

# 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 **RITSON HALL, ALINGTON HOUSE, 4 NORTH BAILEY, DURHAM CITY, DH1 3ET** on **THURSDAY 27 SEPTEMBER 2018 AT 19:00** to transact the following business:-

- 1. TO RECEIVE AND APPROVE (OR NOT) APOLOGIES OF ABSENCE FROM TODAY'S MEETING**
- 2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM MEMBERS.**
- 3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.**
- 4. MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM TASK FORCE** – see attached report including Revised Terms of Reference for the task force.
- 5. APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 26 JULY 2018 AND 5<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2018**
- 6. COMMITTEE UPDATES**
  - Planning Committee meeting minutes from meetings held on the 3 July, 27 July, 10 August and 7 September.
- 7. UPDATE FROM CHAIR – COMMUNICATIONS POLICY SEE ATTACHED.**
- 8. PARISH MEETING 17 SEPTEMBER – MOTION FROM CLLR R CORNWELL –**  
The Parish Council wishes to put on record its appreciation of the work done by the St Nicholas Community Forum in opposing the plans to site a County Headquarters building on the Sands, and congratulates and thanks the Forum. We hope we can continue to work together in the spirit of collaboration and cooperation.
- 9. HISTORY OF LORD LONDONDERRY STATUE AND BATTLE OF NEVILLES CROSS – PROVISION OF INFORMATION BOARDS**
- 10. MEMBERSHIP OF THE CITY OF DURHAM SAFETY GROUP** – see copy of letter attached below.
- 11. DURHAM COUNTY COUNCILS AND KIER PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR A NEW HQ.** Cllr J Ashby to give a verbal report on the seeking of potential legal advice regarding the DCC HQ Planning Application.
- 12. MEMBERSHIP OF THE CDALC LARGER COUNCILS FORUM AND REPRESENTATION ON THE CDALC CITY OF DURHAM AREA COMMITTEE.**

**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. CYCLE OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

**2018**

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)

20 September 2018

## AGENDA ITEM 4: MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM TASK FORCE

Durham University has requested to attend today's meeting of the City of Durham Parish Council. Owen Adams (Pro Vice Chancellor – Colleges & Student Experience), hannah Sheppherd (Community Liaison Officer) and Sam Dale (Director of Student Support & Wellbeing) will be in attendance.

The University representatives want to discuss the revised terms of reference for the Task Force which they hope now more closely aligns with the council's own priorities and will enable councillors to feel comfortable to join the Task Force and its sub-groups.

A copy of the revised Terms of Reference is shown below.

### **Durham University Community Engagement Task Force (CETF) Terms of Reference (ToR) 2018/19**

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

This terms of reference operates within the context of the University Strategy 2017-27 and the planned growth of the University in terms of the student population.

Understanding community benefits along with issues and concerns around this is important in enabling the University to optimise its contribution to communities within the City and wider Durham county area and to take reasonable and proportionate steps to mitigate the consequential impacts.

The core aims of the taskforce will be to:

- a) Develop and maintain positive partnerships and engagement with stakeholders in the local community
- b) Build students sense of belonging and responsibility
- c) Recognise the amenity<sup>1</sup> of residents
- d) Enhance the contribution made by the University to the City and wider Durham county area

As a group the Task Force will seek to promote a partnership approach at all times, acknowledging the views of the wider Durham community and the role partnership can play in developing local solutions to local issues<sup>2</sup>. The group will be guided by data, feedback and dialogue between the University and the City.

#### **2. Membership:**

Subject to change as the task force evolves, membership is proposed initially to be comprised as follows:

<b>Representatives of the</b>	Student Support and Wellbeing, Experience Durham, Marketing and Communications, Business and Innovation, Culture Durham, Estate and Buildings, Colleges, Durham Students Union
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<sup>1</sup> The Planning Portal defines 'amenity' in its Glossary as "A positive element or elements that contribute to the overall character or enjoyment of an area. For example, open land, trees, historic buildings and the inter-relationship between them, or less tangible factors such as tranquility". The Task Force also understands a broader interpretation of the word encompassing freedom from impacts such as noise, dirt, smell, and the positive attributes of comfort, convenience, or enjoyment.

<sup>2</sup> Feedback from University and City events can be viewed at: <https://www.dur.ac.uk/community/>

<b>University<sup>3</sup> and students</b>	
<b>Representatives of key City stakeholders</b>	County Durham & Darlington NHS Foundation Trust, County Durham & Darlington Fire and Rescue Service, Durham County Council (DCC) Planning Department, DCC Partnerships & Community Engagement, DCC Neighbourhood Warden, Durham Area Action Partnership, Durham BID, Durham Constabulary Police University Liaison Officer
<b>Representatives of City residents (5 posts)</b>	City of Durham Parish Councillor(s), Durham County Councillor(s), DU Residents Forum representative(s)

The University will be guided by the wishes of the elected members and residents groups representatives as to how the 5 'resident' positions on the task force may best be apportioned as a reflection of the diversity of roles undertaken by those persons.

### **3.Sub Groups and Action Plan:**

The CETF will monitor the work of five sub groups focussing on specific thematic areas. Each sub group will have an action plan clearly demonstrating the issues being explored across their thematic area.

The five thematic areas are drawn from the wide ranging feedback the University has received from its events in April and June 2018 under the "University and City: Growing Together" banner. They support ideas, suggestions and proposals to be directed to an appropriate sub-group for consideration and development into action.

The five thematic areas are as follows:

<b>Sub-group</b>	<b>Theme</b>
<b>Economic</b>	Business Commerce Innovation Enterprise Procurement (including Catering) Careers & Employability
<b>Cultural</b>	Arts Heritage Music Theatre Tourism
<b>Citizenship</b>	Volunteering and Outreach Neighbourliness Behaviour Personal Safety

<sup>3</sup> Directors or Heads are expected in the first instance. Deputies by exception.

<b>Lived Environment</b>	Accommodation Estates and Buildings University Infrastructure Local Services
<b>Durham For All</b>	Open access to facilities Open access to colleges Open access to activities Open access to knowledge Communications and marketing

Composition of any sub-groups will be considered on a case by case basis, drawing on the most appropriate skills / experience, thereby allowing for wider input beyond the core membership. Sub-groups will be led by a University representative and co-chaired with a City partner.

