



**CITY OF DURHAM PARISH COUNCIL**

**NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

**CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

**SEPTEMBER 2019**

The Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement is available at:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/the-plan/>



### **Contact Details**

Parish Clerk

City of Durham Parish Council

Office 3 D4.01d

Clayport Library

8 Millennium Place

Durham

DH1 1WA

Email: [parishclerk@cityofdurham-pc.gov.uk](mailto:parishclerk@cityofdurham-pc.gov.uk)

Website: <http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/>

## CONTENTS

	<b>Page No:</b>	
1	Introduction: Reference to legislation	1
2	Background: Why we decided to develop a Neighbourhood Plan	1
3	Consultation aims and strategy	2
4	Consultation activities	3
5	Summary of key issues raised during consultation and how we responded to them	5
6	Co-operation with major stakeholders	15
7	Key stages in the process	16
8	Appendices showing engagement activities	27
A	Communications and engagement action plan (April 2015)	27
B	Community groups and stakeholders	30
C	Schools and colleges	31
D	Building developers and land / property owners	31
E	Residents' associations	32
F	Neighbouring Parish Councils	32
G	Statutory and other official bodies	33
H	Website containing key consultation documents referenced in this <i>Statement</i>	33

THE REST OF THIS PAGE IS DELIBERATELY LEFT BLANK

## **1. Introduction: Reference to legislation**

1.1 This *Consultation Statement* describes how the Durham City Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations sets out what a Consultation Statement should contain:

- Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan;
- An explanation of how they were consulted;
- A summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- A description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

## **2. Background: Why we decided to develop a Neighbourhood Plan**

2.1 Our Neighbourhood has a population of around 25,000, including around 18,000 students, and contains many important sites and functions. It is the county town and the World Heritage Site of the cathedral and castle is a strong tourist attraction. It is home to Durham University, an agricultural college, four secondary schools, four primary schools, the county's main hospital, a major prison, several sporting venues, a green belt, government offices for passports and national savings, a main bus station and an East Coast Main Line rail station. It is a business and retail centre providing a range of professional and leisure services. Much of its housing stock is occupied by students and several key sites in the City centre have been developed for purpose built student accommodation. Others are under development for offices, hotels and leisure and retail facilities. It is a very confined location and needs improvements to sustainable modes of travel to reduce congestion and improve air quality. In short, Our Neighbourhood presents many issues for planning policies to address.

2.2 Citizens of Durham have a long-standing interest and concern about their City and developments in it: the civic amenity society The City of Durham Trust was founded in 1942. More recently concerns about the growth of the University and the conversion of family homes into student houses in multiple occupation led to the setting up of the Balanced Communities Working Group in 2003 and the Balanced and Sustainable Communities Forum in 2008. This was coordinated by Durham's MP, Roberta Blackman-Woods.

2.3 Alongside this residents' associations have been established dealing with similar issues and also taking a more general interest in their neighbourhoods. The longest established of these are the Elvet Residents' Association, the Crossgate Community Partnership and the St Nicholas Community Forum. The Friends of the Durham Green Belt are another organisation taking a keen interest in local planning issues.

2.4 All of these bodies have commented on planning applications as they affected their areas of interest. These are assessed against the prevailing local plan, which since 1 April 2004 has been the City of Durham Local Plan (DCLP), and the overarching national guidance which, at the time, was the Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) and Planning Policy Statements (PPS).

2.5 The DCLP was revised according to Government guidelines in April 2007. In March 2012 the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and in 2015 Durham

County Council published an assessment of the consistency of the saved policies of the DCLP with the NPPF. The latest edition of the NPPF was published in February 2019.

2.6 The passage of time and changes in the national planning policy context affected the weight that should be given to certain parts of the Local Plan. Problems were being encountered in finding policies to control unsuitable development. Developers were also criticising the Local Plan claiming that it was too old to be relevant. And new problems were arising, particularly in the growth of student accommodation, that the Local Plan was not equipped to deal with.

2.7 The Localism Act of 2011 has the stated aim of devolving decision-making down from central government to local communities. It made provision for neighbourhood plans to be created by parish councils or, where one did not exist, by neighbourhood planning forums. This created interest among residents' groups and the Balanced and Sustainable Communities Forum, even as the law was passing through its parliamentary stages. The possibility was there to create a neighbourhood planning forum that would address these issues and provide new opportunities to steer development in Durham in the right direction.

2.8 Following an initiative from the MP the Sustainable Communities Forum reconstituted itself as a steering group that was working towards becoming a Neighbourhood Planning Forum. Having obtained the right number of members it formally applied to the County Council on 10<sup>th</sup> July 2013 to be designated, and this request was agreed to on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2014.

2.9 The chronology of the development of the NP from the earliest stages in 2011 to its completion in 2019 is given in Section 6.

### **3. Consultation aims and strategy**

3.1 *Planning Practice Guidance* (Paragraph: 047 Reference ID: 41-047-20140306. Revision date: 06 03 2014) sets out the requirements for the role of the wider community in neighbourhood planning. These are that a qualifying body should be inclusive and open in the preparation of its neighbourhood plan and ensure that the wider community:

- is kept fully informed of what is being proposed
- is able to make their views known throughout the process
- has opportunities to be actively involved in shaping the emerging neighbourhood plan
- is made aware of how their views have informed the draft neighbourhood plan

3.2 These are precisely the aims and strategy followed by the Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum (The Forum). The most important feature of a neighbourhood plan is that it is prepared and agreed by local people and the Forum describes the area covered by the plan as "Our Neighbourhood". Work on the Plan began in 2014 and provided the opportunity for continuous consultation throughout. These consultations enabled the Forum to find out what people who live and work in the area, and those who visit, think of the policies and proposals as the Plan developed.

3.3 Community consultation and involvement have been sought from the outset of this plan for Our Neighbourhood, through public meetings, leaflets, surveys, community events, activities with schools and a stall in the Market Place. The planning policies in our

Neighbourhood Plan have all been drawn directly from what people, including children, have said in response to the open questions: What is good about Durham City? What is bad about Durham City? What needs to change? This has ensured that the voices of the people participating in all of the consultation opportunities have been the determinants of emerging policy ideas.

3.4 A *Communications and engagement Action Plan* was drawn up in April / May 2015 and this guided the Forum's activities. This *Plan* can be seen at Appendix A.

#### **4. Consultation activities**

4.1 The Forum was established in January 2014. It started slowly as members learned what was required and their attention was taken up with the Examination in Public of the County Durham Local Plan that was later withdrawn. Work gathered momentum in 2015 and details are given in Section 6 of this statement. Hundreds of emails have been exchanged among members of the working group. With people resigning and new people joining, 40 people have been Forum members and 22 members have taken part in the Forum Working Group and the City of Durham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Party that succeeded it. The Forum itself has held 62 meetings and its working groups have met 133 times. The notes of all these meetings were posted on our website as the work progressed and they can be found at:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/resources/minutes-forum/>

and at

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/resources/working-party-minutes/>

4.2 The foundation for all the Forum's work was the Priority Survey carried out in June / July 2015. Two open events were held in Durham Town Hall when people were asked "What is good about Durham City?", "What is bad about Durham City?" and "What needs to change?" Leaflets were also delivered to every house and they contained a questionnaire; there was also an on-line questionnaire. 162 replies were received and very strong views were received from the public about planning and planning issues. The results of these early fundamental consultations can be found on our website at:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/PrioritySurveyResults.pdf>

4.3 A number of more specific consultations followed and details are given on our website:

##### ***Young people's views***

*October 2015 to March 2016*

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/NPF-Young-Peoples-consultation-report-2016-PDF.pdf>

**Views of businesses**

March 2016

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/EconomicSurveyResponses.pdf>

**Pedestrians' views**

June 2016

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/PedestrianConsultation.pdf>

**Arts and culture views**

August 2016

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/ArtSurveysResponses.pdf>

4.4 Individual members of the Forum also engaged with various community groups and key stakeholders. Some examples are given in Appendix B. The Forum's Engagement Officer was also in regular contact with the local press and we had 16 articles or other mentions in *The Durham Times*.

4.5 Two Regulation 14 consultations have been conducted, the first under the aegis of the Forum and the second because the City of Durham Parish Council took over responsibility for developing the Neighbourhood Plan in May 2018. It was advised by Durham County Council that it should conduct a further consultation. Part of the reason for this was that DCC agreed to revise the Neighbourhood Plan Area slightly so that it coincided with the new Parish area. This largely involved the addition of some properties in the Gilesgate area.

