</p>
<p>L12b Referring to para 4.229: Durham Universities' masterplan identifies the need for the provision of a significant venue for music and drama performance to raise the cultural profile of the University and City, allowing it to make a strong contribution to the arts nationwide. The facility would provide large scale performance and exhibitions spaces as well as facilities for music and drama practice and rehearsals. The University requests that the NPF includes a policy supporting this ambition.</p>	<p>c3 There is no policy relating to the provision of new cultural facilities.</p>	<p>Consider adding a new policy, or changing policies C1 and/or C3 to include this ambition. Also included under Policy C3</p>
<p>L23 C1 and C2 require the involvement of the DCC.</p>	<p>c2 Involvement of DCC in Policies C1 and C2</p>	<p>Covered by discussion with Council</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	COMMENT CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION TO BE CONSIDERED
<b>Policy C2: Information Hub</b>		
Q25 (1) Information Hub: This could be staffed by volunteers. (Info. Centre in Ludlow, Shropshire is run by volunteers.)	c5. Run Information hub by volunteers	Consider changes to supporting text for Policy C2
EQ42 I fully agree with this section of the plan. The university, cathedral, gala, venues and not-for-profit organisers such as Empty Shop should be able (and encouraged) to upload event information to a TIC easily to make the most of such a facility and attractive/useful to the largest possible section of residents and visitors. It should be mirrored by an up-to-date website/app where the same information can be easily accessed from anywhere.	c5. c4. Ideas for how to run TIC	Consider changing supporting text for Policy C2 and Policy Implementation Project 4 Visit Durham has a website with what's on information at <a href="https://www.thisisdurham.com/whats-on">https://www.thisisdurham.com/whats-on</a> Also included under General: Projects
EQ43. Re Policy C2. We would be sceptical of the efficiency or value of creating any sort of resource which solely exists as an information hub. Available space in the city centre is minimal and affordable space even more so. Also pertinent is the fact that an increasing majority of people plan their journeys and activities before leaving the house or carry a smart device with them - casting doubts on the longevity and necessity of any such resource. A hub which is integrated into an existing or new facility and which the use of could be monitored would be more appropriate. Most crucially a better quality and number of dedicated, free poster spaces would probably assist with clear lines of communication regarding activities and events.	c2 Concern  c3 c5 Suggesting change to policy and supporting text	Concern noted  Consider
EQ46 Agree with all apart from the information hub - Is this really needed? Durham is so small!	c3 except for Policy C2	Consider with other comments on Policy C2
Q54 I think the Information Centre should be brought back to the Market Place.	c2 / c3 Support for Policy C2 and possibly a change to the other text	To consider if supporting text for Policy C2 needs to be this site-specific

<p>WC118 ... development of the Miners' Hall as some form of visitor reception or other service point would make good use of its position.</p>	<p>c5 Addition of Miners Hall as venue for Policy C1 or C2</p>	<p>Consider addition to supporting text for Policies C1 or C2, plus addition as stakeholder to Policy Implementation Projects 3 and 4. Also included under Policy C1</p>
<p>WC123 Comment on your post "Policy C2" I support the principle of this policy. The information software should be accessible to all events and attractions providers so every organisation can easily add an event they organise with tags for easier searching. I would like the University to participate in it making the information about public lectures and events accessible. A the minute residents (or tourists) not working on the University has no way to learn about events open to public which University hold.</p>	<p>c5 Suggesting change to other text</p>	<p>Consider</p>
<p>WC125 It amazes me, and visitors alike, that a heritage city such as Durham City has no museum to illustrate its rich history from the period of early Christianity to the present day, including the period of the Norman Conquest, the 'Prince Bishops', the mining industry, ship building etc. ... Has anyone thought of using the former miners' hall at Redhills as the venue for a Durham Heritage Museum?</p>	<p>c2. Miners Hall as a heritage Museum</p>	<p>Consider including Miners Hall as a venue under Theme 6 Also included under Policy C1</p>

<p>L9b It is considered that there needs to be more of a reference to Visit County Durham throughout this section acknowledging that they are the destination management organisation / official tourism body for Durham who is responsible for coordination of the tourism sector and they advise providers of attractions, services and events on how to set up information services.</p> <p>The county council is very concerned that this policy and supporting text has been drafted with insufficient understanding of the work of Visit County Durham. What is described below would be expensive to set up and very costly to maintain. This puts into question the deliverability of the proposal.