

## City of Durham Parish Council

Dear Councillor,

### **In accordance with the Local Government Act 1972**

I hereby give you notice that a **Meeting** of the **City of Durham Parish Council** will be held in the **The Lantern Room, Town Hall, Durham City, DH1 3NJ** on **Thursday 26 July 2018** at **19:00** to transact the following business:-

1. **DURHAM UNITED FOOTBALL CLUB** – presentation by the club secretary.
2. **TO RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE COUNTY DURHAM PLAN AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE CITY OF DURHAM PARISH COUNCIL AREA** - Mike Allum DCC Head of Spatial Policy
3. **TO RECEIVE AND APPROVE (OR NOT) APOLOGIES OF ABSENCE FROM TODAY'S MEETING**
4. **TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM MEMBERS.**
5. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.**
6. **APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 21 JUNE 2018**
7. **COMMITTEE UPDATES**
  - ) Personnel Committee held on 28 June – see attached minutes
  - ) Planning Committee meetings held on 29 June - see attached minutes
8. **UPDATE FROM CHAIR.**
9. **A FURTHER DISCUSSION ON THE NAME OF THE COUNCIL.** Please see the attached report from NALC Legal Team concerning the use of the City of Durham name.
10. **DECLUTTERING THE STREETS OF DURHAM** – see attached report
11. **DURHAM COUNTY LOCAL PLAN PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION: DRAFT RESPONSE ON BEHALF OF THE PARISH COUNCIL** – see attached report
12. **MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM TASK FORCE** – see attached report

13. **DISCUSSION ON HOLDING AN AWAY DAY FOR THE PARISH COUNCIL –**  
this will include a discussion about the strategic priorities for the council which will eventually be passed to the appropriate committee for action.

14. **A MOTION FOR DISCUSSION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR R ORMEROD**  
This council opposes any attempt to reduce the number of parking spaces in Church Street as this will be detrimental to residents, parents of children at the primary school, people attending church and local businesses.

Council undertakes to write to the Chief Executive of Durham County Council to inform him of this view.

15. **MOTION FOR DISCUSSION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR E ASHBY**  
'This Council resolves to ask Durham County Council to be added to the list of partners on Durham City's Safety Committee

16. **MOTION FOR DISCUSSION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR J ASHBY**  
"Following the recent 'consultation' about the re location of County Hall to the Sands, this Council calls upon the County Council to urgently review:

1 the proposal itself and specifically our previous request that Aykley Heads or Milburngate be re-considered: and

2 the way the decision has been delivered to the public via the developer's minimal exhibition and its accompanying inadequate feedback form.

We applaud the County Council's desire to confirm the unique status of Durham City and to find ways of supporting the vitality of the city centre. However as representatives of residents in that city centre we still need the County Council to explain how these benefits balance the costs to the local community as well as the implications for surrounding towns and villages and the County's workforce.

We ask the County Council and its developer Kier to pause the planning process while these major issues and other more detailed matters such as traffic management, air quality and impacts on the natural environment and the visitor economy can be given due consideration.

We urge the County Council to proceed with its planning application only when these matters have been subject to proper public scrutiny as part of a significantly improved consultation process.

17. **MOTION SUBMITTED FOR DISCUSSION BY COUNCILLOR R CORNWELL**  
"This Council welcomes the decision of Durham County Council to seek a direction under Regulation 7 of the Town and County Planning Act to control

the display of 'To Let' boards in the Durham City Centre Conservation Area, and resolves to write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in support of this proposal.”

18. **INVITATION TO DURHAM IN BLOOM LUNCHEON** – see attached report

19. **TRAINING FOR PARISH COUNCIL**

20. **CYCLE OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

**2018**

23 August  
27 September  
25 October  
22 November  
20 December

**2019**

24 January  
28 February  
28 March

**And** pursuant to the provisions of the above-named act, **I Hereby Summon You** to attend the said meeting.



Stephen Ragg  
Interim Clerk City of Durham Parish Council

c/o Room 103 Floor 1  
County Hall  
Durham  
DH1 5UF

Tel 03000 269921  
Email [cdalc@durham.gov.uk](mailto:cdalc@durham.gov.uk)

19 July 2018

## CITY OF DURHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the City of Durham Parish Council held on Thursday 21 June 2018 at 7.00 p.m. in the Lantern Room, Durham Town Hall, Durham.

### **Present:**

Councillors E Ashby, J Ashby, V Ashfield, J Atkinson, L Brown, S Cahill, R Cornwell, A Doig, J Elmer, D Freeman, G Holland, R Ormerod, C Reeves, M Ross and E Scott.