4.6 For the first consultation in 2017 leaflets were delivered to every address in Our Neighbourhood, six consultation events were held in local community centres, and hard copies of the draft plan, summary documents and questionnaires were available at County Hall, Durham Town Hall and the Clayport Library. Questionnaires were also available online. Similar arrangements were in place in 2019, though on a slightly smaller scale. Leaflets and summary documents were delivered to the new addresses in Gilesgate and three consultation events were held, one specifically in Gilesgate to facilitate engagement with the newly added residents and businesses.

4.7 The responses obtained during these two Regulation 14 consultations were subjected to a rigorous categorisation process and resulted in corresponding revisions to the draft plan. These activities were supported by workshops, and further meetings / correspondence, with relevant staff from Durham County Council's planning and spatial policy team. The details of these processes and revisions can be found at:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/your-views/2017consultation/2017-response-analysis/>

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/your-views/2019-consultation/2019-response-analysis/>

4.8 This analysis is structured theme by theme and also covers more general sections of the plan:

- The categorisation of all the responses to both the Plan and the *Sustainability Analysis*;
- The identification of all the issues that need addressing;

- The consequent revisions to the policies and supporting text.

4.9 In addition, we carried out a numeric analysis of all the questionnaire responses and it is available at

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Numeric-Analysis.pdf> (For 2017)

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Numeric-Analysis-2019-Consultation.pdf> (For 2019)

4.10 We also posted on the website the collated responses from all the questionnaires, the website and emails so that members of the public could readily see the responses for themselves:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Collated-Comments.pdf> (For 2017)

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/2019-Consultation-All-Comments.pdf> (For 2019)

4.11 And similarly we posted the full text of all the letters received during the consultations:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/your-views/2017consultation/2017-letters/> (For 2017)

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/your-views/2019-consultation/2019-letters/> (For 2019)

## 5. Summary of key issues raised during consultation and how we responded to them

### Theme 1: Sustainability

Summary of the key issues / concerns	How the issues have been addressed
<p><b>Priority survey 2015</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments explicitly dealt with sustainability issues, either good or bad or what needed to change</li> <li>• Some relevant concerns were expressed about transport and the environment, but these were picked up in Themes 2b and 5</li> </ul>	<p><b>After the priority survey</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members of the working group were aware of the importance of the notion of “sustainable development” in the NPPF and realised that it needed to play a similarly key role in the NP.</li> <li>• Sustainability became the first Theme so that it became the “golden thread” for the NP as a whole.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pre-submission consultation 2017</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considerable concern was expressed about the lack of clarity in the introductory wording of Policies S1 and S2 because they covered so many criteria.</li> <li>• Concern was also expressed about the overlap between S1 dealing with sites</li> </ul>	<p><b>After the 2017 pre-submission consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The introduction to them was simplified.</li> <li>• Policies S1 and S2 were combined to avoid overlap and confusion.</li> </ul>

<p>and S2 dealing with buildings on those sites: how would they be used together?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was also concern about the lack of emphasis on the promotion of bio-diversity.</li> <li>• The suggestion was made that there should be a policy requiring masterplans for large and particularly significant sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The promotion of bio- and geo-diversity was strengthened.</li> <li>• Policy S2 became one concerned with masterplans</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pre-submission consultation 2019</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductory wording of Policy S1 needs simplifying.</li> <li>• Concern that Theme 1 did not respond sufficiently strongly to the climate emergency.</li> <li>• Concern about lack of clarity about flood zones.</li> <li>• Need to reference principles of sustainable drainage and water management</li> <li>• Criticism that reference to public art in Policy S1 needs to be more specific.</li> <li>• Many criticisms that Policy S2 did not define “large” sites that required masterplans.</li> <li>• Many criticisms of the wording of Policy S2.</li> </ul>	<p><b>After the 2019 pre-submission consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wording clarified and strengthened.</li> <li>• Wording changed to clarify the need for the sequential test.</li> <li>• Principles referenced in supporting text.</li> <li>• Treatment of public art moved to Policy C1.</li> <li>• “Large” replaced with the NPPF definition of “major development”</li> <li>• Policy S2 revised in line with Policy E1 to give more detail.</li> </ul>

## **Theme 2a: Heritage**

<b>Summary of the key issues / concerns</b>	<b>How the issues have been addressed</b>
<p><b>Meetings with World Heritage Site Co-ordinator and University professor, visual arts and culture</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for better consideration of local issues in planning decisions.</li> <li>• Significance of World Heritage Site</li> </ul> <p><b>Priority survey</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primacy of World Heritage Site in people's concerns</li> <li>• Concern about new buildings detracting from setting and views of World Heritage Site</li> <li>• Better enforcement in protection of city's heritage</li> </ul> <p><b>Study of young people's views 2015/16</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong appreciation of heritage and architecture of the city</li> </ul>	<p><b>Pre-submission draft policies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy H1: Protection of the World Heritage Site</li> <li>• Policy H2: The Conservation Areas</li> <li>• Policy H3: The Character Areas</li> <li>• Policy H4: Our Neighbourhood outside the Conservation Areas</li> <li>• Policy H5: Listed buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens, and Registered Battlefields</li> <li>• Policy H6: Non-designated Heritage Assets</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pre-submission consultation 2017</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very high level of support for the heritage</li> </ul>	<p><b>After the 2017 pre-submission consultation</b></p>

<p>policies (H1 96%, H2 89%, H3 88%, H4 89%, H5 90%, H6 87%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about:</li> <li>Protection and opening up of views relating to the World Heritage Site</li> <li>Strategic nature of policies and conformance with NPPF</li> <li>Suggestions of detail for improving wording of policies</li> <li>Encouraging reuse of historic buildings and avoiding decay</li> <li>Quality of architectural design in new buildings</li> <li>Suggestions for changes to Appendix C</li> </ul> <p><b>Meeting with Historic England, Spring 2018</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to emphasise local significance of heritage in policies</li> </ul> <p><b>Meeting with Durham County Council officers, March 2018</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for strong policies to protect heritage assets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alterations in wording to comply fully with NPPF</li> <li>Minor alterations to reflect accepted professional vocabulary</li> <li>Consolidation of content into four policies to avoid repetition</li> <li>Additional provisions on architectural merit and reuse of buildings</li> <li>Altered wording to emphasise local distinctiveness</li> <li>Amendments and corrections to Appendix C</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pre-submission consultation 2019</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High level of support for the heritage policies (H1 86%, H2 86%, H3 84%, H4 86%)</li> <li>Suggestions for improvements in wording of policies and associated text</li> </ul>	<p><b>After the 2019 pre-submission consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small changes in the policies to improve and strengthen them</li> <li>Small changes to associated text</li> </ul>

**Theme 2b: Green Infrastructure**

Summary of the key issues / concerns	How the issues have been addressed
<p><b>Priority survey 2015</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High value placed on riverbank setting and riverside walks, and the woodland wedges bringing green space into the City</li> <li>Value placed on parks and nature areas</li> <li>Need to protect green spaces / Green belt</li> <li>Need to improve the riverside</li> </ul>	<p><b>After the priority survey</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishment of Green Infrastructure as a theme in its own right</li> <li>Policy G1: detailed policy to protect and enhance green assets</li> <li>Policy G2: designation of Local Green Spaces to protect key green spaces</li> <li>Policy G3: Emerald Network</li> <li>Policy G4: Enhancement of the Green Belt</li> </ul>
<p><b>Ongoing Public Engagement</b></p> <p><b>Study of young people's views 2015/16</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Value river and river walks</li> <li>Improve access to and leisure opportunities on the riverbanks</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussions with Friends of Flass Vale 2016</b> (large group of local wildlife supporters)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion / details of Emerald Network</li> </ul>	