This is a living document. Suggestions on the scope of each sub group are welcomed by email to: [university.strategy@durham.ac.uk](mailto:university.strategy@durham.ac.uk)

#### **4. Governance and operating arrangements**

The CETF will report directly to the University Executive Committee (UEC) and regular updates will be provided. The initial operating period will be the 2018-2019 academic year. The key output from the TF will be a report with recommendations to UEC after review in summer 2019. The report will include a recommendation regarding the future role and work of the Task Force.

The Community Engagement Task Force (CETF) and each sub-group will meet at least once termly. The CETF will be co-chaired by the Pro Vice Chancellor (PVC) for the Wider Student Experience (WSE) and the Director of Estates and Buildings. The CETF coordinator is the Community Liaison Officer (Durham University).

#### **5. Version Control**

Owner	
Author	Hannah Shepherd, Community Liaison Officer, Durham University
Version	4.1
Date	August 2018
Status	Final Draft

Hannah Shepherd (Community Liaison Officer ) has requested to speak for around five minutes to give the background on the work that has informed this version of the terms of reference.

Owen, Sam and Hannah can then answer any questions that are forthcoming from councillors.

The next full meeting of the Task Force is in November, however the University expects sub-groups to get off the ground in October so it would be preferable if we could

identify who the representatives would be (if the terms of reference is agreeable) at the meeting on the 27<sup>th</sup>.

<b>ACTION REQUIRED</b>	For council members to consider the approval of the attached Terms of Reference and resolve whether they wish to support the request to appoint parish council representative(s) to this task forces
----------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## **CITY OF DURHAM PARISH COUNCIL**

Minutes of a Meeting of the City of Durham Parish Council held on Thursday 26 July 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, D Freeman, G Holland, R Ormerod, C Reeves, M Ross and E Scott.

**Councillor E Scott** in the Chair

### **1. Durham United Football Club**

The Chair welcomed the Matt Stephenson, Club Secretary of Durham United Football Club to the meeting who was in attendance to provide a short presentation on the background of the club, its future and how the parish council could potentially assist them in achieving their goals going forward.

Councillor E Ashby asked whether the club has sought funding from other organisations. It was noted that a number of successful applications had been made to the AAP as well as other parish councils within the area over previous years.

Councillor Cornwell asked how many children who attended were from within the City of Durham Parish area. Although the exact numbers were not known, it was acknowledged that most children who played football at St Margaret's and Neville's Cross Primary Schools attended.

Further discussion took place regarding community access and how improved facilities were enabling the club to attract players of all abilities. M Stephenson also advised that an Adult Team was also being established and were utilising facilities across the county area.

The Chair thanked M Stephenson for his presentation and it was suggested that the club approach the parish council in the future to determine whether any financial support could be given to the Club once the Finance Committee had established what if any budget could be allocated for grants.

### **2. Presentation on the County Durham Plan by M Allum, Head of Spatial Policy**

The Chair welcomed Mike Allum, Head of Spatial Policy Durham County Council and Graeme Smith, Policy Team Leader to the meeting, who were in attendance to provide an overview of the County Durham Plan Preferred Options documents and its implications for the City of Durham and wider area.

Members were provided with a detailed presentation which included information on challenges, quantity of development, employment and town centres, housing and housing viability, transport and what was included in the plan for the Durham AAP area.

The Chair raised a query regarding the impact on healthcare and the planning consultation process and noted that in many cases responses were not provided from the NHS however noted ongoing issues regarding GP appointments and pressures on local services.

Councillor Freeman noted that Durham City had not been allocated within the plan for office accommodation and asked what would happen should an application for this type of use come forward in the area. The Policy Team Leader advised that although not designated within the plan this type of use would be deemed acceptable should the proposals be viable.

Councillor Ashfield noted that although there was specific mention within the plan for older people's housing, there was a lack of accommodation suitable for younger single people who worked locally.

Further discussion took place regarding the community infrastructure levy and Neighbourhood Planning. Councillor Cornwell queried the omission of Community Infrastructure Levy from the proposals as this would result in a loss of income for the parish council and other parish councils.

Councillor Holland asked what, if any, adjustments would have to be made to the plan on the basis of Brexit and shifts in funding and contracts.

Councillor J Ashby noted the improvements to the student accommodation policies and applauded the work of officers in this regard. However, asked what safeguards there would be to prevent the residential properties being built at Milburngate becoming student lets. It was noted that such use would require change of use via formal planning permissions.

Councillor E Ashby in referencing the western relief road asked what was contained within the plan to protect that area between it and the A167 throughout the duration of the plan. It was noted that landscape protection such as greenbelt areas were identified within the plan. Any greenbelt areas which were to be removed were identified.

The Chair thanked the officers for their presentation.

### **3. Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A Doig and J Elmer.

### **4. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

## 5. Public Participation

The Chair welcomed members of the public, who were in attendance to raise matters of concern with the Parish Council.

A local resident addressed the council and advised that he was a resident of the viaduct area of the city. He advised that his concern related to the Dominos business which during university term time did not adhere to its late license and continued to serve customers, namely students, after the licensed closure time. This was probably going to be more prevalent following the construction of new university residences on the old County Hospital site. He therefore asked that in the interests of local residents and noting the impact that noise and disturbance had on these residents that the parish council seek to notify the County Council and request that the licence be reviewed prior to the new term commencing.

The landlady of a local licensed premise addressed the council to advise of her disappointment in the discussions and time that had been taken by the parish council in previous meetings discussing topics which she considered to be low in importance considering the amount of issues affecting the city at this current time including; new Durham County Council HQ and the impact on residents and businesses and the erosion of Church Street due to University expansion. She advised that she hoped that the parish council would be the main voice for residents in objecting to these proposals for the city.

## 6. Minutes

**Resolved:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2018 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## 7. Committee Updates

**Resolved:** That the minutes of the following committee meetings be noted and that the following amendments be made:

### **Personnel Committee, 28 June 2018**

It was resolved that a part time salary would initially be working around 20 hours per week and that the City of Durham Parish Council would be graded as a profile three council.

### **Planning Committee, 29 June 2018**

Submission of comments on planning application DM/18/01446/FPA: proposed retrospective application for replacement windows at 10 Lawson Terrace was discussed; a letter of objection to be submitted by Cllr Cornwell. The Committee had met fortnightly in the Town Hall.

### **Environment Committee**

It was Resolved that the clerk circulate Committee members to expedite setting a date for the first meeting of the Environment Committee.

