

**2019 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION  
CATEGORISATION OF COMMENTS AND PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED**

**Theme 6 - A City with an Enriched Community Life**

**22 July 2019**

The comments have unique codes as follows:

- SEQ = electronic questionnaire response
- SQ = paper questionnaire response
- SEM = email response
- SWC = web comment

However, no personal details have been provided.

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

- L2 = City of Durham Trust
- L5 = Durham County Council
  - L5b = Durham County Council Appendix
- L6 = Durham University
  - L6a = Durham University Response
- L12 = Resident1
- L18 = WHS Coordinator

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 input into initiatives in 'Looking Forwards'
- c5: suggesting changes to the other text of the Plan

## THEME 6

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<b>COMMENTS RELEVANT TO THEME 6</b>		
<b>SEQ2</b> The proposal of using the DLI site as a new arts venue is also pretty stupid. This should include gallery space, exhibition space, family activities etc, this should be in the town centre and attract people into the town, how about utilising the old M&S building. {Work/run business}	c2. Policy C1	(The Plan does not propose using the DLI site.) General support for policy noted.
<b>L12</b> Resident1 {parts copied to Themes 3,4,6, Comments} 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.	c3. Policy C3	Amend policy to change 'In each case' to 'In the first case' Amend text to say that the availability of an equivalent nearby alternative facility is a relevant factor when assessing the proposals.
<b>SQ2</b> {Parts copied to Themes 3,5,6} I agree with an enriched community life. {No 'your details' given}	c2. Policy C1	Support noted
<b>SQ15</b> {Parts copied to Themes 4,5,6} Strong support for C4 {Work / run business DH1}	c2. Policy C4	Support noted
<b>SQ15 /cont (i)</b> Strong support for ... C1. {Work / run business DH1}	c2. Policy C1	Support noted
<b>SQ16</b> {Parts copied to Themes 3,6, Comments} Accessibility in Durham City centre needs to be given more attention, e.g. no disabled toilets after hours. {Work / run business & student	c4. Policies C2 and C3 c5. Policies C2 and C3	{Assume moving about the City is dealt with in Theme 3.} Availability of toilets in general may be issue for 'Looking Forwards'

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
DH1}		Should mention access for people with disabilities in text.
<b>SQ16 /cont (i)</b> Policy C4 - growing student population requires more GPs - already lack of appointments. {Work / run business & student DH1}	c2. Policy C4	Support noted
<b>SQ20</b> {Parts copied to Themes 3,5,6} C1: Not clear. C4: Not clear. {Resident DH1}	c2. Policy C1 c2. Policy C4	Noted. There is not enough detail here to help us to address the lack of clarity.
<b>L18</b> WHS Coordinator {parts copied to Themes 1,2a,2b,3,4,5, Comments} <b>Theme 6: A City with an Enriched Community Life</b> <b>Policy C1: Provision of Facilities for Arts and Culture</b> <b>Policy C2: Provision of New Community Facilities</b> <b>Policy C3: Protection of an Existing Community Facility</b> <b>Policy C4: Health Care and Social Care Facilities</b> A strong arts and culture provision in the City can help with its attractiveness for extending and enriching the stay of visitors to the WHS. A City with a strong community provision is part of its attraction to students and also to a more diverse range of residents. Ensuring the diversity of the City is valuable in ensuring its sustainability – an important factor in conserving the WHS townscape setting.	c2. Policy C1 c2. Policy C2 c2. Policy C3 c2. Policy C4	Support noted Support noted Support noted Support noted
<b>SEM3</b> {Parts copied to Themes 1,2b,3,6,Comments) 6. Lastly, a big bug bear of mine is the lack of amenity for children within the city centre. A neighbourhood plan should support the needs of all ages within the community and there is nothing for children to do in Durham, this is a big business opportunity for the city and should also attract visitors and families from outside of the city. Cinemas are not the only form of family entertainment! It would be lovely to see our	c5. Policy C2 c5. Policy C3	Paragraph 4.289 and also the photograph immediately before these policies both indicate that these policies include facilities for children, but this will be made clearer in the supporting text and justification.