<p><b>Correspondence with local residents groups 2016</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lists of the green areas in their locality of importance to them</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Pre-submission consultation 2017</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High level of support for the green infrastructure policies (G1 93%, G2 90%, G3 88%, G4 88%)</li> <li>• Suggestions for minor improvements</li> <li>• Suggested deletion of an area from the Observatory Hill Local Green Space</li> <li>• Suggested extension to include two fields on the opposite side of Potters Bank and Bow Cemetery</li> </ul>	<p><b>After the 2017 pre-submission consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small changes in the policies to improve and strengthen them</li> </ul> <p><b>Observatory Hill Local Green Space</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After discussions with local residents and landowners, these two suggestions were assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal. The decision was to make the extension and refuse the deletion</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pre-submission consultation 2019</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High level of support for the green infrastructure policies (G1 88%, G2 86%, G3 86%, G4 86%)</li> <li>• Suggestions for improvements in wording of policies and associated text</li> <li>• Suggestion for extension to the Observatory Hill Local Green Space</li> </ul>	<p><b>After the 2019 pre-submission consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes in wording of policies, and associated text, to improve clarity, particularly Policy G1</li> </ul> <p><b>Observatory Hill Local Green Space</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision on extension of Observatory Hill Local Green Space informed by the Sustainability Appraisal and discussions with land owner. Decision made by Parish Council to include the extension in the Observatory Hill Local Green Space</li> </ul>

**Theme 3: Economy**

Summary of the key issues/concerns	How the issues have been addressed
<p><b>Priority survey 2015 and study of young people's views 2015/16</b></p> <p><b>Meetings with business owners</b></p> <p><b>Business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a more mixed economy less reliant on the public sector</li> <li>• Attract new high tech industry</li> <li>• Attract small businesses and business incubators</li> <li>• Support local businesses</li> <li>• Create more employment opportunities particularly for young people</li> <li>• Create a better working environment</li> <li>• Create more office space</li> <li>• Better connectivity</li> </ul> <p><b>Retail</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More diverse retail offer in the city centre</li> <li>• Encourage specialist retailers and craft practitioners</li> </ul>	<p><b>Issues addressed through pre-submission draft policies</b></p> <p><b>Policy E1 Larger Employment Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of a business park at Aykley Heads (E1:1) for a diverse mix of businesses and office space and at Mountjoy (E1:2); a site for science, technology, start-up and incubator businesses.</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy E2 Other Employment Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocate three specified sites within the city and windfall brownfield sites for A2 (financial and business services) and B1 (Business- Offices) uses and craft and creative spaces and associated sales.</li> <li>• Developments should include sustainable transport links, open space and be situated close to, or incorporate, ancillary amenities</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A coordinated plan for the city centre</li> <li>• Improve the bus station and North Road</li> <li>• Better maintenance of the streetscape</li> <li>• More leisure and entertainment opportunities in city centre including events</li> <li>• Repurpose empty buildings</li> </ul> <p><b>Questionnaire survey of local businesses distributed through BID (Business Improvement District)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car parking</li> <li>• Improve &amp; expand Park and Ride</li> <li>• Diversity of independent retailers</li> <li>• More city centre events and better advertising for them</li> <li>• Improve streetscape and signage</li> <li>• Improve connectivity</li> <li>• Challenge out-of-town retail</li> </ul> <p><b>Tourism</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make Durham a destination city and develop more tourist attractions &amp; events so that visitors stay longer.</li> <li>• An information hub for residents and visitors</li> </ul> <p><b>Questionnaire survey of local businesses distributed through BID (Business Improvement District)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better promotion of Durham as a tourist destination</li> </ul>	<p><b>Policy E3 Retail Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A1 (Retail) to be the predominant use for the Core Retail Area.</li> <li>• To maintain a vibrant city centre allow change of use for ground floor premises from A1 to non- A1 cultural and leisure.</li> <li>• Repurpose redundant upper floors for commercial, retail and tourism.</li> <li>• Improving the public realm and access for all users</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy E4 Primary and Secondary Frontages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage positive growth and diversity for the evening economy particularly with regard to entertainment for families</li> <li>• Developments should not harm the character of the historic environment or have a negative impact on residential amenity.</li> <li>• Tourism policies were unintentionally omitted in the pre-submission draft plan</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pre-submission consultation 2017 Business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad support for policies although the following concerns were raised:</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy E1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DCC consider Aykley Heads to be a strategic issue and suggest it be removed from the NP</li> <li>• Sustainability and transport/access issues at both sites</li> <li>• Loss of green space and protection of the environment</li> <li>• Speculative development of office space</li> <li>• Broaden the business uses at Mountjoy</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy E2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safeguard the existing craft and creative business environment at Fowlers Yard</li> </ul> <p><b>Retail</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad support for the policies although</li> </ul>	<p><b>After 2017 pre-submission consultation Policy E1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sites are strategic employment sites for Durham City and this policy contains more local detail than the CDP and therefore should remain</li> <li>• Addition to Policy E1 is a requirement for a masterplan to promote standards of sustainability and to address issues of transport, accessibility and environment</li> <li>• Policy E1.2 amended to include educational use for the Mountjoy site</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy E2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amended to limit the business Use Classes at Fowlers Yard to protect the existing business environment</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy E3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amended to incorporate the majority of Policy E4 Primary and Secondary Frontages</li> <li>• Simplified the clarification to just</li> </ul>

<p>the following concerns were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repetition of content of policies E3 and E4</li> <li>• Designation of city centre retail area</li> <li>• Confusion over the clarification and definition of Primary and Secondary Frontages</li> <li>• Uses of Primary and Secondary Frontages</li> <li>• Protect the setting of the World Heritage Site and conservation area</li> </ul> <p><b>Meeting with Durham County Council officers April 2018</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed to use DCC's Town Centre and Shop Frontage map and classification</li> </ul> <p><b>Tourism</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A policy referring to tourism and the visitor economy should be included in the plan</li> </ul>	<p>Primary Frontage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Included residential as a Use Class for upper floors of Primary Frontage</li> <li>• Strengthened the policy wording to protect the setting of the WHS</li> <li>• Changed Town Centre area Map 6 and Shop Frontage Use Classes following Durham County Council's model</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy E4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Becomes a separate policy for Evening Economy in line with a policy in emerging County Durham Plan</li> <li>• <b>Policies E5 Visitor Attractions and E6 Visitor Accommodation</b> included in plan</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pre-submission consultation 2019</b></p> <p><b>Business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad support for policies, although the following concerns were raised:</li> <li>• <b>Policy E1</b></li> <li>• DCC and Durham University consider there is no need for a masterplan in the policy as there is no reference to them in the NPPF and paragraphs 124 &amp; 127 refer to design principles</li> <li>• More local detail required for each site in policy and supporting text</li> <li>• No evidence for the requirement of a minimum buffer of 15m of trees around Mountjoy site</li> <li>• Suggestion that the Providence Row site should include Use Class for education</li> </ul> <p><b>Meeting with DCC officers in September 2019 following the close of the public consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Policy E1:</b> Aykley Heads site considered to be strategic by DCC and concern that the existing visitor car park, which is in the Green Belt, is not allocated for development in the policy or included in Proposals Map 5</li> <li>• <b>Policy E2:</b> Providence Row now being developed, remove allocation from the policy; also Blagdon Depot which is in Flood Plain 2 and Green Belt</li> <li>• <b>Retail</b></li> <li>• Broad support for policies although the</li> </ul>	<p><b>After 2019 pre-submission consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Policy E1</b></li> <li>• The reference to masterplans can be found in the NPPF Glossary of Terms under Design Code and therefore the reference has been retained.</li> <li>• The full definition of masterplan is outlined in Theme 1 Policy S2 and Policy E1 references this.</li> <li>• New paragraph in supporting text adds more detail as to why these sites have been included in the Plan</li> <li>• New paragraph included regarding the provision for well-connected pedestrian and cycle paths to the City centre</li> <li>• Site E1.2 removed as now very little land remains undeveloped</li> <li>• Justification text for policies E1 and E2 amended for both policies to delete a reference to the supply of student accommodation as this is now outdated</li> <li>• The protection of the Green Belt is a major objective of the Plan and therefore no change to policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy E2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providence Row allocation removed</li> <li>• Blagdon Depot removed from the allocation, but retained as a possible future site if the issues identified are resolved</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy E3</b></p>