### **Councillor E Scott** in the Chair

#### **1. Apologies**

There were no apologies for absence.

#### **2. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **3. Public Participation**

A local resident addressed the council to outline his concerns regarding the expansion of Durham University, its plans for a route down South Road and the impact of increased student numbers entering Church Street where the proposed plans for pavement widening will have a significant impact on traffic flow, parking, risks to pedestrians, access to local businesses, the local school, church and St Oswalds Institute and those in assisted living, where there was great demand placed upon accessible parking spaces.

Many residents of Church Street were concerned regarding the expansion proposals and its impact upon the immediate area.

A further local resident reiterated the comments made and furthermore queried why money had been spent on re-marking the roads in this area if it was known that major changes were going to be required to accommodate the expansion.

A motion was proposed by Cllr Ashfield as follows

“This council resolves to ask the County Council that we be included in the list of statutory consultees on the amended proposal relating to Church Street so that we can make a formal response to the revised proposals when they are re-presented”.

**Seconded** by Councillor Ormerod.

Councillor Freeman noted that he had raised these issues with the highways department at Durham County Council only a matter of weeks ago and he provided an update to the council on those discussions including details of how the scheme would be funded.

Members continued to discuss the implications that the proposals had upon the city and it was acknowledged that the growth of the university was a problem and there was a desperate need for transport planning. It was also noted that St Oswalds Church, which was very busy, popular and well regarded would be affected by the proposals and could see an impact upon services held such as funerals. All of the issues raised needed to be carefully considered and it was the opinion of members that more holistic approach was required. It was further suggested that the University provide a presentation to the parish council on their proposals.

Upon a vote being taken the motion was **carried**.

#### **4. Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on 10 May 2018 and 6 June 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair with the following amendments:-

That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 May refer to being those of the Inaugural meeting and not the Annual Meeting.

The minutes of the 5 June –

Item 7, resolution to read

That the council establish Committees as follows:

Environment Committee (omit the words “and events”)

Item 8 – to amend the incorrect spelling of Councillor Ormerod’s name

#### **5. Committee Minutes**

There were no committee minutes to consider at this time.

#### **6. Approval of Draft Terms of Reference**

The Interim Clerk advised that further to discussion at previous meetings, the Terms of Reference for the following committees were appended to the report and were submitted for approval.

**Resolved:** That the Terms of Reference for the following committee be agreed with the following amendments

- (i) Finance Committee – to consist of a minimum of 5 members.
- (ii) Planning Committee - To allow delegated authority to those Planning Committee members to make representations on planning applications.
- (iii) Licensing Committee – Change to last paragraph to read “*And either the premises named in the licence application are with the jurisdiction of the parish council...*”

It was further agreed that Councillor Cahill be appointed to the said committee.

- (iv) Environment Committee – to remove the word Events from the title of the committee.

And to rectify the typo at item (h)

## 7. Motion submitted for discussion by Councillor R Ormerod

In accordance with a Notice of Motion it was **Moved** by Councillor Ormerod

*“That this council opposes the decision of Durham County Council to relocate its civic headquarters to the Sands area in Durham city centre. This relocation would be detrimental to the local community and would cause problems with parking, would create an unsustainable traffic situation on Providence Row, Claypath and the wider city centre and would further diminish the air quality in Durham city.*

*This council also notes that Durham County Council plans to redevelop its present headquarters site and the wider Aykley Heads site as business park which would attract thousands of jobs to our city.*

*This council undertakes to write to the Leader and Chief Executive of Durham County Council urging them to reconsider the decision and look at the option to relocate its headquarters to the new business park at Aykley Heads.”*

Councillor J Ashby **Moved** the following amendment

*“This council undertakes to write to the Leader and Chief Executive of Durham County Council urging them to reconsider the decision and look at the option to relocate its headquarters within the Aykley Heads or Milburngate site”*

**Seconded** by Councillor Scott

Councillor Ormerod accepted the amendment to the Motion. The following then became the substantive Motion:

*“That this council opposes the decision of Durham County Council to relocate its civic headquarters to the Sands area in Durham city centre. This relocation would be detrimental to the local community and would cause problems with parking, would create an unsustainable traffic situation on Providence Row, Claypath and the wider city centre and would further diminish the air quality in Durham city.*

*This council also notes that Durham County Council plans to redevelop its present headquarters site and the wider Aykley Heads site as business park which would attract thousands of jobs to our city.*

*This council undertakes to write to the Leader and Chief Executive of Durham County Council urging them to reconsider the decision and look at the option to relocate its headquarters within the Aykley Heads or Milburngate site”*

Upon a vote being taken the substantive motion was **carried**.