## **8. Update from Chair**

The Chair advised that, further to discussions at a previous meeting, contact had been made with the Head of Culture and Sport, Durham County Council with a view to obtaining a discounted rate for block meeting bookings at the Town Hall. A decision was awaited on the matter. She did however also note that there were also other options available in Durham for committee meetings such as the Gala Theatre, Library and Antioch House and these should also be explored.

## **9. Name of the Council**

The Interim Clerk reported that following discussions at previous meetings, advice had been sought from the National Association of Local Councils concerning the proposed name change to the City of Durham Council. He noted that upon that advice, the council could resolve to use, community, neighbourhood and village within its title or retain the current title of parish council.

### **Resolved:**

That the parish council retain the name the City of Durham Parish Council however may use an abbreviated title for non-official correspondence and this arrangement be reviewed at the 2019 AGM.

## **10. Decluttering the Streets of Durham**

The Interim Clerk advised that two separate but related requests had been received relating to A-boards, waste bins and tables causing obstruction to pedestrians on Elvet Bridge and Saddler Street. The requests received from the Durham City Access For All Group (DCAFAG) and a parish councillor from Shincliffe were detailed within the attached report and the council should determine whether to support the requests and report the issues to Durham County Council.

Following discussion on the above issue it was suggested by Councillor Ormerod that the Interim Clerk also write to York Council to request a copy of their policy in order to inform the County Council as to best practice.

### **Resolved:**

That the parish council undertakes to write to Durham County Council to support the requests from residents and also to outline the best practice of York Council.

## **11. Durham County Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation: Draft Response on behalf of the Parish Council**

The Interim Clerk presented for comments and approval the proposed draft response from the City of Durham Parish Council Planning Committee to the Durham County Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation.

Councillor Brown asked whether a further addition could be made to prepared response to include the need for a circular Park & Ride on the A690 west of Durham servicing the main employment centres. This was agreed.

**Resolved:** that the response, with the above addition, be submitted on behalf of the City of Durham Parish Council to Durham County Council before the deadline of 3 August.

## **12. Membership of the University of Durham Community Engagement Task Force**

The council considered a report which provided an update following a meeting with the Community Liaison Officer to discuss future engagement with Durham University's Community Engagement Task Force and specifically the changes previously agreed by the Council to the draft Terms of Reference.

### **Resolved:**

That Councillor J Ashby and Councillor A Doig be nominated to represent the Parish Council on the University's Community Engagement Task Force. In addition should either one of the above members be unable to attend then a suitable substitute shall be made.

## **13. Parish Council Away Day**

The Chair advised that some suggested dates would be circulated to members to allow arrangements to be made for a meeting to take place in September to discuss priorities.

## **14. 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 any attempts 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.*

*The Council therefore undertakes to write to the Chief Executive of Durham County Council to inform him of this view"*

Councillor Ashfield **Moved** the following amendments

*"This Council opposes any attempt to reduce the number of parking spaces in Church Street as this would be detrimental to residents, parents of children at the primary school, people attending church and local businesses and furthermore will oppose all proposals by the County Council for major changes to traffic use (foot, car and bicycle) on Church Street until such a time as the University further progresses its master plan.*

*In the light of the contribution made by the representative from the University at a meeting which was held at The Institute on Church Street on Friday 20<sup>th</sup> July, we now*

*believe that the University intends to make further analysis of the likely future traffic changes. It understands the need to channel footfall in various directions to spread the pattern from Church Street. On Church Street itself, alternative paths have been offered, including crossing the churchyard, away from the motor traffic.*

*This council undertakes to work with the residents, businesses and the school on Church Street to help come up with a feasible and preferable scheme or schemes, if necessary.*

*This Council requests the County Council to take all these aspects into account and to refrain from actioning any plans for the street in the meantime. We undertake to write to the Chief Executive of Durham County Council to inform him of this view and to copy the University into such correspondence”*

Councillor Ormerod accepted the amended motion.

**Seconded** by Councillor Freeman

**Resolved:**

This Council opposes any attempt to reduce the number of parking spaces in Church Street as this would be detrimental to residents, parents of children at the primary school, people attending church and local businesses and furthermore will oppose all proposals by the County Council for major changes to traffic use (foot, car and bicycle) on Church Street until such a time as the University further progresses its master plan.

In the light of the contribution made by the representative from the University at a meeting which was held at The Institute on Church Street on Friday 20<sup>th</sup> July, we now believe that the University intends to make further analysis of the likely future traffic changes. It understands the need to channel footfall in various directions to spread the pattern from Church Street. On Church Street itself, alternative paths have been offered, including crossing the churchyard, away from motor traffic.

This council undertakes to work with the residents, businesses and the school on Church Street to help come up with a feasible and preferable scheme or schemes, if necessary.

This Council requests the County Council to take all these aspects into account and to refrain from actioning any plans for the street in the meantime.

We undertake to write to the Chief Executive of Durham County Council to inform him of this view and to copy the University into such correspondence.

**15. Motion submitted for discussion by Councillor E Ashby**

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

*“That this Council resolves to seek membership of Durham City’s Safety Group”.*

**Seconded** by Councillor J Ashby

**Resolved:** That this Council resolves to seek membership of Durham City's Safety Group

## **16. Motion submitted for discussion by Councillor J Ashby**

In accordance with a Notice of Motion it was **Moved** 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".*

Councillor Ormerod **Moved** the following amendment to the last paragraph to read *"this council undertakes to write to the Chief Executive of Durham County Council outlining these concerns"*.

**Seconded** by Councillor Cornwell

**Resolved:**

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 and that this council undertakes to write to the Chief Executive of Durham County Council outlining these concerns.

#### **17. Motion submitted for discussion by R Cornwell**

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

*“That this Council welcomes the decision of Durham County Council to seek a direction under Regulation 7 of the Town and Country 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”.*

**Seconded** by Councillor J Ashby

**Resolved:** That this Council welcomes the decision of Durham County Council to seek a direction under Regulation 7 of the Town and Country 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**

The Interim Clerk advised that the Vice Chairman of Durham County Council had extended a personal invitation, for two parish council representatives to attend a special luncheon with Britain in Bloom Judges on Tuesday 7 August in Durham Town Hall.

**Resolved:** That Councillors E Ashby and L Brown be nominated to attend the luncheon on behalf of the parish council.

#### **19. Training for Parish Council**

**Resolved:** That the above item be deferred to a future meeting.

#### **20. Cycle of Future Meetings**

The Chair advised that in light of various members being unavailable to attend the August meeting she proposed that the meeting be cancelled.