</p> <p>It is also extremely concerning that the proposal for an information hub will replicate their function and also undo much of Visit Durham's coordination of the sector that has taken place over the last 11 years. This duplication of current work is likely to result in confusion and inconsistent messaging for visitors. If an information hub was to be set up then it should be one that is joint managed by Visit County Durham and a body that provides similar services to residents.</p> <p>The county council strongly opposes the branding 'Love Durham' as it has invested heavily in the place brand and an information hub would need to reflect this.</p> <p>The county council wishes to clarify that The Pointers are a voluntary run service, if they were to take a more active role in the provision of visitor information especially for areas outside of the city they would need to be professionally trained to do so - Visit County Durham have advised that they could support with this.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, if this policy is to be retained then the county council considers that this policy would benefit from being reworded. At present this policy fails to include an appropriate scope of criteria against which the acceptability of a proposal could be assessed. Furthermore the term 'and should be accessible' is superfluous as the policy is written at present as a development that relates well to the modes of transport referred to would by definition be accessible.</p>	<p>c3 Objection that this Policy cuts across the work of Visit County Durham.</p> <p>c5 Possible change to other text</p> <p>c5 Objection to brand</p> <p>c2. Clarification given about The Pointers</p> <p>c3 Objection to current wording</p>	<p>Consider wording of Policy, possibly with Visit County Durham.</p> <p>But see L11 below.</p> <p>Consider change</p> <p>Consider whether to drop this proposal.</p> <p>Possible change to other text</p> <p>Consider rewording. This policy had a lot of support from respondents.</p>
--	---	--

<p>L11 Durham Pointers' committee would like to endorse Policy C2 of Durham City Neighbourhood Plan: Information Hub</p> <p>Many visitors express their surprise that a cathedral city like Durham lacks an easily accessible central hub of information for visitors. We are very conscious that less well known, or attractions away from the centre, are not adequately promoted and we do our best to advise visitors and residents about events and attractions both within the city and across the County. In our experience, day or short stay visitors are rarely prepared to use the telephone service 'This is Durham'. Indeed this facility no longer operates at weekends.</p> <p>The proposed central hub offers the potential to provide a much needed central information point which could hold and disseminate information on local county attractions and community events. We believe any such provision should embrace all modern media methods for the distribution of information but should also be a place for face-to-face encounters. Our experience has demonstrated that the majority of older visitors to the city prefer personal contact. Remote access can also prove challenging for those with physical or learning disabilities.</p> <p>Additionally, if the Hub were located in the Town Hall with public access encouraged, the historic interior could be an added visitor attraction.</p>	<p>c2 Support for Policy C2 with reasons why existing arrangements are in their view not working</p>	<p>Support noted. Need to reconcile this with the Council's submission L9b above, if that is possible.</p>
<p>L23 C1 and C2 require the involvement of the DCC.</p>	<p>c2 Involvement of DCC in Policies C1 and C2</p>	<p>Covered by discussion with Council</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	COMMENT CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION TO BE CONSIDERED
<b><i>Policy C3: Provision of New Community Facilities</i></b>		
<p>WC63 Please include the protection and provision of more public toilets in Policy C3 and C6.</p>	<p>c2 Change to text of Policies C3 and C6. The reference to C6 seems odd, as C4 would be more appropriate. Note addressed by Project 14</p>	<p>Consider change to Policy C3, and C4 or C6 Also included under Policy C4</p>
<p>Q68 C3 How would you finance this with council funding cuts communal halls are being closed.</p>	<p>c5 Concern</p>	<p>Consider change to supporting text</p>
<p>Q76 C3 need to also mention point 8. Need good quality sustainable design that respects the distinctiveness of Durham.</p>	<p>c3 Suggesting change to policies</p>	<p>Consider (though it may be best addressed by Policy S2, or Policies H2 and H3)</p>
<p>L8b [extracts from 23 page document] It is essential that the clubhouse facilities are of a modern standard throughout to enable full use of the clubhouse in order to generate funds via social and fundraising events. A modern, usable clubhouse is crucial to the long-term sustainability of the Club. [...] Among the potential ground improvements that the Club will consider and investigate with an eye on 2029 and beyond are: • New clubhouse – either rebuilt on current site or new build in south-east corner of the ground</p>	<p>c5 Possible mention in supporting text re DCCC</p>	<p>Consider mention in supporting text.</p>
<p>L12b Referring to para 4.229: Durham Universities' masterplan identifies the need for the provision of a significant venue for music and drama performance to raise the cultural profile of the University and City, allowing it to make a strong contribution to the arts nationwide. The facility would provide large scale performance and exhibitions spaces as well as facilities for music and drama practice and rehearsals. The University requests that the NPF includes a policy supporting this ambition.</p>	<p>c3 There is no policy relating to the provision of new cultural facilities.</p>	<p>Consider adding a new policy, or changing policies C1 and/or C3 to include this ambition. Also included under Policy C1</p>