Upon submission by Councillor Doig the council also agreed that the Planning Committee should undertake a review of wider planning matters as well as responding to planning applications (where it has delegated powers) where it needs to make recommendations to full Council for a formal response from the council to the appropriate body or bodies.

## 8. Motion submitted for discussion by Cllr A Doig

In accordance with a Notice of Motion it was **Moved** by Councillor Doig

*“That this council should initiate a public meeting in the Autumn in the Town Hall for voters and residents to have their say on issues relating to the City”*

Councillor J Ashby **Moved** the following amendment

*“That this council should initiate a public meeting in the Autumn in the Town Hall for voters and residents to have their say on issues and priorities for the council”*

**Seconded** by Councillor Brown

Councillor Doig accepted the amendment to the Motion. The following then became the substantive Motion:

*“That this council should initiate a public meeting in the Autumn in the Town Hall for voters and residents to have their say on issues and priorities for the council”*

Upon a vote being taken the substantive motion was **carried**.

It was further noted that members had discussed at a previous meeting options for holding an away day and the Interim Clerk advised that this could be discussed further at a future meeting.

## 9. Britain in Bloom

The Chair welcomed Oliver Sherratt, Head of Direct Services Durham County Council who was in attendance to provide a presentation on the Britain in Bloom initiative.

Councillor Ormerod commented that he had been involved with the initiative previously and had found it to be an excellent tool for bringing together the community and developing a sense of community pride. He noted that the costs were far outweighed by what had been achieved and fully supported the scheme.

Councillor Elmer added that whilst he acknowledged the success of the scheme and its ability to motivate a desire for excellent standards he did query what happened throughout the remainder of the year and whether resources were pulled from other areas of the county in order to work on the various projects.

Further discussion took place on the topic and Councillor Scott asked whether there were also opportunities for community gardens to be involved. The Head of Direct Services advised that he would be happy to take this forward.

Councillor E Ashby suggested that all future matters relating to Britain in Bloom be referred to the Environment Committee for action. Furthermore that the parish council be formally considered as a partner and that a floral display be created to mark the launching of the new parish council for the City of Durham.

**Resolved:** That the parish council support the Britain in Bloom initiative and further correspondence be dealt with through the Environment Committee.

## **10. Community Relations Task Force**

Councillor Doig advised that the Durham University Residents Forum (DURF) had suggested he raise with the Council a nomination for one council representative to attend meetings of the University's Community Engagement Task Force (CETF). Details of the scope of the CETF were detailed within the attached report.

Councillor Doig went on to provide an update following his attendance at a recent meeting and after lengthy discussion and consideration of the offer, members felt that it would not be appropriate to put forward a representative to site on the CETF at this time.

Councillor Doig proposed that

"Before the council is prepared to participate in the Task Force, it considers that the Terms of Reference should be redrafted to address the issues associated with the university's Masterplan and the potential impact of the increased student numbers on the amenity of residents and

That the council is happy to meet with university representatives to discuss the Terms of Reference prior to considering membership of the task force."

**Resolved:** That no appointment to the Community Engagement Task Force be made at this time. Councillor Doig and Councillor J Ashby were to pursue changes to the terms of reference and refer back to council.

## **11. Estimate of Expenditure Spent to Date**

The Interim Clerk presented for information a copy of the estimates of expenditure for the year to date. He advised that the precept was currently retained within Durham County Councils accounting systems, until such a time as the council appoints a new Clerk and agreement has been made as to banking arrangements.

It was further noted that figures presented were estimates only and may vary when final invoices had been received. The report went on to further highlight budget implications including; recruitment of clerk and associated on costs to the employer, costs associated with HR advice provided by DCC, Internal and External Audit Fees, Insurance costs and it was reported that at this stage, it was not known whether the County Council would recharge the parish council for the administrative support being provided until a new Clerk was appointed.

In referring to the estimated printing costs, Councillor Holland noted that the estimated figure appeared to be high and queried whether this could be reduced by providing access to meeting papers electronically. The Interim Clerk advised that the cost of printing was charged at 3p per page however the figure quoted was an

estimate only. If any member wished to receive electronic copies of correspondence only then they should notify the Interim Clerk.

Further discussion took place regarding venue hire and it was noted that at the previous meeting a decision had been taken to hold the first 12 months meetings at the Town Hall. It was noted however that Durham County Council were unable to provide a discount on the cost of room hire and as the hire of the Town Hall was expensive, it was thought by some that alternative venues should be explored.