The following schedule of meetings was therefore noted:

**2018**

27 September

25 October

22 November

20 December

**2019**

24 January

28 February

28 March

**Approved as a correct record**

**Signed**

**Chair**

**27 SEPTEMBER 2018**

## **CITY OF DURHAM PARISH COUNCIL**

Minutes of a Meeting of the City of Durham Parish Council held on Wednesday 5 September 2018 at 7.00 p.m. in The Shakespeare Hall, North Road, Durham City, DH1 4SQ.

### **Present:**

Councillors E Ashby, J Ashby, V Ashfield, J Atkinson, L Brown, S Cahill, R Cornwell, J Elmer (arrived 7:05), G Holland, R Ormerod, C Reeves, M Ross and E Scott.

**Councillor E Scott** in the Chair

### **1. Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received and approved by council from Councillors A Doig and D Freeman.

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

There were no declarations of interest from members of the council.

### **3. Public Participation**

The Chair welcomed members of the public, who were in attendance to raise matters of concern with the Parish Council.

A number of members of the public participated in relation to Planning application DM/18/02369/FPA by Kier Property Developments for the Sands Car park and Durham Sixth Form Car Park Site, Freemans Place, Durham DH1 1SQ. This involves the erection of office headquarters with associated car parking (inclusive of multi storey car park) with associated landscaping, highway and infrastructure works and demolition of existing structures.

The following is a precis of the points that were made:-

- Why could the development not be made in Spennymoor as this development would over concentrate Durham City with office blocks.
- There was an expression that residents were pleased that there was now an independent voice to counteract Durham County Council and the University.
- The multi storey car park in Durham was crazy and backward looking.
- It was considered there were a number of technical planning issues including increased air pollution from traffic.
- There was a deep feeling of concern about residents being ignored by the County Council.
- There was mention of the Save our Sands Campaign.

- It was suggested that some of the proposal on the bus park is apparently considered to be commons land with the possibility that it can't be built on unless there is a public enquiry.
- A public meeting was demanded.
- It was suggested that the area of land being used for this proposal was not identified as being a development area on the Durham County Plan Preferred Options Document.
- It was remarked that there were already 100 objections to this proposal on the planning portal.
- Residents did not understand the rationale for this decision and there were so many arguments against this decision.
- If this proposal is approved for the Sands then there could be a strong case for further development in this area.
- What were the key criteria for building this in the area suggested. Was it just an economic argument, as DCC own the land making this the cheapest option?
- Could the Parish Council investigate the use of a lawyer to oppose the plan?
- It was considered unethical for DCC to approve what in effect would be its own HQ on the Sands – albeit the planning application was submitted by Kier Property Developments.
- There were ecological and environmental issues with this development and the fragile area of the land and river would be spoilt by this development.
- This development would spoil one of the tourist attractions (The Sands) for the City.

#### **4. (a) CONSIDERATION OF, AND RESPONSE TO THE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE NEW DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL HQ ON THE SANDS**

Having heard the comments of the public, the Council then considered the notes prepared by the Planning Committee and the Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum regarding this planning application.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee should meet further and provide a response to DCC and that they should write to the Secretary of State to ask for this application to be "called in" to the Planning Inspectorate. It was resolved that if necessary, the council should seek legal advice to support this letter to the Secretary of State

Members agreed that, as the public are totally opposed to this application, wherever possible the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is used to identify material planning objections to the application.

Members then considered the various sections of the notes provided to assist with the ultimate response by the Planning Committee to DCC.

#### **A Process and Procedure.**

Cllr Elmer remarked that it needed to be demonstrated that previous policies (e.g. City of Durham Local Plan) and the emerging County Durham Plan are taken into consideration for this application. It was suggested that the saved Local Policies are not given as much weight now that there was an emerging County Durham Plan.

It was considered that there was a bad process followed for the outline and full business case option 3 to develop on DCC's own land and this has resulted in an imperfect application.

Members were concerned over the shifting deadline dates for responses and the timing of the planning application and consultation over the summer months.

It was resolved that the City of Durham Parish Council would issue both national and local press releases on this topic.

## **B. Traffic and air Quality.**

Members considered that there would be further damage from air increased air pollution in the Claypath/Providence Row/Gilesgate areas as a result of this planning application. They resolved to add a further point to the council's response to DCC concerning the possible cognitive development and degeneration for older people arising from increased air pollution.

A further addition was required as there is no mention of the new school proposed for the area and the impact and risk from a possible increase in air pollution in the area.

It was suggested that a further transport assessment was required and further information be provided.

## **C. Safety**

Members suggested that there are a number of conflict zones and possible increases in traffic flow in the planning proposal area including the

- A609/Gilesgate
- the slip road off the A690
- coach drop off points
- school buses drop off to go to the Freemans quay baths
- cathedral bus stop and market place steps
- HQ staff being dropped off at work and walking from P& R to work
- Accessibility to the town for disabled persons as lifts frequently out of order in Walkergate etc.
- The number of egress and access points in relation to the existing and proposed multi story car parks.
- The obvious dangers of increased traffic on Providence Row.
- The increased risk of cyclists being injured on the cycle route due to the increased traffic flows in the town.

## **D. Environment**

Once again, it was remarked that new NPPF policies and the emerging County Durham Plan should be taken into consideration in any response.

Members commented that relevant Wildlife and Countryside Acts should be considered in their response to DCC especially in relation to protected species. It was pointed out that an otter has been recorded on the river Wear.

It was noted that the Environment Agency had yet to comment on the application.

## **E. The Building**

Members heard that the building was not considered to be 100% eco-sustainable and was considered not to be of good quality modern design. There were no suggestions of climate change, water harvesters, heating source pumps, Archimedes screws or solar panels in the design which was not fitting with the 21 Century.

The new building was within striking distance of a World Heritage site and was in a conservation area and, although the new piazza looked good on the drawings, it may not look so good in reality. There was no greenery proposed for this area either.

The height of the new building was also causing concern for members.

## **F. The Consultation**

Members were deeply concerned over the short notice for the consultation process and the standard of the consultation itself especially in Freemans Quay.

It was considered that it may be suggested that the consultation did not meet the Aarhus Convention standards for consultation and that further investigations into this should be made.

Member considered that as this is a "county" public building that the consultations should have been more far reaching than they were.

A councillor remarked that Area Action Partnerships had received good presentations in relation to the application and how it is integral to the HQ development and the Aykley Heads development into a business park.

## **G. Other Locations**

It was discussed that DCC had not been too transparent about the choice of location.