<p>following concerns were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Policy E3</b></li> <li>• The criteria need clearer definition</li> <li>• The Use Classes for ground floor use need to accord with those designated for upper floors</li> <li>• Consider residential amenity when converting the upper floors to residential accommodation</li> <li>• <b>Policy E4</b></li> <li>• Public safety needs to be addressed in the policy</li> <li>• Policy needs more local detail and to refer to a broader evening economy</li> <li>• <b>Tourism</b></li> <li>• Broad support for the policies although the following issues were raised:</li> <li>• <b>Policies E5 &amp; E6</b></li> <li>• Policy needs to refer to existing sites as well as future developments. Consider splitting the policies to make them clearer.</li> <li>• Consider whether it is necessary to refer to a specific timeframe in policy E6 to limit the length of use of visitor accommodation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy criteria have been amended to include the same Use Classes in Primary Frontage for ground floors and upper floors</li> <li>• Criterion d) and supporting text has been amended to ensure that the change of use of upper floors to accommodation will not have a negative impact on residential amenity</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy E4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting text amended to include a reference to public safety and a requirement for a supporting statement to be submitted with planning application</li> <li>• Policy &amp; supporting text amended to include local detail and the benefit of the evening economy</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy E5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Split into two halves to refer to existing attractions and new attractions and to give finer detail specific to Durham City.</li> <li>• Supporting text has been amended to reflect this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy E6</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amended to include detail specific to Durham City and to ensure no negative impact on residential amenity.</li> <li>• Supporting text has been amended to justify the inclusion of a condition of consent to restrict visitor accommodation becoming a permanent residence.</li> </ul>
---	--

**Theme 4: Housing**

Summary of the key issues/concerns	How the issues have been addressed
<p><b>Priority survey 2015</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redress the huge imbalance towards student accommodation, and the various problems this causes</li> <li>• Provide more housing (e.g. affordable housing; housing for families, older people and young professionals)</li> </ul>	<p><b>After the priority survey</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish Theme 4 ‘A City with attractive and affordable places to live’</li> <li>• Policies D2 and D3: controlling HMOs and PBSAs</li> <li>• Policies D4 and D5: meeting these needs</li> </ul>
<p><b>Meetings of residents’ groups</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to aim for balanced and sustainable communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies D2 and D3: controlling HMOs and PBSAs</li> </ul>

<p><b>Meetings and correspondence with house-builders</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need suitable sites for residential development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy D1: land for residential development</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pre-submission consultation 2017</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High level of support for the HMO and PBSA policies</li> <li>• Suggestions for minor improvements</li> <li>• County Council concerns re duplication/confusion on D2 and D3</li> </ul>	<p><b>After pre-submission consultation 2017</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small changes in the policies to improve and strengthen them</li> <li>• Align with County Council's Preferred Options policies but retain key difference of local concerns re saturation levels</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pre-submission consultation 2019</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repeated high level of support for the HMO and PBSA policies</li> <li>• Suggestions for minor improvements</li> <li>• County Council and University continued concerns re duplication/confusion on D2 and D3</li> </ul>	<p><b>After pre-submission consultation 2019</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further small adjustments to the policies</li> <li>• Align with improved County Council Submitted Plan policies but retain key differences to reflect local circumstances</li> </ul>

**Theme 5: Transport**

Summary of the key issues / concerns	How the issues have been addressed
<p><b>Priority survey 2015</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor walking and cycling facilities</li> <li>• Peak-time traffic congestion</li> <li>• Poor bus services to employment sites</li> <li>• Relocation of the bus station</li> <li>• Local rail services, especially early mornings and late evenings</li> <li>• Difficulties over car parking</li> <li>• Need for more Park and Ride sites with longer opening</li> <li>• Too many taxis</li> </ul> <p><b>Study of young people's views 2015/16</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walking and cycling facilities</li> <li>• Pavement congestion</li> <li>• Heavy traffic, road safety</li> <li>• More car parking</li> <li>• Bus station improvements</li> <li>• Cheaper bus fares</li> </ul> <p><b>Study of views of businesses 2016</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• need for cheaper car parking and better Park and Ride</li> </ul>	<p><b>After the priority survey</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further engagement with pedestrians and cyclists to understand nature of poor facilities and possible remedies</li> <li>• Contributed to stakeholder engagement in Durham City Sustainable Transport Strategy</li> </ul>
<p><b>Meeting with Trust Pathways</b> (local cycle campaign)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of current cycling provision and desirable routes without provision</li> </ul> <p><b>Pedestrian needs/issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compiled lists of pedestrian</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft policies concentrating on enabling and encouraging sustainable travel within Our Neighbourhood</li> </ul> <p><b>Pre-submission draft policies:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy T1: Accessibility of proposed developments</li> </ul>

<p>infrastructure issues via stall at a community event</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional similar issues identified</li> </ul> <p><b>Meeting with Durham County Council officers, January 2017</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scope of policies, design guidance</li> <li>• Conformance with emerging strategic policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy T2: Designing for sustainable transport</li> <li>• Policy T3: Residential car parking in the Controlled Parking Zone</li> <li>• Policy T4: Residential cycle parking</li> </ul>
<p><b>Strategic Environmental Assessment, summer 2017</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identified that mobility aid storage would strengthen the policies to assist people with disabilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy T4 amended: Residential storage for cycles and mobility aids</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pre-submission consultation 2017</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good level of support for the transport policies (T1 83%, T2 82%, T3 71%, T4 81%)</li> </ul> <p>Concerns about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality, congestion, traffic speed</li> <li>• Traffic resulting from major developments, including University expansion and Aykley Heads</li> <li>• Provision for children, disabled and elderly people</li> <li>• Bus station relocation</li> <li>• Car parking, including electric vehicle charging</li> <li>• Cyclist/pedestrian conflicts</li> <li>• Poor cycling provision</li> <li>• Difficulty of providing for cycling, especially in the city centre</li> <li>• Signage and information</li> <li>• Possible effects of policy on residential car parking</li> <li>• Details of policy on residential cycle / mobility aid storage</li> <li>• Suggestions of detail regarding pedestrian/cycling issues maps</li> </ul> <p><b>Meeting with Durham City Access for All group</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion and clarification of views of respondents</li> </ul>	<p><b>After the 2017 pre-submission consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Merged policies T1 and T2 to reduce duplication</li> <li>• Strengthened references to air quality and transport assessments</li> <li>• Added further text relating to people with reduced mobility</li> <li>• Amended supporting text to cover when separation of pedestrians and cyclists is needed</li> <li>• Policy on car parking amended to cover concerns raised in responses</li> <li>• Policy and supporting text on cycle and mobility aid storage revised to reduce requirement for individual dwellings and to allow for a wide range of design solutions</li> <li>• Amended walking and cycling issues maps to reflect comments received and changes on the ground</li> <li>• Maps moved to appendix D, with their use in relation to accessibility assessment clarified</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pre-submission consultation 2019</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High level of support for the transport policies (T1 88%, T2 84%, T3 88%)</li> <li>• Suggestions for improving clarity of Policy T1</li> <li>• Concerns about clarity of the wording of Policy T2</li> <li>• Storage of mobility aids in Policy T3</li> </ul>	<p><b>After the 2019 pre-submission consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies T1, T2 and T3 slightly reworded to improve clarity.</li> <li>• Further supporting text added.</li> </ul>

<p>questioned</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request for policy relating to railway station car parking</li> <li>• Inconsistency noted between transport theme and Policies C1 and C2</li> </ul>	
--	--