**Resolved:** That the content of the report and the council's current financial position be noted.

## **12. Discussion of Items for the next agenda**

The Chair invited members to discuss items for inclusion on the next agenda. Councillor Ormerod noted that Durham United Football Club had expressed a desire to attend a future meeting. Councillor Scott suggested that this be dealt with at the next meeting.

Also, given that the deadlines for comments on the emerging County Durham Plan, remained a high priority for the council, it was agreed that the council contact DCC Planners to seek a presentation on the CDP at the next meeting.

It was also noted that the council wished to discuss the name of the parish council at the next meeting. The Interim Clerk advised that legal advice was being sought on the matter and further details would be provided at the next meeting.

Councillor Atkinson in referring to discussions at a previous meeting noted that arrangements were still to be made for an away day / open meeting and a date was required. It was suggested that this also be included on the agenda for discussion at the next meeting.

**Resolved:** That the following items be included on the agenda for the next meeting:

- i. Durham United Football Club
- ii. County Durham Plan
- iii. Away Day / Autumn Public Meeting
- iv. Name of council

## **13. Proposed date of future meetings**

**Resolved:** That the proposed schedule of meetings be agreed.

Approved as a correct record

Signed

Chair

26 JULY 2018

## **CITY OF DURHAM PARISH COUNCIL**

Minutes of a Meeting of the City of Durham Parish Council Personnel Committee held on Tuesday 19 June 2018 at 10:00 in Alington House, 4 North Bailey, Durham, DH1 3ET.

### **Present:**

Councillors R Cornwell, D Freeman, G Holland and E Scott.

**Councillor E Scott** in the Chair

### **1. Apologies**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **2. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

- 3.** Members discussed details of the National Agreement and Guide to Good Employment Practice issued by the national Association of Local Councils and Society of Local Council Clerks. They also took note of the salary scales payable to clerks wef 1 April 2018.

A discussion ensued over the profile considered applicable to the new clerks position and the associated salary. Consideration was given to the current level of services being provided by the council and the number of hours considered appropriate for the clerks position given the current levels of service provision etc.

It was resolved that a part time salary would initially be working around 20 hours per week and that the profile of the council would profile three council. This would obviously increase as the years progress and the council provides more services and employs more staff etc.

It was agreed that further discussion was required with a Human Resources expert to ensure that the correct procedures were followed in relation to the appointment of the new clerk.

It was resolved that DCC HR's service be approached to provide the necessary guidance for the recruitment process.

**Approved as a correct record**

**Signed**

**Chair of Personnel Committee**

## CITY OF DURHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the City of Durham Parish Council Planning Committee held Friday 29 June 2018 at 10:00 in the Mezzanine Room Durham Town Hall, Market Place, Durham DH1 3NJ

**Present:** Cllrs J Ashby, R Cornwell, J Elmer, C Reeves and J G Holland (Secretary)

1. **Appointment of Chair:** Cllr Roger Cornwell elected
2. **Submission of comments on planning application DM/18/01669/FPA:** proposed conversion from C3 (family home) to C4 (student HMO) at 10 Highwood View. The comments made by Cllr Ashby (Appendix 1), opposing this application, were discussed and agreed.
3. **Submission of comments on planning application DM/18/01446/FPA:** proposed retrospective application for replacement windows at 14 Lawson Terrace was discussed a letter of objection to be submitted by Cllr Cornwell.
4. **45 applications still under consideration:** were discussed (Appendix 2) and those highlighted in bold were given more detailed consideration. RC would circulate the full list for other members of the committee to review.

**DM/18/01 582/FPA** It was agreed that there would be an objection to a development at the Elm Tree Inn because of the loss of disabled access (action RC).

**DM/18/01492/FPA and DM/18/01493/LB** The proposed take away on Elvet Bridge met with concern and the need to limit its activities to a closing time of 11.00pm was agreed.

**DM/18/01270/FPA** The increase in size of 22 Mitchell Street and its conversion from C3 to C4 took this development well over the 10% margin now in force. It was agreed to support the County Council in its opposition to this application (action RC) and encourage it to enforce the 10% 'rule'.

**DM/18/01115/FPA** It was noted that the proposed development at Fram Well House encroached on the Green Belt and it was questioned whether the applicant could demonstrate "exceptional circumstances" for an office site. It was agreed that an objection should be made, based on that from the Sidegate Residents Association, which RC would circulate.

**DM/18/01043/FPA** The significant development of Garden Villa, adjacent to Durham Johnston School, was noted and concerns were expressed about potential highway problems.