It was suggested that DCC pauses their decision and investigate locations for their new HQ either at alternative sites within the Durham City or alternative areas of the County who would benefit from the increased footfall of officers being relocated there.

## **H. Procurement Process**

Members noted details of the procurement process undertaken by DCC and agreed to comment on this as part of any press release issued by the council.

### **4 (b) MOTION PROPOSED BY CLLR J ASHBY**

Members discussed the motion submitted by Cllr Ashby (see 5 September agenda for details) and agreed that Cllr Ashby be given permission to seek estimated costs of legal advice in relation to this planning application. Further information should be reported back to a future council meeting – possibly the 27 September.

It was also suggested that a public consultation event be held to discuss the application with members of our electorate and the general public. This resolution was agreed and that the clerk should make the necessary arrangements.

Council agreed to place on record their thanks to members of the Planning Committee for the work they have undertaken and the information provided for tonight's committee meeting.

**Approved as a correct record**

**Signed**

**Chair**

**27 SEPTEMBER 2018**

**APPROVED AS A CORRECT RECORD**

# CITY OF DURHAM PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Planning Committee Meeting at 10.00am on Friday 13<sup>th</sup> July 2018 in Antioch House

- 1. Present:** Cllrs J Ashby, Cornwell, Elmer, and Holland (Secretary)
- 2. Apologies:** Cllr C Reeves
- 3. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.
- 4. Minutes of the Meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> June:**

accepted as a true and accurate record
- 5. Matters arising:**
  - a. The application to construct a Premier Inn had been deferred by the County Council Planning Committee. Cllr Ashby noted that in the originally approved outline plans the intention to introduce 441 apartments had been welcomed but the loss of 40 of these to the proposed Premier Inn was unwelcome and a further loss of about 100 apartments to an intended office block was equally unwelcome. Cllr Elmer noted that the emerging Neighbourhood Plan paid close attention to appropriate building design in this part of the City and that this must be taken into account in any new application for this site.
  - b. The application to build at Fram Well House (DM/18/01115/FPA) had been approved on the casting vote of the Chairman of the Central/East Area Planning Committee. As this is a large development in the Green Belt, the decision has to be referred to the Secretary of State for final approval. Previous similar cases had not been called in, the reason given being that the Government remains committed to giving more power to councils and communities to make their own decisions on planning issues. However, these had all been made before a democratically elected parish council had been formed, and Cllr Ashby would draft a letter to emphasise this additional factor.

The immediate installation of CCTV cameras in the commonly used parking areas coupled to new restrictions was noted. This required planning permission and committee doubted that it had been formally agreed.
  - c. Application DM/18/01043/FPA had been withdrawn before it was considered by the Central/East Area Planning Committee.
- 6. The following applications were considered:**
  - a. **DM/18/01492/FPA**, 21 Elvet Bridge, creating a pre-prepared food outlet on small premises was regarded as acceptable because cooking smells would not be dominant. As a precaution Cllr Cornwell would submit a letter of concern at the potential for this arrangement breaking down.
  - b. **DM/18/01582/FPA**, access amendments to the rear of the Elm Tree Inn, had involved consultations with Dr Barry Gower (Access for All), but it was

not clear to members whether access had at any time been available for disabled and whether the proposed changes in any way altered this situation.

- c. **DM/18/01669/FPA**, additional constructions at 10 High Wood View was regarded as a concealed attempt to create extra HMO rooms. Cllr Cornwell agreed to write a letter of objection to this application.
  
- d. **DM/18/01650/FPA**, Mathematical Sciences and Computer Sciences for the University of Durham. Cllr Ashby compared the structure as having all the elegance of Fort Knox. Committee could support the intention but had concerns about the design quality. Cllr Cornwell believed that the University's Master Plan should be placed clearly in the public domain because the proposed expansion of Maths and Computing Sciences was not being matched by an increase in university accommodation: the new colleges, built via PPI at Mount Oswald had again been delayed. These concerns would be submitted by Cllr Cornwell.
  
- e. **DM/18/01908/FPA**, land to the east of the DLI Museum. A proposal by NWL to construct a builders compound for work in Flass Vale was regarded by Cllr Cornwell as a wasted opportunity: why not use the empty DLI Museum building and a far better and far more environmentally friendly alternative? Cllr Cornwell undertook to write a letter to NWL's agents recommending this course of action.

## **7. Our response to the consultation on the Preferred Options of the County Durham Plan**

- a. Cllr Holland criticised Policy 36 on the low carbon policy and agreed to add a paragraph to this preliminary submission.
  
- b. Cllr Elmer had made calculations on SHMA and questioned the sustainability of the proposed housing plan and its inaccurate recognition of the real demographic structure of County Durham. He agreed to add a paragraph to our submission.
  
- c. Cllr Ashby wished to see a step change in the way that the evening economy of the City is managed. He believed that Planning and Licensing should form a single Department.
  
- d. Cllr Cornwell raised the issue of the Neighbourhood Levy and changes planned by central government which would have an impact on how much planning gain could be enjoyed by a Parish.
  
- e. Cllr Holland noted that the proposed Western Bypass relied on income from an intended development at Sniperley Park and from similar sources in Bearpark. In his opinion the Western Bypass was a 'white elephant', a road from nowhere to nowhere that would bring little benefit to motorists; and the development at Sniperley Park merely benefited the developers and land owners, the County Council in particular, and wantonly destroyed Green Belt land without any "exceptional circumstances".

- f. It was agreed that Cllr Ashby would write and co-ordinate the preliminary response document.

**8. Proposed new County Council Offices on The Sands**

Committee members agreed that the resolution passed by the Council at its last meeting should be forwarded to Savills, who are conducting the consultation. They felt this should be augmented with further comments, including that the public consultation (which the majority of the committee had attended) had the element of a "done deal". Better alternative options had not been adequately investigated. The location at Freeman's Quay was unsuitable in terms of traffic congestion, air pollution, access, ecological damage and its location adjacent to the World Heritage Site. Furthermore, it offered no regeneration benefits.

Because the closing date for the consultation was 19 July, a week before the next City Council meeting, and because the Committee's remit does not extend to sending responses to consultations, it was agreed to ask Cllr Scott to take Chair's action and authorise the submission in order to meet that deadline.

**9. The date of the next meeting**

It was agreed that this should be at 10.00 am on Friday 27<sup>th</sup> July in the Town Hall.