<p>L9b The county council strongly considers that the uses contained within this policy should be an exhaustive list otherwise it presents uncertainty over the scope of uses. It is suggested that reference is made to the appropriate Use Classes set out in the Use Classes Order.</p> <p><b>Criterion 1</b> this is not considered appropriate as it is a policy consideration in its own right which is already clearly dealt with in NPPF.</p> <p><b>Criterion 2</b> as worded could preclude a proposal that relates well to a residential area that is not currently served by local facilities.</p> <p><b>Criterion 3</b> the term 'wherever possible' weakens the application of this criterion.</p> <p><b>Criterion 6</b> reference to parking and servicing are important considerations which are absent from the policy.</p>	<p>c3 Objection to list of examples, an exhaustive list is recommended</p> <p>c3 Objection as duplicates NPPF</p> <p>c3 Objection to twin test</p> <p>c3 Objection as too weak</p> <p>c3 Objection to omissions</p>	<p>Consider revision along lines suggested.</p> <p>Consider: would moving to supporting text resolve this? Consider this constructive criticism</p> <p>Consider this constructive criticism</p> <p>Consider adding references to parking and servicing.</p>
<p>L12b Policy [...] states that development will not be permitted if it is in the green belt. This is not considered to be sound as the tests in the NPPF should be followed.</p>	<p>c3 Objection as duplicates NPPF</p>	<p>Consider: would moving to supporting text resolve this?</p>
<p>L23 Finally we recognise, as with the development of a community facility at Merryoaks for the community associations and residents in the CCP, NXCA and Merryoaks areas, that C3 is a sensible policy but one that requires collaboration with the University and the DCC</p>	<p>c2 Support with proviso of collaboration with DCC and University</p>	<p>Consider proviso in supporting text</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	COMMENT CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION TO BE CONSIDERED
<b>Policy C4: Protection of an Existing Community Facility</b>		
EQ05 Existing community facilities may not be economically viable but might warrant attempts to secure funding support / community takeover before being declared redundant	c5 Suggesting change to other text of Policy C4	Consider changing other text
WC42 POLICY C 4. Whilst I support this Policy, I suggest it be re-formatted as follows: 1.The facility is no longer financially viable, but an equivalent facility is available nearby to satisfy the needs of the local community, OR 2.There is no significant demand for the facility within that locality.	c3 Suggesting change to policies	Consider
WC63 Please include the protection and provision of more public toilets in Policy C3 and C6.	c2 Change to text of Policies C3 and C6. The reference to C6 seems odd, as C4 would be more appropriate. Note addressed by Project 14	Consider change to Policy C3, and C4 or C6 Also included under Policy C3
L9b The county council considers that in the interests of clarity the approach of cross referencing in this policy should be avoided. The scope of uses to which these policies relate should be aligned to the use Classes Order. <b>Criterion 3</b> The county council considers that it is unclear as to whether criterion 3 is applicable to either scenario set out in criterion 1 and 2. The policy should be amended to provide the necessary clarity.	c3 Rewording suggested  c3 Suggesting change to resolve ambiguity	Consider alternative approach suggested here  Revise wording.
L23 We support C4-6 although we feel that it is important to note that health and related provision should not be used to subsidise, for example, what should more properly fall within the responsibility of the University.	c2 Support but proviso about responsibility of University	Support noted Consider including proviso in supporting text



COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	COMMENT CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION TO BE CONSIDERED
<b><i>Policy C5: Protection of Urban Open Spaces</i></b>		
Q43 All these facilities are needed but is C5 strictly necessary when it is already dealt with under Green Infrastructure?	c2 Concern about duplication	Commenter does not seem to have read supporting text 4.246 Need to consider changing policy or clarifying in supporting text. Cross ref to Theme 2b
Q62 C5.1 – use of “or” between clauses again worrying.	c3 Concern	Consider change to policy
Q76. C51-4. Good quality materials, street furniture, lighting, landscaping. The space should respect the urban grain and townscape. C5.2 Who decides what is surplus to requirement. Concerned there may be some bias used here from University or Durham County Council.	c3 Suggesting change to policies c2 Question	Consider adding a new point 4 to C5.1 Answer question
WC44 POLICY C 5.2. As currently drafted point 3 -the provision of equivalent or better quality space- appears to be a requirement, whether or not 1 or 2 can be demonstrated. Is this the intention, or am I just being thick?	c3 Concern	Need to clarify policy. Is it 1 OR (2 and 3), or (1 OR 2) AND 3, or something else?