**DM/17/03547/FPA and DM/17/03548/LB** The alterations to the Three Tuns Hotel, with demolition at the back to introduce extra student rooms taking the total occupancy to 118 was noted. **DM/18/00894/FPA** The proposed development of the Premier Inn at Framwelgate Waterside was given more detailed consideration and it was agreed that opposition to this would follow 3 lines: loss of apartments; the layby; and the poor townscape roofline design. It was agreed that GH would speak at the forthcoming county planning committee to raise these concerns.

**DM/18/00896/VOC** Councillor Freeman had called this proposal to permit new service yard access, car parking and servicing yard amendments, additional cinema screen and amendment to Framwelgate Peth access so as to permit non-residential traffic to committee, and RC will circulate significant letters to objection.

6. **To consider the proposed extra office block at Milburngate House:** this was noted and its association with the proposed Premier Inn was recognised. The proposed sale of land by the County Councillors to the developers in order to sustain part of this scheme was also noted.

7. **County Durham Plan Preferred Options:** it was agreed to dedicate at least one entire meeting to this single topic.

8. **The development of a new County Hall at the Sands:** members endorsed the action of the Acting Clerk in contacting Kier Property to advise them that the City of Durham Council is a stakeholder in this proposed development. It was noted that there was a conflict of interest: the County Council was the landowner and any determination of the application would be by the County Council's own officers and planning committee. Under the circumstances the matter should be referred to the Secretary of State for his determination because of a conflict of interest.

8. **To consider a schedule of future meetings:** it was agreed that the committee should meet in Durham Town on alternate Fridays at 10.00am. The next meeting will be on Friday July 13<sup>th</sup> 2018.

There being no further business the meeting ended at 12.01 pm.

APPROVED AS A CORRECT RECORD

SIGNED *ROGER CORNWELL*

CHAIR OF PLANNING COMMITTEE

## **AGENDA ITEM 9: A FURTHER DISCUSSION ON THE NAME OF THE COUNCIL**

Please find below the legal advice received from NALC on 28 June 2018 concerning the proposed name change to the City of Durham Council.

*I have seen the order made 8 December 2017 which created the council. Clause 6 provides that here shall be a parish council for the City of Durham and the name of the council shall be “The Parish Council of the City of Durham”.*

*I note the reference to other parish councils that do not have “parish” in their names, for example, the City of Ely Council. I understand these names were conferred by royal prerogative.*

*You refer to the charter trustees for the old City of Durham. I understand that they hold the City of Durham Council name. On that basis, unless they allow the the Council to use the City of Durham Council name, my view is that the council cannot use it and cannot just resolve to call itself City of Durham Council. I advise as per paragraph 3 of NALC’s LTN on names and styles of parish councils, and which I recommend to the council, that s75 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (“the 2007 act”) inserted a new section 12 A into the Local Government Act 1972 (“the 1972 Act”) and also amended sections 14, 15 and 16 of the 1972 Act to offer flexibility in the name of a parish council and a further choice of alternative styles available to a parish council. The alternative styles are community, neighbourhood and village. Further to the above, my view is that the council can resolve to call itself one of these styles.*

<b>ACTION REQUIRED</b>	For council members to consider the above and resolve whether they wish to refer to themselves as a parish or one of the alternative styles suggested.
----------------------------	--

## AGENDA ITEM 10: DECLUTTERING THE STREETS OF DURHAM

Two separate but related requests have been received concerning issues within the City of Durham Parish Council area. Both have asked for the support and intervention of the parish council.

The Durham City Access For All Group (DCAFAG) has met and asked that they draw the attention of the Council to its views regarding the recent repairs to the surface of Elvet Bridge. DCAFAG welcome the improvements in the quality of the surface, making it more comfortable for wheelchair users. However they do have concerns about the proliferation of A-boards, waste bins and outside tables and chairs on the bridge. Whilst DAFAG understands the need for businesses to advertise their wares, the obstructions constitute a significant danger to users of the bridge who are visually impaired. In DAFAG's view, A-boards should not be permitted on the bridge, and outside tables and chairs should be suitably protected by barriers which would prevent visually impaired users of the bridge from colliding into them.

A further but very much related request has been received from a parish councillor for Shincliffe who states

For two years now I have been trying to get DCC to police their policy on shops placing "A" boards on pavements. The situation in Saddler Street in particular is crazy and dangerous. I have witnessed wheelchair users having to use the road to pass obstructing boards. and having to compete with traffic! I wonder whether the CDPC could also make an approach to DCC too please?