## **Theme 6: Community**

<b>Summary of the key issues/concerns</b>	<b>How the issues have been addressed</b>
<p><b>Priority survey 2015</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lively, vibrant, multi-cultural city, with friendly people and strong community feeling is a plus</li> <li>• Valued existing community, leisure, entertainment and cultural facilities</li> <li>• But wanted more of them</li> </ul>	<p><b>After priority survey</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish Theme 6 'A City with an Enriched Community Life'</li> <li>• Policy C1 to provide new facilities for arts and culture.</li> <li>• Policies C2 and C3 to provide new and protect existing community facilities.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Research for evidence base</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only one GP practice in the Parish</li> <li>• Predicted growth in student numbers</li> <li>• 33% of the permanent residents are retired, and 11% are aged 75 or over.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy C4 to provide for health care and social care facilities.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Targeted study of art and culture 2017)</b> Lot of support for what we have, but:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for community art spaces for all residents, tourists and students</li> <li>• Need for exhibition spaces</li> <li>• Need for a central information 'hub' and better signage</li> <li>• Need for a City or County Museum / better interpretation of history of the City</li> <li>• Protection of historic buildings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy C2 to provide new community facilities</li> <li>• Policy C1 to provide new facilities for arts</li> <li>• Policy C2 to provide new community facilities</li> <li>• Policy C1 to provide new facilities for arts and culture.</li> <li>• Policy C3 to protect an existing community facility</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pre-submission consultation 2017</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy C1 did not provide criteria against which the acceptability of a proposal could be assessed.</li> <li>• There is no policy relating to the provision of new cultural facilities.</li> <li>• Policy relating solely to an Information Hub duplicated the following policy.</li> <li>• Policy C3 (now C2) should not include examples of uses as this causes uncertainty</li> <li>• Provision should be made for loading/unloading equipment and for servicing</li> <li>• Policies should not duplicate the NPPF</li> <li>• Policy C5 duplicates policies in the Green Infrastructure theme.</li> </ul>	<p><b>After 2017 pre-submission consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy C1 rewritten to provide criteria</li> <li>• Policy C1 rewritten to provide criteria</li> <li>• Policy C1 rewritten to apply generally to facilities for arts and culture</li> <li>• Policy deleted and relevant parts incorporated in what is now Policy C2</li> <li>• List of possible uses moved to supporting text, and emphasised that this is not exhaustive.</li> <li>• Provision added to policies</li> <li>• Offending clauses removed</li> <li>• Policy C5 deleted and relevant content moved to Green Infrastructure</li> <li>• An extra criterion added for parking provision.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health care facilities need nearby parking for their users</li> <li>• Various minor improvements suggested</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements incorporated</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pre-submission consultation 2019</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If there is no demand for a facility then a suitable alternative should not be sought</li> <li>• It is not possible to insist that the facility is open to all.</li> <li>• The requirement to provide space for passengers to be set down and picked up is contradictory given the policies encouraging non-car travel.</li> <li>• It is not clear how to demonstrate a community need or harm to the viability of an existing facility.</li> <li>• The policies only really apply to new build and not to alterations and conversions to existing buildings.</li> <li>• Clarity is needed as to how to assess alternative provision for a facility it is proposed to close.</li> <li>• Care homes should not be sited near incompatible uses</li> <li>• Care homes should have parking provision</li> </ul>	<p><b>After 2019 pre-submission consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Absolute requirement removed from Policy C3. But the availability of alternative facilities when there is some demand is now a material factor</li> <li>• Requirement removed from Policy C1 – other clauses address specific accessibility</li> <li>• Remove the phrase <i>to set down / pick up passengers</i> from the text of the Policy C1. This is now addressed in the supporting text.</li> <li>• Clauses added to policies C1 and C2 to address need/harm issues. Guidance now offered in the supporting text. The suitability will depend on the activity and the proximity</li> <li>• Text of Policy C4 amended to avoid sites where existing non-residential uses may be to the detriment of the residents.</li> <li>• Policy C4 amended.</li> </ul>

## 6. Co-operation with major stakeholders

6.1 Durham County Council (DCC) is the local planning authority and as such has a duty to provide advice or assistance to a neighbourhood planning forum as required by paragraph 3 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The Forum has worked closely with DCC in the preparation of the plan. DCC's liaison officer is included in mailings to members of the Forum and the subsequent Parish Council Working Party. The liaison officer has attended several meetings, accompanied as appropriate by other officers with specialist knowledge of areas such as conservation, landscape and transport as the policies on each theme were developed. DCC officers provided health checks and joined Forum members in topic workshops and SA discussions. DCC also provided very detailed responses to both the Regulation 14 consultations

6.2 Durham University does not have such a statutory role, but it is the biggest institution in Our Neighbourhood. In the early stages of the development of the plan it was not easy to persuade them to engage with the Forum. However, from just before the time of the first Regulation 14 consultation the University took a more active part in our consultations. It provided two venues for consultation events so that staff and students might be involved. It also provided a very detailed response to the Regulation 14 consultation and this was followed up by a constructive meeting. The University has around 18,000 students living in Our Neighbourhood and they actually constitute over 70% of the population covered by the Plan. It has not been easy to engage students in our consultations, mainly because

they are a transient and temporary population, but they have been included in all our efforts to contact local people through leaflets, emails to every student, and consultation events.

6.3 In addition to the University we have tried to engage the other education providers in Our Neighbourhood. We have contacted all the primary and secondary schools, state and private, and worked closely with some of them to obtain the children's views (See paragraph 4.30 above and Appendix C). We also interviewed senior staff at the Houghall Campus of East Durham College, a specialist agricultural college, and the Principal of New College Durham. This is actually located just outside Our Neighbourhood but it is a very large provider of vocational education of great significance for the plan area.

6.4 Another major stakeholder is the Business Improvement District (BID). Its Director of Business Engagement was a member of the Forum and was closely involved as co-convenor of the Economy theme in the early stages of its development.

6.5 The Forum made strenuous efforts to engage with housing developers through DCC's list of contacts. The list of contacts can be found at Appendix D.

6.6 The Forum also maintained regular contacts through its members in the local residents' associations who were encouraged to provide feedback on the drafts of the Plan. A list of residents' associations can be found at Appendix E.

6.7 Forum members were also active in the Durham City Area Action Partnership, the Durham University Residents' Forum and the City of Durham Trust. They were provided with regular presentations and updates on the progress of the plan and they gave feedback to Forum members.

6.8 All the neighbouring parish councils were also alerted to the consultations. A list is included at Appendix F.

6.9 The list of all the statutory and other official bodies involved in the consultations is given at Appendix G.

## 7. Key stages in the process

Date	What we did	Who was involved
April/May 2011	Discussions among local residents groups about setting up a Neighbourhood Planning Forum	Crossgate Community Partnership; St Nicholas Community Forum
24 June 2011	Meeting called by the local MP to discuss reconstituting the Balanced and Sustainable Communities Forum as a Neighbourhood Planning Forum	MP, public
15 November 2011	Localism Act becomes law	
8 May 2012	Public meeting about the new law in the Town Hall	Planning Officer, Durham County Council, public

City of Durham Parish Council. Neighbourhood Plan. Consultation Statement

26 October 2012	The Balanced and Sustainable Communities Forum confirmed that it will be submitting an application to Durham County Council to become a Neighbourhood Planning Forum	Members of the Forum
26 October 2012	An appeal from the MP's office for 21 people to sign up to become Neighbourhood Planning Forum members	MP
9 April 2013	First Forum meeting. Called by the local MP. Note: Forum meetings continued: Minutes are available on the Forum's website at: <a href="http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/resources/minutes-forum/">http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/resources/minutes-forum/</a>	People interested in being Forum members (28 people had expressed an interest)
23 May 2013	Forum Meeting: Officers appointed	Muriel Sawbridge, Chair Roger Cornwell, Vice-Chair Teresa Hogg, Treasurer Ann Evans, Secretary
10 July 2013	Application to Council to become a Neighbourhood Planning Forum, in the absence of a town or parish council for the historic centre of Durham City	Members of the Forum
16 January 2014	Council granted approval for the Forum	
30 January 2014	AGM/Public meeting held by Forum	Forum members, public
February 2014	Engagement team was set up to publicise the work of the Forum and produce the Engagement Plan. Team worked on outside formal Forum meetings.	Muriel Sawbridge (Chair), Roger Cornwell (Vice Chair), Jonathan Elmer (Engagement Officer)
February / March 2014	Forum website set up: <a href="http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk">http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk</a> NPF public email contact set up: <a href="mailto:npf@durhamcity.org.uk">npf@durhamcity.org.uk</a> . Regular postings of news items as well as information about the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Comments are received from members of the public	
22 March 2014	Muriel Sawbridge, Forum Chair, spoke at The City of Durham Trust meeting	The City of Durham Trust members, public

1 April 2014	Engagement Team held a meeting with members of the Sedgefield Plan Steering Group	Engagement Team, members of the Sedgefield Plan Steering Group
25 April 2014	Forum Meeting. Forum agreed to set up Topic Groups to collect data about Durham City and to scope the topics. Note: Work carried on by the Topic Groups outside official Forum meetings	Forum members volunteered to be involved with the various Topic Groups which were: Communities and environment (Roger Cornwell); Housing (Mike Costello); Infrastructure (tbc); Economy (Colin Wilkes); Conservation and heritage (Kirsty Thomas)
25 April 2014	Sue Childs appointed as Treasurer	Sue Childs
June 2014	Forum Bank Account set up	Sue Childs
July 2014	Mailing list set up: private one for Forum members only to conduct business	
July 2014	Contact started with County Council support officer.	
31 July 2014 (pre-hearing meeting).	County Durham Local Plan Examination in Public	Forum member represented the Forum
1-31 October 2014	Examination in Public	
15 September 2014	Muriel Sawbridge, the Chair, resigned for personal reasons	
4 October 2014	Grant received. Ref: NPG-00629	
6 October 2014	Training session run by Planning Advice Plus	Forum members
November 2014	Survey placed on Web	
7 November 2014	Forum agreed that Roberta Blackman-Woods would take over the position of Chair	
January 2015	Property database put up on Forum website	
14 February 2015	Forum staffed a stall in Durham Market Place 10am to 4pm	Forum members, volunteers, public
26 / 27 April 2015	Draft Communications and Engagement Action Plan plus overview of the current stage of the Plan	