L4 We do however note Policy C5 (loss of urban open spaces) which appears to be identical to Policy G1.3 (loss of green assets). Is there any real difference between these proposed Policies? Are both really needed?	c3 / c5 Concern about duplication	Need to consider changing policy or clarifying in supporting text. Cross ref to Theme 2b

<p>L9b The county council has noted that the threshold contained within this policy is inconsistent with that cited elsewhere in the draft plan. Furthermore the policy wording suggests that only criteria set out within that policy needs to be adhered to for a scheme to be acceptable. In the interests of clarity the policy should be reworded to replace the phrases 'will be supported if' with 'should'</p> <p>The policy intention at C5.1 is at odds with the title in that it relates to the provision of open space as opposed to protection of such space and is considered to overlap with Policy G1 which poses issues in the application of the policies in question.</p> <p><b>Criterion C5.1.3</b> it is an unreasonable requirement for developers to address existing short falls in provision. Such a requirement should only relate to the requirements of the scheme in question.</p>	<p>c3 Inconsistency pointed out</p> <p>c3 Objection to wording</p> <p>c3 Inconsistency pointed out</p> <p>c3 / c5 Overlap with policy G1 suggested</p> <p>c3 Objection to wording</p>	<p>Consider resolving inconsistency with policy G1.1 and elsewhere? Consider rewording: the current wording has a presumably unintended consequence.</p> <p>Need to resolve the protection / provision wording Urban open spaces can be hard, i.e. not green, but this distinction is not clear in our policies. Consider rewording. The intention of 5.1.3 was to let developers provide the space away from the site if it wasn't possible within.</p>
<p>L23 We support C4-6 although we feel that it is important to note that health and related provision should not be used to subsidise, for example, what should more properly fall within the responsibility of the University.</p>	<p>c2 Support with proviso about responsibility of University</p>	<p>Consider including proviso in supporting text</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	COMMENT CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION TO BE CONSIDERED
<b>Policy C6: Health Care and Social Care Facilities</b>		
Q18. C6. Access of disabled people to facilities needs ensuring as a priority Dentist facilities without such access need to be discovered factually rather than reliance on “anecdotal evidence”.	c5 Suggests better evidence needed	Consider gathering more evidence (which would go in supporting text)
Q63 Para 4.251 last sentence: ‘a requirement for’ should be ‘provision of’?	c5 Suggesting changes to other text	Consider changing supporting text under Policy C6 (para 4.251)
WC45 POLICY C 6. I support this Policy and suggest that emphasis be given to the importance of adjoining car-parking space. I think the items listed 1 to 9 need to be reviewed/reformatted in finalising the draft. (See in particular point 6).	c3 Concern that Policy C6 does not mention car parking c3 Point 6 should not have been numbered: web version differs from the printed document.	Consider change to policy, and relationship with Policies T1, T2  Error in web version to be corrected
L9b The county council considers that as nursing homes and care homes have differing considerations to health centres and surgeries it would be more appropriate for them to be considered in another housing related policy. <b>Criterion 1</b> this is not considered appropriate as it is a policy consideration in its own right which is already clearly dealt with in NPPF. <b>Criterion 7</b> it is considered that levels of amenity and open space should be good, not ‘satisfactory’. <b>Criterion 4 &amp; 8</b> could be refined into one criterion to avoid unnecessary repetition within the policy.	c3 Suggests splitting of the policy  c3 Objection as covered by NPPF  c3 Objection  c3 Suggestion for rewording	Consider – but this was two policies originally which we merged due to repetition. Consider. Maybe move to supporting text? Consider this constructive criticism  Consider.
L12b Policy [...] states that development will not be permitted if it is in the green belt. This is not considered to be sound as the tests in the NPPF should be followed.	c3 Objection as covered by NPPF	Consider: Maybe move to supporting text?
L23 We support C4-6 although we feel that it is important to note that health and related provision should not be used to subsidise, for example, what should more properly fall within the responsibility of the University.	c2 Support with proviso about responsibility of University	Consider adding proviso into supporting text