<b>ACTION REQUIRED</b>	For council members to consider the above and resolve whether they wish to support these requests for the council to approach DCC regarding these issues.
----------------------------	---

# **AGENDA ITEM 11: DURHAM COUNTY LOCAL PLAN PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION: DRAFT RESPONSE ON BEHALF OF THE PARISH COUNCIL**

## **Durham County Local Plan Preferred Options report**

### **Draft 'headlines' comments by the City of Durham Parish Council**

---

#### **Introduction**

1. The Parish Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on this most important planning document for the City and the County.
2. At this stage the Parish Council does not propose to make detailed comments on all relevant aspects of the Plan. It is a very comprehensive document and the Parish Council understands much of the broad principles it lays down both for achieving good development and for protecting heritage and landscape.
3. There are, however, some particular matters that the Parish Council wishes to highlight at this stage, as follows.

#### **Housing development**

4. As Preferred Options rightly notes, Durham City is a small city. It is also a fragile city, under pressures from many quarters, notably Durham University's growth aspirations. The Parish Council considers that the housing priority is to allocate land in the Parish area for C3 family housing, including affordable family housing, in order to try to redress the student/resident imbalance that has been created and to try to support shops and other facilities with more year-round residents. For example, we suggest that the former builder's yard in John Street/Holly Street should be allocated for family/elderly persons housing.
5. There is a crucial need for housing suitable for the elderly. About 87% of the extra households in County Durham between 2018 and 2035 are aged 75 years and over. Durham City has a higher proportion of elderly households in its long-term (i.e. non-student) population than the County Durham average, so this is a particularly important issue to the Parish Council.
6. Yet the Preferred Options document requires only 10% of the 6,295 proposed new dwellings in County Durham, i.e. about 630, should be provided for the elderly. This is woefully inadequate. The Parish Council therefore urges that land owned on behalf of the public by the County Council is used with appropriate social and market housing providers to develop housing for the elderly.

#### **The Green Belt**

7. The Parish Council welcomes the presently identified Green Belt protections within its area such as the removal of the previous proposals in the Green Belt for major housing development at Merryoaks and for housing development near

Sidegate. Similarly, it welcomes the deletion of development in the Green Belt plateau area of Aykley Heads.

8. The Parish Council leaves it to others to comment on the proposed 'sustainable urban extensions' into the Green Belt as these are outside the Parish area. However, the so-called Western Relief Road through the Green Belt does impinge on our area and we offer comments below.

### **Durham University**

9. Preferred Options portrays Durham University as a wholly benevolent presence in the city. There is much that the University brings to the city, and the Parish Council welcomes those aspects that are positive.
10. But the Council must also recognise and address the negative aspects. Paragraph 5.10 of Preferred Options takes an uncritical, indeed benign, view of the University's growth Masterplan. In particular, the apparent acceptance of an increase by 6,000 in the number of University students in Durham City represents a passive conclusion that the city can cope. The Parish Council considers that, on present evidence, the city cannot cope - the term-time daily struggle with over-crowded pavements, cars parked all over grass verges, and whole areas blighted by rowdy parties, rubbish and rats. The Parish Council considers that there should therefore be a full assessment of the economic, environmental and social impacts of the proposed scale, pace and locations of the Masterplan's proposals.
11. The policies in Preferred Options do set out improved ways in controlling the creation of more houses in multiple occupation and do allocate six sites for new PBSAs. However, the County Council and the University together must form and fund a partnership vehicle to return sets of houses presently in multiple occupation back to homes for long-term (i.e. non-student) residents.

### **Transport**

12. The Sustainable Transport Strategy is a highly significant forward step in managing the pressures in this fragile city not just in its physical fabric and heritage qualities but also air pollution, quality of life and the vitally important tourism sector of the economy.
13. The Parish Council will be fully supportive of measures to implement the Sustainable Transport Strategy in the soonest possible time-frame. Better provision for pedestrians, for cyclists, and for public transport-users are the priorities.
14. The proposed Western Bypass is opposed by the Parish Council. We support measures for traffic-calming along the A167 but we consider that the proposed Western Relief Road will bring traffic back into our Parish Council area either through Lowes Barn Bank onto the A167 or back to the Nevilles Cross A167/A690 crossroads which is where the severest problems occur. This project cannot be reconciled with the statement in Policy 23 that *"all development shall deliver sustainable transport by (a) delivering, accommodating and facilitating*

*investment in sustainable modes of transport in the following order of priority: walking, cycling, bus and rail transport, car sharing and alternative fuel vehicles”.*

- 15 We note that there is no proposal for a further Park-and-Ride facility and believe that this should be remedied in the County Plan, to the west or southwest of the Parish area, as this would greatly assist reducing the destructive pressures and congestion caused by vehicular traffic attempting to enter the city centre and to park.