27 April 2015	First meeting of Working Group Note: Working Group meetings continued on a monthly basis (later weekly): Minutes are available on the Forum's website at: <a href="http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/resources/working-group-minutes/">http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/resources/working-group-minutes/</a>	Forum members and other volunteers to carry out practical activities to progress the Plan.
April/May/June 2015	Planning for the Priority public consultation	Forum Working Group
June/July 2015	Public consultation - Priority survey via questionnaire (delivered as a leaflet to every house in the Forum area) and also made available as an online questionnaire. 162 responses	Forum members, volunteers, public
14 June 2015	Forum stall at Eco Festival	Forum members, public
13th June and 20th June 2015, 11am to 1pm	Stalls in Durham Market Place	Forum members, public
15 June 2015	Data Protection Registration: this has been renewed on an annual basis	
29 June 2015, 7.00 to 9.00 pm	Public consultation – priority survey. Open meeting in Town Hall. 100 people attended; more had to be turned away.	Forum members, volunteers, public
8 July 2015, 7.00 to 9.00pm	Public consultation - priority survey. Additional open meeting in Town Hall. 12 people attended	Forum members, volunteers, public
9 July 2015	Forum Facebook page set up	
July to September 2015	Survey responses analysed	Working Group members
11 August 2015	Working Group email list set up	
17 August 2015	Public email list set up	All people who expressed interest in receiving further information during the public consultation
7 October 2015	As agreed at a Forum meeting, Roger Cornwell became Chair; John Lowe became Vice Chair; Pippa Bell became Engagement Officer; Sue Childs remained as Treasurer	
16 October 2015	Meeting with members of the Morpeth Neighbourhood Plan	Forum members, members of the Morpeth Neighbourhood Plan

29 October 2015	Attended County Durham Neighbourhood Working Group meeting	Engagement Officer
30 October 2015	Forum responded to Council's consultations on planning issues; start of an on-going activity of responding to relevant local and national Consultations	Working Group on behalf of the Forum
October / November 2015	Developed the Plan's Vision, objectives and themes. Topic Groups morphed into Theme groups. Theme groups carried on work outside meetings, including contacting, and meeting with, relevant stakeholders and residents	Working Group using the results of the public consultation. Theme Groups: Theme 1: A City with a sustainable future (John Lowe and David Miller); Theme 2: A beautiful and historic City, (a) Heritage (Kirsty Thomas), (b) Green Infrastructure (Sue Childs and Angela Tracy); Theme 3: A City with a diverse and resilient economy (Pippa Bell and Adam Deathe); Theme 4: A City with attractive and affordable places to live (John Ashby and Sue Childs); Theme 5: A City with a modern and sustainable transport infrastructure (Matthew Phillips and Karen Elliott); Theme 6: A City with an enriched community life (Roger Cornwell)
October 2015 to March 2016	Survey of the views of children and young people carried out. Four schools covered; 70 children and young people took part	Pippa Bell, children and young people
9 November 2015	Council email to PSHBF members on behalf of Forum	
November 2015	More activity on Forum's Facebook page	MP's intern on a voluntary basis
November 2015	Developers' mailing list set up	
16 November 2015	Ros Ward, an experienced planner, volunteered to be the Forum's Project Manager	
January 2016	University sent email to all students linking them to the students online priority survey	University students

January 2016. Ongoing	Theme Groups started to draft policies based on results of public consultation and continuing feedback from relevant stakeholders and residents	Theme Group members.
20 January 2016	Vision and Themes launched	Working Group
22 January 2016	Forum Twitter account set up	
11 February 2016	Email sent to residents' groups asking them to identify significant heritage assets, green assets, open spaces, community facilities, and sites for new development.	Crossgate Community Forum; Elvet Residents' Association; Nevilles Cross Community Association; St Nicholas Community Forum; Sheraton Park Residents' Association; Sidegate Residents' Association; Whinney Hill Community Group; Merryoaks Residents' Association
18 February 2016	Meeting with the new VC of Durham University	Roger Cornwell, Chair, and VC
March 2016	Business questionnaire survey carried out. 13 responses	Pippa Bell and business owners
18 March 2016	Forum AGM	Forum members, public Election of officers: Chair: Roger Cornwell Vice Chair and Secretary: John Lowe Treasurer: Sue Childs Engagement Officer: Pippa Bell. Appointment of Theme Convenors: A beautiful and historic city: Kirsty Thomas and Angela Tracy. A city with a diverse and resilient economy: Pippa Bell. A city with attractive and affordable places to live: Sue Childs and John Ashby. A city with modern infrastructure: Karen Elliot and Matthew Phillips. A city with enriched community life: Roger Cornwell. A city adapted to climate change: John Lowe and David Miller
12 April 2016	Meeting with officers of Durham County Council	Forum working Group, DCC officers

City of Durham Parish Council. Neighbourhood Plan. Consultation Statement

12 May 2016	Attended a County Durham Plan Business breakfast meeting at Rivergreen	Pippa Bell, Engagement Officer, Roger Cornwell, Chair, and Peter Jackson, Forum member
24 May 2016	Workshop to critique the draft policies	Working Group
19 June, 11am to 5pm	Attended Eco Festival. Carried out pedestrian and cyclists survey	Forum working Group members, public
7 July 2016	Attended County Durham Neighbourhood Working Group meeting, to study the relationship between neighbourhood plans and the County Plan	John Lowe Vice- Chair and Ann Evans, Forum member
August 2016	Arts and culture questionnaire survey carried out. 28 responses	Angela Tracy and artists
4 October 2016	Working Group Meeting attended by Durham County Council officers	Working Group members and Durham County Council officers
13 October 2016	Grant received, for pre-submission consultation. Ref: NPG-02594	
18 October 2016	Technical support offer received for assessment of housing sites. Ref: DR-00957	
20 October 2016	Forum Meeting to agree wording of Policies.	Forum members
October, November, December	Production of list of policies to accompany SEA screening report; production of screening report; production of draft plan Document	Working Group
November 2016	Durham University Estates Manager, joins the Forum and the Working Group	Durham University Estates Manager
1 December 2016	Attended County Durham Neighbourhood Working Group meeting to look at independent examination procedures and policies on housing for older people	Pippa Bell, Engagement Officer, and Sue Childs, Treasurer
6 December 2016	Agreed to hold the pre-submission consultation from Friday 17 February to Friday 31 March 2017	Forum Working Group
14 December 2016	Meeting with DCC to discuss the SEA screening report and DCC's health check on our draft policies	DCC officers and Working Group members

22 December 2016	Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Screening Report sent to statutory consultees: Environment Agency, Historic England, Natural England	
January/February 2017	Planning for pre-submission consultation	Working Group
January/February	Finalising draft plan document and putting it up on the Website	Working Group
16 January 2017	Received DCC health check on the draft plan; ongoing - revised draft plan in the light of these comments	Working Group
19 January 2017	Historic England's feedback on the draft plan; revised draft plan in the light of these comments	Working Group
19 January 2017	Participated in Durham AAP's Tripartite Meeting on the future of Durham City, with Durham University and Durham County Council	Roger Cornwell, Chair, and Sue Childs, Treasurer. Members of Durham AAP, University and DCC representatives, public.
30 January 2017	Confirmation from DCC that we will not be provided with the most recent SHLAA and OSNA	
31 January 2017	Meeting with DCC officers about transport policies.	DCC officers and R Cornwell and M Phillips (Forum)
2 February 2017	News that Historic England felt that an SEA was required (letter dated 26 January 2017). Environment Agency felt that with agreed changes an SEA was not required (EA email 6 February 2017).	
14 February 2017	Meeting with DCC to discuss the SEA situation. The Forum agreed to undertake an SEA	DCC officers and Working group members
17 February 2017	Forum AGM	Forum members, public Election of officers: Chair – Roger Cornwell Vice Chair – John Ashby Treasurer – Sue Childs Secretary – John Lowe Engagement Officer – Pippa Bell
22 February 2017	Unspent grant returned	Sue Childs