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
teenagers catered for and provided with something positive within the city.		
<p><b>L2</b>            {parts copied to Themes 1,2b,4,5,6, Comments}            The City of Durham Trust ...            ....The Trust applauds Policies C1-3 and the way the Plan seeks to address the significant gaps in provision for arts and culture in central Durham. A central art gallery seems a particular desideratum, and the proposal for a City Centre community hub is very welcome. It remains strange that a city such as Durham has no tourist information office, despite the work of Visit Durham.</p>	<p>c2. Policy C1            c2. Policy C2            c2. Policy C3</p>	<p>Support noted            Support noted            Support noted</p>
<p><b>L5b</b>            Durham County Council            {parts copied to all Themes, Comments}</p> <p><b>C1 LPA Comment</b>            Criterion a: It is not possible to insist that the facility is open to all. The best that can be secured through the neighbourhood plan is for it to be accessible in terms of design and location, so the potential is there. That issue is covered by other criteria in the policy.            If it was in the town centre there would be no requirement to demonstrate need.</p>	<p>c3. Policy C1</p>	<p>(a) has been added to deal with public art. This has been moved from S1(k). Consequently following clauses have been re-lettered and the comments below refer to the new letters.            It is not clear what we meant by “open to all” particularly as (f) and (g) address the more specific aspects of this. Delete “and are open to all from (b)            It is not clear why town centre facilities are any different to those elsewhere as far as requiring need to be demonstrated.            See also note against L5b /cont (ii).</p>
<p><b>L5b /cont (i)</b>  <b>C1 LPA Comment</b>            (Copied from comments against Theme 5)            Within Theme 6 it is suggested that new arts facilities in the City Centre need to provide space for passengers to be set down and picked up but</p>	<p>C3 policy C1</p>	<p>Remove the phrase  <i>to set down / pick up passengers and</i></p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>bearing in mind the policies encouraging non-car travel, this is a contradiction within the Plan. Suggested Action Resolve contradiction.</p> <p>It is not clear how would to demonstrate a community need or whether the proposal would harm the viability of an existing facility?</p>	<p>c5. Policy C1 (a) and (c) in the version consulted on (b) and (d) in the revised version</p>	<p>from the text of the policy.</p> <p>(b) This has been addressed in the supporting text. The applicant would be expected to make a case that their proposal would meet a community need. (d) One would expect representatives from existing facilities to object on these grounds.</p>
<p><b>L5b /cont (ii)</b> <b>C2 LPA Comment</b> The policy will be difficult to apply to alterations and extensions to existing buildings and may be missing opportunities to add value to managing development of existing sites as most criteria could only be applied to new accommodation. <b>Suggested Action</b> Further criteria may be necessary, or the scope of the policy changed regarding existing accommodation. Splitting criteria as per approach in Policy C1 would assist.</p>	<p>c3. Policy C2</p>	<p>The issue identified here would probably also apply to Policy C1. We have not addressed the conversion of old buildings to new community uses, where some compromises might be necessary. The suggested action does seem to offer a way forward.</p>
<p><b>L5b /cont (iii)</b> <b>C3 LPA Comment</b> Whilst the intent of this policy is supported in order to apply it there would need to be a definition of locality in order that the reader knows the geographical area of search. There could be such facilities outside the neighbourhood area which would suffice. Without such clarity it will be difficult to implement the policy. The supporting text should provide some guidance as to how to undertake the tests associated with criteria a &amp; b.</p>	<p>c5. Policy C3</p>	<p>This issue has also been raised in comment L12. Guidance will be added to the supporting text. This will need to address the fact that different types of facility could well have different areas of search. The challenge is to provide clarity and not waffle.</p>
<p><b>L5b /cont (iv)</b> <b>C4 LPA Comment</b></p>	<p>c3. Policy C4</p>	<p>Criterion (g) should be amended to</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>Residential care homes may have differing requirements to the other uses. For example, the policy does not adequately reflect the need to consider compatibility of care homes with adjacent uses. This is a more sensitive use than the others cited in the policy.</p> <p><b>Suggested Action</b> Amend criterion g to reflect need to consider impacts that existing non-residential uses may have on a care home's amenity and impacts that a care home may have on the operation of an existing business.</p>		<p>consider impacts that existing non-residential uses may have on a care home's amenity. Does criterion (c) not address the impacts that a care home may have on the operation of an existing business? Perhaps the supporting text could make this clear?</p>
<p><b>L5b /cont (v)</b> <b>C4 LPA Comment</b> Criterion e excludes residential care homes when it should not. There are some operational requirements.</p>	c3. Policy C4 (e)	Remove cross-heading "And in the case of..."
<p><b>L6a</b> Durham University {parts copied to all Themes, Comments} <b>Page 133 –Paragraph 4.266</b> <i>"it seems reasonable to infer that some expansion..."</i> The Neighbourhood Plan group should seek evidence from GP and dental practices and NHS Care Commissioning group to ascertain whether there is capacity in current practices to expand.</p>	c5. Paragraph 4.266	<p>Evidence was obtained, see <a href="http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/themes/community/health/">http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/themes/community/health/</a> but this was not documented in the Plan document. This has been rechecked and is now referred to in the updated Plan. All practices are accepting new patients and it seems disproportionate to make hypothetical enquiries.</p>
<p><b>L6a /cont (i)</b> <b>Page 136:-Policy C1:</b> This policy has been amended to cover facilities for culture as well as art. This change is supported.</p>	c2. Policy C1	Support noted
<p><b>L6a /cont (ii)</b> <b>Page 136:-Policy C1:</b></p>		

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
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.	c5. Policy C1	We could refer to this proposed new significant venue in the supporting text.
<p><b>L6a /cont (iii)</b>  <b>Page 139 –Policy C3:</b>                      This has been amended in line with our comments on the previous consultation draft and is welcomed.</p>	c2. Policy C3	Support noted