**SIGNED** ROGER CORNWELL

**CHAIR OF PLANNING COMMITTEE**

# CITY OF DURHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Planning Committee Meeting at 10.00am on Friday 27<sup>th</sup> July 2018 in Durham Town Hall

## MINUTES

**Present:** Cllrs Cornwell (Chair), Ashby, Reeves and Holland (Secretary)  
Cllr Brown was also in attendance.

**Apologies:** Cllr Elmer

**Declarations of interest:** none

**Minutes of the Meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> July:** received and agreed as a correct record

### **Matters arising:**

**DM/18/01908/FPA**, land to the east of the DLI Museum. The Chair noted that this was a retrospective application and work had already begun on a site that had been similarly used in the past. Objection to be withdrawn.

**DM/18/01650/FPA**, Mathematical Sciences and Computer Sciences building. It was agreed that the University's Master Plan was insufficient to make adequate comment on this application and an objection based on inadequate background information should be submitted (previously circulated).

### **Matters for Report:**

**DM/18/01731/FPA**, Ingleside, Whinney Hill, change of use from C3 to C1. The change of use to a bed and breakfast seemed to be inappropriate but it was agreed to leave this determination to the County Council.

**DM/18/02118/FPA**, 27-bedroom apartment block in Holly Street. After an extensive discussion on the viability and suitability of this proposal, including rights of way and car parking requirements, it was agreed that, in order to prevent this building becoming a PBSA, that conditions should be imposed restricting the building to C3 only, restricting it for residents over the age of 55, increasing and improving disabled access, and allowing no variation in the proposed room allocations that would lead to any increase in the number of rooms offered. Cllr Cornwell to write this letter.

**DM/18/01671/FPA**, a small HMO in Prospect Terrace, Neville's Cross, by accretion adding 2 extra bedrooms from 4 to 6. Cllr Ashby noted that the Article 4 constraint did not address this form of stealth studentification. Cllr Brown indicated that she opposed this application on the following grounds: the small size of the proposed rooms; the lack of parking capacity; that only 1 extra bedroom should be permitted; the need to licence this property after October 1<sup>st</sup> 2018. It was agreed that the Council should also object in an attempt to set higher standards. Cllr Brown to call this application to Committee.

This application raised a general issue, that of rooms that barely met the legal minimum size and which might be unsuitable for students who would need a desk, etc. The County Council could agree a higher standard, and Cllr Cornwell will approach the Students' Union via Cllr Cahill to see if a joint approach to the County Council would be worth while.

**DM/18/01727/LB and DM/18/02009/AD**, modifications to the Town Hall. These need Listed Building Consent. It was agreed to seek a meeting with County Council officers to discuss these proposals.

**DM/18/01917/FPA**, extension to a corner building in Springwell Road, North End. There had been neighbour objection from households facing this property. It was agreed that Cllr Brown would investigate these objections and, until then, no comment should be made.

**DM/18/01995/FPA**, Multi-media teaching block, Durham 6<sup>th</sup> Form Centre, The Sands. Cllr Ashby commented that, although there was concern about the car parking, there seemed to be no cause for objection. It was agreed that no comment would be made.

**DM/18/02017/VOC**, variation in condition for a light well at 24 The Avenue, Crossgate. Work had started without planning permission and Cllr Cornwell had lodged a complaint with Ms Pam Glaister at County Hall.

### **Recent Planning Applications**

Cllr Cornwell reported on recently received applications: DM/18/02210/FPA a shop converting to an Ice Cream Parlour on Riverwalk; DM/18/02130/FPA building extension to a family house at Hawthorn Edge, Neville's Cross, an application supported by Cllr Brown; DM/18/02199/FPA and DM/18/02200/LB the change of use of the former Newcastle Building Society building on Elvet Bridge; all to be considered at the next planning meeting.

### **The County Durham Plan**

The previous evening's meeting of the Parish Council had agreed the submission.

### **Any Other Business**

Cllr Ashby noted that a formal letter of objection should be sent to the Secretary of State asking that the proposed development of a building cutting into the Green Belt above Diamond Terrace should be called-in as a departure from the Development Plan and contrary to the NPPF, noting that the new City of Durham Parish Council was now the appropriate democratically-accountable body to express local community views. He agreed to draft such a letter (now done and sent by the Chair).

### **Date of Next Meeting**

It was agreed that the next meeting will be at 10.00 am on Friday 10<sup>th</sup> August but that there would be no meeting on Friday 24<sup>th</sup> August.

There being no further business the meeting ended at 11.57 am.

**SIGNED** ROGER CORNWELL

**CHAIR OF PLANNING COMMITTEE**

# CITY OF DURHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Planning Committee Meeting at 10.00am on Friday 10<sup>th</sup> August 2018 in Alington House

## MINUTES

1. Present: Cllrs R Cornwell (Chair), J Ashby, C Reeves.  
Cllrs L Brown and E Ashby were also in attendance.
2. Apologies: Cllrs J Elmer, G Holland.
3. Declarations of interest: none.
4. Minutes of the Meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> July: received and agreed as a correct record.
5. Matters arising:
  - (a) to approve the following responses (for text of letters see parish web site):  
DM/18/02118/FPA: 27-bedroom apartment block in Holly Street - response approved.  
  
DM/18/01671/FPA: a small HMO in Prospect Terrace, Neville's Cross - response approved.
  - (b) Outcomes of representations: Cllr R Cornwell presented an analysis of the outcomes on each of the ten representations made to the County Council to date.

Reference	Position	Outcome	Address	Notes
18/01115	Oppose	Approved	Fram Well House Diamond Terrace	Jurisdiction declined by the NCPU
18/01270	Oppose	Approved	22 Mitchell Street	
18/01446	Oppose	Refused	10 Lawson Terrace	
18/01492	Ask for conditions	Pending	21 Elvet Bridge (takeaway)	Late change to terminal hour, they are seeking 2am
18/01582	Ask for conditions	Approved	Elm Tree Inn	Plans amended to remove steps
18/01650	Defer	Deferred	University Maths & Computing building	Essential information missing from application
18/01669	Oppose	Pending	10 High Wood View	
18/01671	Oppose	Pending	11 Prospect Terrace	
18/01908	Withdrawn	Pending	Land To The East Of DLI Museum	Original position was to oppose
18/02118	Ask for conditions	Pending	North East of Holly Street,	

Regarding Holly Street, Cllr R Cornwell will send Cllr L Brown a copy of the representation letter.