February, March, April, June 2017	Drafting of the SA Scoping report; drawing up and piloting the sustainability criteria	Working Group
10 March 2017	Grant received, for pre-submission consultation. Ref: NPG-02963. We had to apply again for the money for the pre-submission consultation as this would now occur in the next financial year.	
31 March 2017	Meeting with Historic England. Discussed the SEA/SA requirement and how best to proceed	Historic England and DCC officers, Working Group members
April 2017	Preparation of draft structure for Scoping Report	Working Group, Historic England and DCC officers
May 2017	Preparation of draft Scoping Report	Working Group
11 June 2017	Formal consultations on draft Scoping Report with Statutory Bodies	Historic England, Nature Conservancy, Natural England and DCC
July 2017	Responses from Statutory Bodies and DCC lead to revised Scoping Report	Working Group
August - October	Preparation of Draft SA/SEA report	Working Group
October 2017	Practical preparations for Regulation 14 consultation: Summary leaflet and questionnaire prepared; All homes and businesses informed of the consultation; Durham University and the Student Union used email systems to inform staff and students; hard copies at County Hall and Clayport Library.	Forum members
3 November 2017	Forum launches consultation.	Forum
4 November – 18 December 2017. Events: 4 Nov – Town Hall AAP event 6 Nov – St John's 14 Nov – Ustinov College 21 Nov – St Oswald's 24 Nov – St Nicholas' 6 Dec – Wharton Park	Regulation 14 Consultation	Working Group and public

City of Durham Parish Council. Neighbourhood Plan. Consultation Statement

14 December 2017	Meeting to discuss DCC's responses	DCC officers and Working Group members
19 January 2018	Forum meeting decides to convene weekly meetings to ensure oversight of Working Group following DCC criticism.	Forum members
8 March 2018	Sustainability Appraisal workshop	DCC officers, University representative and Working Group members
9 March 2018	Workshop on housing policies	DCC, DU and working group representatives
21 March 2018	Forum AGM	Forum members and public
27 March 2018	Meeting to discuss DU's responses to consultation draft plan.	University representatives and Working Group members
19 April 2018	Forum meeting	Forum members and public
3 May 2018	City of Durham Parish Council elected	Members of Parish Council
17 May 2018	Forum meeting	Forum members and public
26 June 2019	Site visit of potential housing sites	AECOM, site owners, and Working Group members
27 June 2019	Site visit of potential University PBSA sites	AECOM, University representative and Working Group members
2 July 2018	Meeting with DCC about DU's proposed student accommodation sites	DCC officer and Working Group members
24 July 2018	Forum meeting	Forum members and public
25 October 2018	Parish Council ratified work of the Forum and constituted the working group as the Neighbourhood Plan Working Party (NPWP) reporting to the Parish Council's Planning Committee.	Parish Council and NPWP
2 November 2018	Meeting with DCC agreed need for additional Regulation 14 consultation after Parish Council has assumed responsibility for the Plan.	DCC officers and Working Party members
November 2018	AECOM consultants start <i>Sustainability Appraisal</i> of the draft Neighbourhood Plan	AECOM

City of Durham Parish Council. Neighbourhood Plan. Consultation Statement

22 November 2018	Parish Council asks DCC to align Neighbourhood Plan boundaries with Parish boundaries.	Parish Council
13 December 2018 – 31 January 2019	DCC holds consultation on boundaries	DCC, public
22 February 2019	DCC agrees to amend the boundaries	DCC
May 2019	Second Regulation 14 Consultation publicised in press and via DU's internal system to all staff and students. Summary document and questionnaire updated. Hard copies at County Hall, Durham Town Hall and Clayport Library.	Working Party, DU
18 May 2019	Leaflets and summary document delivered to all properties in Gilesgate area that had been added to the NP area	Working Party members
17 May – 5 July 2019 Events: 22 May – St John's 3 June – St Giles 22 June – St Nicholas	Second Regulation 14 Consultation	Working Party and public
25 June 2019	Presentation about the NP to Neville's Cross Community Association	Working Party members
1 July 2019	Site visit of Observatory Hill Local Green Space	Representatives from the Cathedral and the University, Working Party members
July – August 2019	Categorisation of consultation responses and revision of NP	Working Party
27 August 2019	Working Party meets for first consideration of the Plan text	Working Party
2 September 2019	AECOM sends revised version of <i>Sustainability Appraisal</i>	AECOM
3 September 2019	Working Party considers this draft <i>Consultation Statement</i>	Working Party and DCC officer
10 September 2019	Working Party gives further consideration to the Plan text	Working Party and DCC officer
11 September	Meeting with Durham School re Observatory Hill Local Green Space	Representatives of Durham School, Parish Councilors, Parish Clerk
17 September 2019	Working Party considers <i>Basic Conditions Statement</i> and clears up loose ends	Working Party and DCC officer
27 September 2019	All documents submitted to Parish Clerk	Working Party members
4 October 2019	Documents considered by Parish Planning Committee	Parish Planning Committee

24 October 2019	Documents considered by full Parish Council	Parish Councillors
-----------------	---	--------------------

## 8. Appendices showing engagement activities:

### Appendix A: Communications and Engagement Action Plan (April 2015)

#### Overview

Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum has convened for the purpose of:

- a) Producing a Neighbourhood Plan based on the aspirations and priorities of Durham's residents and those with a direct interest Durham's communities, environment and economy
- b) To ensure that future planning decision making reflects the interests of Durham's communities and stake holders

The powers to produce a Neighbourhood Plan were introduced in the Localism Act 2011. The adopted Plan will consist of a set of policies and spatial allocations that present local community / stakeholder priorities for the type of development and its location.

#### Aims and Objectives

The aims of the Communications and Engagement Action Plan are:

- Openness and inclusivity
- Involvement of the community, by:
  - Keeping them fully informed about the content of the Neighbourhood Plan
  - Enabling them to make their views known throughout the process
  - Giving them opportunities to be actively involved in the shaping of the Neighbourhood Plan
  - Recording and publishing how their views have informed the draft Neighbourhood Plan

It will comprise the following stages:

1. **Early Engagement** – to find out the community's key issues for the Neighbourhood Plan to address. This will inform the selection of the Plan's policies, and will enable development of an overall 'vision'.
2. **Pre-Submission Publicity & Consultation** – to obtain feedback on the draft Neighbourhood Plan from the community and from any relevant consultation body.
3. **Submission of the Neighbourhood Plan to the local planning authority** – to check that it complies with all relevant legislation.
4. **Independent Examination** – to test whether or not the Neighbourhood Plan meets the requirements set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
5. **Referendum**

#### Statutory Outputs of Consultation

The NPPF makes a requirement for two statutory outputs from the consultation which include:

### **Basic Conditions Statement**

The Basic Conditions Statement includes a requirement for compatibility with EU obligations, including human rights requirements.

### **Consultation Statement**

In this regulation “consultation statement” means a document which contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan; explains how they were consulted; summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

### **Methods of Communication and Engagement**

These will include, as appropriate:

#### **1. Early Engagement Stage**

- Website and comments via the Website
- Email and postal address for comments
- Priorities questionnaire via online survey or downloaded leaflet
- Membership of the Forum by key stakeholders, e.g. representatives of resident groups, BID, University, Students’ Union, etc. These representatives will act as conduits of information and comments/suggestions/feedback.
- Press releases and letters to the media
- Public meetings
- Analysis of consultation responses and EiP submissions about the Durham County Local Plan relating to the NPF area
- Encouraging individuals and groups to use Place check (<http://www.placecheck.info/> ) to identify planning issues in their area
- Twitter account

#### **2. Pre-Submission Publicity & Consultation Stage**

The Forum is required to: “publicise, in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area

- i. details of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan;
- ii. details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan may be inspected;
- iii. details of how to make representations; and
- iv. the date by which those representations must be received, being not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the draft proposal is first publicised

Methods to publicise the Neighbourhood Plan would include:

- Full details provided on the Website
- Full version available for consultation at Redhills
- Full version (summary version?) posted to every household in the NPF area
- Full version (summary version?) posted to the relevant consultation bodies affected by the draft Neighbourhood Plan as set out in Schedule 1 to the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)

- Press release and news stories
- Posters

Methods to obtain representations would include:

- Questionnaire
  - available online
  - paper copy posted to every household in the NPF area
  - paper copy posted to the relevant consultation bodies affected by the draft Neighbourhood Plan as set out in Schedule 1 to the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)
- Representations received via Website comments, email, letter

