

GENERAL MEETING - Bowburn & Parkhill Community Partnership - Charity Number 1112151
Tuesday 21 October 2014 6.30pm to 7.30pm

Present: W Bates, R Cowen, J Geyer, K Haigh, G Kitson, D Paget, M Ridley, F Salisbury,
1.Apologies: PC Cockburn, J Blackburn, J Blakey, B Little, M Plews, S Raine, M Syer

In the absence of the Secretary (whose journey back from holiday had been affected by Hurricane Gonzalo) the Chair asked if those present wished to adjourn the meeting entirely until the November meeting, proceed as usual or have an outline of the Planning Committee meeting in the afternoon and the up to date position regarding the Examination in Public. Members wished to proceed on the third option

Planning Applications

The Chair therefore outlined that the Planning Committee had determined the following applications as follows

a) Housing South of Oakfield Road (the “Daisy Field”)

The recommendation for this application was to approve. Two residents, M Syer and C Reed, had addressed the committee, MS on behalf of the Parish Council to express the issues the Parish considered would arise for the school if the application were approved and CR to address concern that separation distances from existing houses was still not fully resolved. Members however voted by 5 to 4 to approve the application

b) Housing South of Crow Trees Lane

The recommendation for this application was to approve. The report considered the highway issues regarding parking for the Infants' School and suggested a condition be imposed to install “double kerbing”. This was explained to be kerbing that is twice the normal height which would discourage people from parking on the verge and prevent them from opening doors next to the kerb. The Chair addressed the meeting to express the concerns about parking on this road during drop off and pick up times at the school and that these had been expressed for some time. After some discussion, members agreed to conditions to ensure a Construction Management Plan was agreed before work commenced and also that they should agree highway safety issues (to include the double kerbing and also possibly double yellow lines). The application was approved

c) Housing to the rear of Wylam Terrace Parkhill

The recommendation for this application was again to approve and it was mentioned that there is still in force an extant planning permission. This application however was to amend the layout which it was considered would be an improvement. There would be a condition to prepare the access road to adoptable standards as far as the entrance into the development. NWL confirmed that the pumping station had been upgraded.

One resident addressed the committee to express concerns the new layout would have on his conservatory. While these were noted, the application was approved

Examination in Public

The chair outlined the following issues that had been discussed at the Examination in Public into the emerging Durham Plan

- a) He had raised the lack of a Policy to safeguard land for education purposes (especially in relation to the “Daisy Field”) on four separate occasions. While the Inspector may still

recommend something on a general basis, in view of the above decision this was now an academic argument so far as Bowburn is concerned

- b) An issue had arisen about linking Parkhill with Coxhoe as a “Settlement Cluster”. This had been requested by Hallam Developments in conjunction with their proposed development of land opposite St Mary’s Terrace and had been agreed by the council. The chair had questioned this when he became aware of the situation and an explanation had been sent to him and the Parish Council that this would have no impact for administrative purposes. Members however wondered why Hallam should want this change if it were for no purpose and requested that all our Councillors attend the November meeting to try to explain this issue

Action JB

- c) He had now been told that the Cape Site is being treated as part of Bowburn North.
- d) He had raised the issue of 470 houses being mentioned in draft Policy 4 but no sites allocated in draft Policy 30. As the Partnership had previously been assured that all proposed housing in Bowburn had either been permitted or was under construction or constructed and that these had been removed from the allocations, he argued that this figure in Policy 4 should be zero. The council agreed to clarify but had not received an answer yet

Action RC

- e) The proposed retail Policy stating Bowburn was a local centre had been amended to remove the words "and not perform a wider retail function or become a retail destination in its own right." In view of this, he had not raised this issue at the EiP.
- f) With regard to employment land, a representative had appeared to speak on behalf of the developers of Durham Green. He wanted the Plan to be amended to include part of the proposed TurSDale rail freight site which is owned by his clients. They proposed a prestige employment on this site for warehousing which, it was argued, could then kick start the TurSDale project. He also stated that, to “pump prime” their own project, they proposed at least 350 houses on the northern part of the estate. He produced a plan of the proposals which showed 2 roundabouts on the A688, one for access to the housing and the other for access to the commercial part of the estate. Both were south of the access to Durham Services.

At this, the Chair indicated that there was some common ground between these proposals and those suggested by the Partnership about using this site as an alternative to Aykley Heads although the Partnership would prefer prestige offices to sheds. The developer’s plan however did not appear to show the proposed Bowburn Relief Road which is included in Policy 50. He also commented that the Partnership has supported the proposal for re-opening the Leamside Line (which is also included in the Sunderland and Gateshead proposed Plans). The developers confirmed they were aware of the proposed relief road and this would be taken into account. It was reported that the Inspector was making a specific site inspection of Durham Green

In view of their continued concerns about the difficulties that may be experienced for the future Primary School now that the council has given planning permission for housing on the “Daisy Field” members also felt that our councillors should discuss what steps may now need to be taken at the November meeting

Action JB

- g) It was noted that the Plan now stated that land at TurSDale was “safeguarded” for a rail freight terminal rather than being “allocated” for this purpose. This is because of doubts as to whether there will be sufficient interest to develop it during the Plan period.
- h) The EiP will resume on 28 October and there are still some issues of interest to the Partnership. A report will be made to the November meeting

Action RC

2. Date and Time of Next Meeting: 6.30pm on 18 November 2014

Actionable items

From September meeting:

6Aii Highways/Environment and 6Biii: Make enquiries about the suitability of planters for Durham Road and Parkhill verges.

MW roundabout: Report concerns to the Highways Agency about the works at the MW roundabout.

6Bvi – Environment art work – Continue to liaise with Paul Armstrong of Esh.

From October meeting

Ask Councillors to attend to discuss above issues re Parkhill/Coxhoe cluster and the proposed Primary School

Seek clarification re 470 houses

Report on outstanding issues from EiP that affect the Partnership