## **Retail**

- 16 The retail hierarchy identified in Preferred Options classes Durham city centre as a sub-regional centre. We agree that this is its role but have concerns as to the adequacy of approach as set out in paragraph 5.33. Essentially, it heralds the redevelopment of the Gates shopping centre and the development of the site of the former Government offices in Milburngate House. Unfortunately, most of the units in both schemes are not shops and, at the same time, the city centre has several empty shops in its main retailing frontages of Silver Street. A focussed and imaginative strategy is required rather than the somewhat complacent tone taken in Preferred Options.

## **The evening economy**

- 17 Policies and practical steps are needed to better address the extremely negative effects of the ‘night-time’ economy in the centre of Durham city. In particular, policies on closing times and the integration of licensing and planning services should be pursued.

## **Sustainability Assessment**

- 18 The NPPF defines sustainable development as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The Sustainability Assessment used for Preferred Options appears to be skewed to deliver the employment, housing and transport infrastructure outcomes sought by the County Council.

## **Energy efficiency**

- 19 Policies 35 and 26 as presently proposed are inadequate. They use the low targets currently proposed by central government to define the County’s future standards. Britain already lags far behind almost every other country in Europe. Yesterday’s targets should not form part of this County Plan. Durham County should have the vision and courage to adopt the Scandinavian standards as their target for the future rather than relying on the already outdated Energy Act of 2013 which was designed to meet just 15% of the UK energy demand. The ambition should be 50% of UK energy demand and this target should be introduced now. The capacity to achieve this level of renewable energy is touched on in paragraph 5.346. That paragraph deserves several policies, rather than the single policy 36 devoted entirely to wind turbines.

20 Policy 36 draws down from earlier work in the original Durham Plan and merits support. At this stage additional Policies 37 and 38 should be introduced. Policy 37 should deal exclusively with photo-voltaics and identify the various routes by which these can be both encouraged and introduced into our energy supply recognising the new generation of such systems and their impact on self-sufficiency. Policy 37 should identify further sources of renewable energy, e.g. ground-loop, air-loop and water-loop that can be introduced whenever new buildings are being constructed or retro-fitted if possible.

### **Infrastructure Levy**

21 The Parish Council notes that the County Council is no longer proposing to charge a Community Infrastructure Levy. The County Association and individual parishes may wish to make representations on this issue, since 15% of CIL comes to Parishes, rising to 25% where there is a Neighbourhood Plan in place. The City of Durham Parish Council considers that (a) it is premature to drop CIL as the proposals mentioned at paragraph 5.262 are a consultation and the current system remains in place; and (b) there are areas of the County where CIL could be sustained. Significant sums of money are involved: the most recent County Durham CIL schedule proposed a charge of £60/m<sup>2</sup> in Durham and Chester-le Street, £30/m<sup>2</sup> in West Durham and £15/m<sup>2</sup> elsewhere. Large retail and Student Accommodation was £150/m<sup>2</sup>. An average house is around 100m<sup>2</sup> so CIL would produce £6,000 per house, with £1,500 per house coming to parishes where there is a neighbourhood plan.

### **Conclusions**

22 The City of Durham Parish Council recognises that the County Council has put forward a realistically ambitious new County Local Plan with many policies that can be given qualified support.

23 However, the particular aspects highlighted above must not to be taken as an unqualified endorsement of the rest of the policies but are presented to the County Council in the hope that these will be taken on board in finalising the Plan.

<b>ACTION REQUIRED</b>	For council members to consider the comments made above from the Planning Committee and resolve to accept them for onward transmission to the County Councils Planning Department before 3 August 2018 deadline.
----------------------------	--

## **AGENDA ITEM 12: MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM TASKFORCE**

On the 3<sup>rd</sup> July as instructed by council, Cllrs J Ashby and A Doig met with Hannah Shepherd (Community Liaison officer) to discuss our future engagement with the Universities Community Engagement Task Force.

Essentially it was agreed that, given the Taskforce was about community engagement and that the main issues of the community were about the impact of student expansion, 'the amenity of residents' should be the immediate focus for all Taskforce work. The proposed sub-groups would address the previously-identified themes but that these would also address the focus on 'the amenity of residents'.

Hannah Shepherd seemed entirely happy with this focus and with the wording for revised Terms of Reference (ToR) which we agreed in principle during the meeting. The revised ToR were submitted to the Pro Vice Chancellor and Chief Operating Officer on the 6<sup>th</sup> July for the consideration and approval. A copy of the revised Draft Terms of Reference, as supplied by the University on the 17 July, is shown below with our requested revisions shown in red.