### **Suggestions of Groups / Individuals to Include**

- local elected councillors and political parties
- local residents
- local shopkeepers, businesses, major employers and business organisations, including chambers of trade or commerce
- community groups such as residents' associations, local civic or amenity societies, local history groups or sports clubs
- landowners of key sites or organisations with significant property holdings and developers with site options
- local trusts and project groups, such as community development trusts, land trusts or building preservation trusts
- educational establishments such as schools, colleges and universities
- local institutions (e.g. arts centres, performance venues, architecture or built environment centres)
- health and social care organisations
- hard to reach groups including young and elderly, single parents, lesbian and gay, ethnic groups, disabled groups, low income, disadvantaged groups. These may be represented by not-for-profit organisations representing minority groups (e.g. elderly, disabled, young people, low-income, lesbian and gay groups, faith groups and ethnic groups)
- community facilitators or activists

### **Consultation Bodies, as itemised in the legislation**

(not all will be relevant to the NPF area)

- (a) where the local planning authority is a London borough council, the Mayor of London;
- (b) a local planning authority, county council or parish council any part of whose area is in or adjoins the area of the local planning authority;
- (c) the Coal Authority;
- (d) the Homes and Communities Agency;
- (e) Natural England;
- (f) the Environment Agency;
- (g) the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as English Heritage);
- (h) Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (company number 2904587);
- (i) the Highways Agency;
- (j) the Marine Management Organisation;

- (k) any person—
    - (i) to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106(3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003; and
    - (ii) who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority;
  - (l) where it exercises functions in any part of the neighbourhood area—
    - (i) a Primary Care Trust established under section 18 of the National Health Service Act 2006 or continued in existence by virtue of that section;
    - (ii) a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) and (c) of the Electricity Act 1989;
    - (iii) a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986;
    - (iv) a sewerage undertaker; and
    - (v) a water undertaker;
    - (m) voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit all or any part of the neighbourhood area;
  - (n) bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the neighbourhood area;
  - (o) bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the neighbourhood area;
  - (p) bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the neighbourhood area; and
  - (q) bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the neighbourhood area.
- [and]
- (iii) any person who, on the date 21 days before the order proposal is submitted under regulation 22, the qualifying body considers to be—
    - (aa) an owner of any of the land which is proposed to be developed under the order proposal; and
    - (bb) a tenant of any of that land

Note:

Information source: Neighbourhood Planning Guidance  
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2>

## **Appendix B: Community groups and stakeholders**

(email contact, if meeting(s) held this is indicated)

City of Durham Trust (meeting)  
Crook Hall (meeting)  
Durham Bird Club  
Durham Business Improvement District (BID) (meeting)  
Durham Cathedral (Dean and Chapter) (meeting)  
Durham City Access for All (meeting)  
Durham City Area Action Partnership (meeting)  
Durham City Cricket Club  
Durham City Velo  
Durham City West Labour Party Branch (meeting)  
Durham Churches Together (meeting)  
Durham County Constabulary  
Durham Markets Company (meeting)  
Durham Miners' Association  
Durham University (Estates Dept.) (meeting)

Durham University Bicycle User Group  
Elvet Striders  
Extinction Rebellion  
Friends of Flass Vale (meeting)  
Local Access Forum (meeting)  
Local Historian (meeting)  
Professor (Visual Culture) and then Chair of Museums Sub Committee, Durham  
University (meeting)  
St. Cuthbert's Cof E  
St. Nicholas  
St. John's  
St. Margaret's  
St. Oswald's  
The Head of Culture, Durham University (meeting)  
Transition Durham (meeting)  
World Heritage Site Co-ordinator (meeting)

### **Appendix C: Schools and colleges**

(email contact, if meeting(s) held this is indicated)

#### **Primary**

Bow School  
The Chorister School  
Neville's Cross  
St Margaret's  
St Oswald's

#### **Secondary**

Durham High School for Girls  
Durham Johnston  
Durham Sixth Form Centre  
Durham School (meeting)  
St Leonard's

#### **Colleges**

East Durham College Houghall Campus (meeting)  
New College Durham (meeting)

### **Appendix D: Building developers and land / property owners**

(email contact, if meeting(s) held this is indicated)

Aldersons  
Banks Group (meeting)  
Barratt Homes North East/David Wilson Homes North East  
Bellway North East Divisional Office  
Carillion (Maple Oak) Ltd  
Cathedral (meeting)  
Cedar (Maple Oak) Ltd  
Charles Church Homes  
D & J Franks  
Dunelm Homes

DPP for Carillion  
Durham Aged Miners' Housing Association  
Durham City Homes  
Durham County Council Assets  
Durham Diocesan Board of Finance via Savills incorporating Smiths Gore  
Durham School (meeting)  
Durham University (meeting)  
Four Housing  
Gentoo Group  
Gladman Developments  
Home Group  
Husband and Brown Limited (meeting)  
Keepmoat Regeneration Northern  
Kingswood Properties (North East) Limited (re 24 The Avenue)  
Livin Housing Ltd  
Lovell Partnerships  
Lovegreen Developments (meeting)  
McCarthy & Stone (meeting)  
Mr Bijan Samadi (re site adj Sainsbury's)  
Mr C J Alderson (re site at Diamond Terrace)  
Mr David Eddleston (re site at Main Street USA)  
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners  
Northern Electric Distribution Ltd  
Paul Tharper  
Persimmon Homes  
PJ Livesey  
Projects for Life Ltd (Glasgow) (re site at former Shell garage)  
Ravensworth Property Developments LLP  
Savills, Smith and Gore  
Signet Planning  
Taylor Wimpey  
Theakston Land (meeting)  
Woodland Trust

### **Appendix E: Residents' associations**

(email contact, if meeting(s) held this is indicated)

Crossgate Community Partnership (meeting)  
Elvet Residents' Association (meeting)  
Neville's Cross Community Association (meeting)  
Whinney Hill Residents' Association  
Sidegate Residents' Association (meeting)  
Sheraton Park Residents' Association  
St Nicholas' Community Federation (meeting)  
Quarry House Lane Environmental Association (meeting)

### **Appendix F: Neighbouring Parish Councils**

(email contact)

Bearpark  
Belmont

Brandon and Byshottles  
Croxdale and Hett  
Framwellgate Moor  
Sherburn  
Shincliffe  
Witton Gilbert

### **Appendix G: Statutory and other official bodies**

(email contact, if meeting(s) held this is indicated)

Campaign to Protect Rural England (meeting)  
CBI (North East)  
Chamber of Trade (meeting)  
The Coal Authority  
County Councillors in all the wards within Our Neighbourhood  
County Durham Local Access Forum  
Durham County Council (meeting)  
The Environment Agency  
Federation of Small Businesses (North East)  
Historic England (meeting)  
Homes England  
The National Grid  
Natural England  
Network Rail Infrastructure  
NHS Primary Care Trust  
North Durham Clinical Commissioning Group  
Northumbrian Water  
Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys NHS Trust  
TUC (North East)

### **Appendix H: Website containing key consultation documents referenced in this Statement**

Minutes of all Forum and working group meetings:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/resources/minutes-forum/> and

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/resources/working-party-minutes/>

Initial Priority Survey:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/PrioritySurveyResults.pdf>

Young People's Views:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/NPF-Young-Peoples-consultation-report-2016-PDF.pdf>

Views of businesses:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/EconomicSurveyResponses.pdf>

Pedestrian's Views:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/PedestrianConsultation.pdf>

Arts and Culture Views:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/ArtSurveysResponses.pdf>

Analysis of 2017 Regulation 14 Consultation:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/your-views/2017consultation/2017-response-analysis/>

Numeric Analysis 2017 Regulation 14 Consultation Responses:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Numeric-Analysis.pdf>

Collated Responses to 2017 Regulation 14 Consultation:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Collated-Comments.pdf>

Letters Received during the 2017 Regulation 14 Consultation:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/your-views/2017consultation/2017-letters/>

Analysis of 2019 Regulation 14 Consultation:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/your-views/2019-consultation/2019-response-analysis/>

Numeric Analysis 2019 Regulation 14 Consultation Responses:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Numeric-Analysis-2019-Consultation.pdf>

Collated Responses to 2019 Regulation 14 Consultation:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/2019-Consultation-All-Comments.pdf>

Letters Received during the 2019 Regulation 14 Consultation:

<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/your-views/2019-consultation/2019-letters/>