6. To consider making representations on the following planning applications:

**DM/18/01727/LB and DM/18/02009/AD:** external display of banners and internal alterations, Mayor's Office, Market Place: agreed to write to the County Council asking for deferral of consideration of the proposals until an officer has been able to attend a meeting of the Parish Planning Committee to explain with large-scale plans what is intended for the interior changes. A County Councillor will be asked to request that these two applications

be referred to Committee on grounds of City of Durham Local Plan Policies E6, E22 and Q16.

**DM/18/02110/FPA:** change of use from use class C4 small HMO to large HMO to both 4 and 5 Southend, South Road: noted.

**DM/18/02130/FPA:** building extension to a family house at Hawthorn Edge, Neville's Cross: noted.

**DM/18/02199/FPA and DM/18/02200/LB:** change of use of the former Newcastle Building Society building on Elvet Bridge: noted.

**DM/18/02210/FPA:** a shop converting to an Ice Cream Parlour on Riverwalk: noted.

**DM/18/02250/AD:** erection and display of 2no internally illuminated fascia text signs and 2no internally illuminated projection signs at Ask Unit 4 Millennium Place: noted.

**DM/18/02259/AD:** display of double sided digital advertising panels on a bus shelter - Durham University Elvet Riverside 1 New Elvet: noted.

**DM/18/02269/AD:** erection and display of 2 no. fret lettering signs to rear, 1 no. hanging banner sign and 1 no fascia sign to front - Covered Market, Market Place: noted.

7. Report on discussions with Durham Students' Union over minimum room sizes in HMOs: Cllr R Cornwell had approached the DSU President and DSU Welfare Officer but neither has replied yet. HMOs licenses in England issued after 1 October 2018 under Part 2 of the Housing Act 2004 will require that the floor area of any room in the HMO used as sleeping accommodation by one person aged over 10 years is not less than 6.51 square metres. The issue is whether to press the County Council to adopt better than this minimum - perhaps 8 square metres.

8. Discussion re Airbnb in Durham City: Cllr R Cornwell reported that there are over 50 Airbnb properties in the Parish area. Cllr L Brown noted that she had taken up with County Council officers the question of whether a change of use from C3 to C1 was involved and that the response was usually not and that if the property was operated as an HMO this would be an unauthorised change to C4 use and would be an enforcement matter. Cllr J Ashby confirmed that this was the view of the Government's Chief Planner. Cllr E Ashby undertook to check whether Visit County Durham has records of Airbnbs.

9. Any other business: Cllr E Ashby drew attention to Duresme House's lack of nearby shops in which to buy food to cook in the studio kitchens and therefore the probability that there will be many visits by Tesco's, Sainsbury's and other delivery vans as well as vans delivering goods bought on-line via Amazon etc. This is certain to cause problems exiting back on to the A167. She wondered if the traffic issue of multiple deliveries should be considered in future PBSA applications. It was suggested that she makes this representation to the County Council in relation to Preferred Options Policy 17.2 on PBSAs.

10. Dates of future meetings: 7th September – Mezzanine Office, Town Hall & 21<sup>st</sup> September – Mayor's Chamber, Town Hall.

11. There being no further business the meeting ended at 11.15 am.

**SIGNED** ROGER CORNWELL

**CHAIR OF PLANNING COMMITTEE**

# CITY OF DURHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting held in Mezzanine Office at the Town Hall, Durham City on Friday 7 September 2018 at 10:00

**Present:** Cllrs Cornwell (Chair), Ashby, Elmer, Reeves and Holland (Secretary)

**Apologies:** None

**Declarations of interest:** Cllr Cornwell declared an interest in the application **DM/18/02372/FPA** | Demolition of Tower Cottage, The Avenue, and building 3 new houses fronting on the The Avenue as his property is close to this site

**Minutes of the meeting on 10 August 2018:** agreed to be a true record.

**Matters arising:** it was noted that, after discussion with the Students Union, members of that Union will attend the next Planning Meeting in order to define the minimum standard size of a student's room and have this recognised as a Planning standard throughout the County.

**DM/18/02369/FPA** | New County HQ: finalising the letter of representation on this planning application: the document submitted by Cllr Ashby was accepted in principle. It was agreed that we objected to this application in principle and in detail and noted that it contravened Local Plan policies E5, E6, E19, DQ1, T1 and EMP11. It is also contrary to NPPF 11 and 124-132 and to the Durham City Draft Neighbourhood Plan. It does not meet the standards required by the World Heritage Co-ordinator and is contravenes the demands of at Arhus Convention Article 5. Furthermore, the Council's own Ecological Assessment is still not available. It was recommended that in the final submission an opening paragraph or abstract should be included that briefly details our primary policy objections.

**DM/18/01727/LB** and **DM/18/02009/AD** | External display of banners and internal alterations, Mayors Office Market Place Durham DH1 3NW (deferred from 27 July): the response on the parish web site was approved.

To consider possibly making representations on the following planning applications:

**DM/18/02120/LB** | various works mostly to garage | 20 South Street  
Noted

**DM/18/02133/FPA** | Extensions to side and rear, alterations to front steps/raised platform and widening of drive | 18 Orchard Drive  
Noted

**DM/18/02268/FPA** | Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of 4no. detached dwellings. | Highfield House Potters Bank Durham DH1 3RR  
No action as yet but Cllr Brown to be asked to look into this application prior to the deadline on September 19th

**DM/18/02328/LB** | Retention of replacement fenestration | 21A Hallgarth Street  
Noted

**DM/18/02335/LB** | Retention of Replacement Fenestration | 21 Hallgarth Street  
Noted

**DM/18/02349/FPA** | Rear single storey extension | 12 St Bedes Close Crossgate Moor  
Noted

**DM/18/02372/FPA** | Demolition of Tower Cottage, the Avenue, and building 3 new houses fronting on the The Avenue. The City Council to object, the County Councillor to call this application to committee

**DM/18/02374/FPA** | Change of use from B1 business to mixed use B1 business & A2 financial and professional services Howarth Litchfield Partnership 4 Old Elvet  
Noted

**DM/18/02390/FPA** | Retention of the repositioning of the field access including erection of post and wire fence and gate, Toll House Road Crossgate Moor DH1 4HU  
DM/18/02464/LB and Cllr Ashby observed that the drawing on these plans is wrong and agreed to send Cllr Brown a diagram indicating the correct position so that this matter can be progressed

**DM/18/02463/FPA** | Various works 6 Leazes Place Durham DH1 1RE  
Noted

**DM/18/02486/AD** County Hall, Framwellgate Peth, DH1 5UQ, Erection of 2no. non-illuminated adverts measuring 6m x 3m. Such a large 18 square metre advertising board located in this position will act as an unnecessary and potentially dangerous distraction to motorists. It was noted that a significantly smaller hoarding at Milburngate had been refused by the County Council which was therefore being inconsistent and contrary in its dealings with the private sector. Cllr Brown to investigate and call to committee if the Council insists on pursuing this application.