Finally we have suggested that, if the revised ToR is acceptable, DURF may then wish to consider if its requested membership of the Taskforce is necessary. We also asked if the University had thought about inviting County Councillors to participate as well as officials and about inviting the Durham Police Architectural Liaison Officer since he takes a keen interest in HMOs, late night licencing, etc.

The university is holding its first full meeting of the Community Engagement Task Force on Monday 30<sup>th</sup> July. The meeting will commence proper at 11.00am, however the room will be available from 10.30am for refreshments and an informal meet and greet between the members.

Jane Robinson and Owen Adams, as chairs of the group, have set aside the hour between 9.30am and 10.30am for discussion outside of the Task Force with Cllrs Doig and Ashby should they wish to have any further discussion.

The University considers that this meeting may not be required if, after our meeting on the 26<sup>th</sup> July, the final draft is accepted and the Parish Council agree to send members to the task force.

Do members agree with this assumption or do they consider that this meeting would still prove to be useful for further discussion with the university.

### **Durham University Community Engagement Task Force (CETF) Draft Terms Of Reference (ToRs)**

#### **1. Scope.**

In the context of the University Strategy 2017-27, the Task Force's core aims are:

- a. Addressing the amenity of residents.
- b. Developing positive partnerships with stakeholders in the local community.
- c. Building students' sense of belonging and responsibility.
- d. Developing engagement with the local community.
- e. Creation of task and finish sub groups around specific themes and issues 1.

## 2. Proposed Core Membership 2

The Community Engagement Task Force (CETF) will be co-chaired by the Chief Operating Officer (COO) and Pro Vice Chancellor (PVC) for the Wider Student Experience (WSE). The CETF coordinator is the DU Community Liaison Officer with membership drawn from:

- a. **Representatives of Durham University 3:** Student Support and Wellbeing, Experience Durham, Marketing and Communications, Student Union, Business and Innovation, Culture Durham, Estate and Buildings, Colleges.
- b. **Representatives requested of Durham City and Region:** City of Durham Parish Councillor(s), **Durham County Councillor(s?)**, County Durham and Darlington NHS Foundation Trust, DCC Planning Department, DCC Partnerships & Community Engagement, DCC Neighbourhood Warden, Durham Constabulary – Police Community Support Officer and Architectural Liaison Officer, Durham BID, DU Residents Forum (x2 representatives)

## 3. Standing Agenda Items

In recognising the impact of its expansion on the amenity of residents as well as the City economy, environment and infrastructure the University proposes that the current CETF agenda includes four key areas as standing items as follows:

- Improving the City environment and experience
- Growth and planning in terms of volume of students
- Housing and sustainable communities
- Anti-social behaviour and managing non-academic misconduct

## 4. Action Plan:

Within 3 above the CETF will explore issues and coordinate activity across five specific thematic areas as follows:

- a. Economic 4
- b. Cultural 5
- c. Citizenship 6
- d. Lived Environment 7
- e. Durham For All 8

The CETF will develop a SMART Action Plan, with regular monitoring and will make recommendations through this on how the university will approach and programme future engagement.

*1 Composition of any sub-groups will be considered on a case by case basis, drawing on the most appropriate skills/experience*

*2 This is an evolving task force which will have an organic membership*

*3 Directors or Heads are expected in the first instance. Deputies by exception.*

*4 Businesses and commerce*

*5 Including the arts and heritage*

*6 Including volunteering and outreach*

*7 Including safety, transport, housing, accommodation, built environment and provision of local services*

*8 Including facilities and activities*

<b>ACTION REQUIRED</b>	For council members to consider the revised Terms of Reference as confirmed by the University and if they are agreed by council, whether they wish to appoint a representative and deputy to the Community Relations Task Force.
----------------------------	--

## **AGENDA ITEM 18: INVITATION TO DURHAM IN BLOOM LUNCHEON**

The Vice Chairman of Durham County Council, Councillor Katie Corrigan, is very grateful for all the hard work and time given each year in support of Durham in Bloom. With this in mind, she would like to extend a personal invitation to a special luncheon which is to be held in Durham Town Hall on Tuesday 7th August, 2018, meeting at 12.45pm, for lunch at 1.00pm. The Britain in Bloom Judges, Brendan Mowforth, Geraldine King and Ann Holland (trainee judge) will be visiting Durham City on that date and they will also be joining you for lunch. The judges will depart at 2.00pm, to travel onto their next destination.

As well as a way of saying 'thank you' it will also be an opportunity to meet in a relaxed atmosphere and to have a chat with the judges themselves.

We are invited to send two representatives to this function.

<b>ACTION REQUIRED</b>	For council members to consider and resolve whether they wish to send two representatives to this event.
----------------------------	--