**Dates of next meetings:**

21st September - to be held in the Mayors Chamber, Town Hall  
5th October – venue to be confirmed

**SIGNED** ROGER CORNWELL

**CHAIR OF PLANNING COMMITTEE**

## **AGENDA ITEM 9: HISTORY OF LORD LONDONDERRY STATUE AND BATTLE OF NEVILLES CROSS – PROVISION OF INFORMATION BOARDS**

A local resident has raised the following for consideration by the council.

There is a lot in the news lately about historical statues which do not reflect modern values- for example, Colston in Bristol and Rhodes in Oxford. We have our own version of this in the market place, with Londonderry, a mine owner who kept his workers in poverty and used hired thugs to break strikes and evict strikers families.

It is ironic that his statue is directly opposite the Market Tavern, where the Durham Miners Association was formed.

I am not suggesting the statue be removed, it has been there long enough to be part of the history of Durham, but surely it could be used as an opportunity to tell more about the story of the struggle for workers rights by the addition of a plaque setting the record straight. Is this something the Parish Council could help with?

The Chair has also raised the question of the commemoration of the Battle of Neville's Cross and whether this is something along with the above, that our Environment might like to deal with.

<b>ACTION REQUIRED</b>	For council members to consider the above and resolve whether they wish to refer this to the Environment Committee to deal with or make a resolution at full council
----------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## **AGENDA ITEM 10: MEMBERSHIP OF THE CITY OF DURHAM SAFETY GROUP**

The clerk was requested by Council to seek membership of the Durham City Safety Group. I have therefore written to DCC to seek such membership and received the following response.

City of Contact: Jane Robinson  
Direct Tel: 03000 267355  
Fax:  
email: Jane.robinson@c  
Your ref:  
Our ref: JR/LA

Dear Elizabeth

### **Re: Membership of the Durham City Safety Group**

Thank you for your letter of 2 August 2018 regarding representation from the City of Durham Parish Council on the City Safety Group.

The City Safety Group is an operational group with representation from the key partner organisations, as such and given that there are no elected members on the group, I don't feel it would be appropriate to have representation from the City of Durham Parish Council.

However given your obvious interest I would be more than happy to discuss how best to develop a communication channel to enable the Parish Council to feed in any issues they may have and for updates to be provided to you on the activity of the group.

Yours faithfully  
Jane Robinson

Chair of Durham City Safety Group  
Corporate Director Adults & Health Services

<b>ACTION REQUIRED</b>	For council members to consider the above response and determine whether they wish to establish a communication channel to feed any issues we have into the Durham City Safety Group.
----------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## **AGENDA ITEM 12: MEMBERSHIP OF THE CDALC LARGER COUNCILS FORUM AND REPRESENTATION ON THE CDALC CITY OF DURHAM AREA COMMITTEE**

As a member of the County Durham Association of Local Councils (CDALC), the City of Durham Parish council is entitled to appoint and send up to three representatives to the CDALC Larger Councils Forum. This Forum brings together the 16 Larger Councils that CDALC has in the County Association. The aim of this Forum is

1. to develop, formulate and respond to the policy issues affecting Larger Local Councils within the overall NALC framework.
2. to provide, by direct access, a full range of national services, including legal advice, when needed.
3. to provide networking opportunities for elected members, clerks and staff of Larger Local Councils.
4. to provide specific and relevant training on issues identified by, and affecting, Larger Local Councils.
5. to undertake research on behalf of the sector within identified policy areas.

The Forum meets four times a year in larger council offices across the County and offers the council the opportunity to network and share ideas with neighbouring larger councils. For example the next meeting is in Horden Parish Council offices on the 22 November.

In addition to this, there is another meeting that this council can be represented on. This is the CDALC Durham area Committee. This aims to bring the parish council representatives together from the ten parish council making up the Durham City Area Action Partnership area. Two councillors from each council are invited to attend.

This Committee has in recent year met very infrequently. The aim of this committee is to obviously bring this group of parish councils together and once a year to choose their CDALC Executive Committee Member and their parish councillor representative on the AAP Board.

<b>ACTION REQUIRED</b>	For council members to consider the above and resolve whether they wish to support these requests for the council to appoint members to the Forum and Committee.
----------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Communications process by which the Council informs and engages with each other, staff (if one day more than a Clerk), stakeholders and other institutions, the public, the media.**

Options framework

Communications Policy With a Focus on Awareness and Information Dissemination	
Internal	External
Organisation Bulletins	Website
Seminars and Training Courses	Public newsletter, annual reports, press releases
	Designated and published spokesperson names
Away Days	Targets on answering telephone, emails and letters
Open meetings	Public Meetings
	Annual Meetings with stakeholders
	Citizen suggestion box
	Advice and Information Booklet

**Internal**

- x In practice we are planning an away day and would suggest we have one annually to discuss both priorities and, away from the public eye, any issues we would wish to air as a group.
- x We have agreed training.
- x We do need some form of intranet, so all information, committee reports, etc., are uploaded so that between meetings we are aware of all matters under discussion. Such an intranet would also serve as a place to retain minutes, upload agendas, etc. This should be part of the website, as a

**External**

- x We will need a website both as access to an intranet and also for public information, such as agendas and reports. This could also usefully carry a record of all our formal statements, etc.
- x We will be asked for information, statements and reactions. I would suggest that chairs of would also suggest that the Chair and Vice-Chair perform a similar role for formal council business. We may need a protocol on what are reserved or unreserved matters in terms of public comment but that can be for discussion.
- x We are open to public comment on a monthly basis, albeit for 15 minutes. We have agreed an whether we need a suggestion box but we may wish to add to the website a portal for public comment (and which may be useful for anyone not able to attend a meeting but have pertinent comments to make).
- x When we have a clerk we should consider a response policy for answering questions, etc.
- x We may wish to think about a leaflet or booklet that summarises the Council, its members and its remit; this may be useful for any open meeting.

**Summary**

We have a number of options and this note is to begin discussions so that, at the next meeting, we can agree how we wish to approach a communications policy.

Elizabeth Scott