

## **Barnard Castle Regeneration Framework Communication and Consultation Log**

### **Consultation Comments and Feedback**

#### **Bowes Museum**

**Date of meeting: 15 May 2012 at 2.00 at Bowes Museum**

**With Adrian Jenkins, Director and Richard Welsby, Finance Officer**

**Chris Myers/Sue Berresford**

#### **Ambition:**

- To increase visitors from 115,000 to 130,000 in next 2-3 years.
- To go from 60% self financing to 70% self financing (Beamish is 95% self financing)
- As well as increasing visitor numbers the Museum is looking at becoming a centre for research and study. Have links with Durham University Cultural and Visual Studies, NHS, Teesside University, plus London connections
- They are positive about the idea of a heritage corridor with Auckland Castle and Durham City/Cathedral
- New phase of works will look at former fire station as store/local history location
- Aim for park becoming sculpture park if grounds could be secured overnight
- Coach houses either side of the front gate could house 12 office spaces for rent
- Market garden area at the rear of the Museum could become a garden nursery area/greenhouse with artists involved and tapping into trend for growing produce

#### **Issues for DCC to follow up:**

- S106 funding as match funding for their park and buildings bids
- They struggle with Visit Durham brand, don't think it works for them
- Schedule ½ yearly meetings to catch up with them
- They would like to see brown signs on A1 combined with other attractions ie 'Barnard Castle, Raby Castle, Bowes Museum, High Force'

## **Barnard Castle Regeneration Framework Communication and Consultation Log**

### **Consultation Comments and Feedback**

#### **Barnard Castle Vision Regeneration Partnership**

**Date of meeting: 15 May 2012 at 4.00 at Woodleigh offices**

**With Michele Armstrong, Richard Betton, Will Weston, Paul Harrison,  
Anne Allen**

**Chris Myers/Sue Berresford**

#### **Comments:**

- Overall the document should bring out the co-ordinated approach to regeneration in Barnard Castle, of projects working together rather than as a list of individual projects
- Development land – parcels of land identified for development but land ownership can make it impossible to develop in reality
- Housing – quality of design for the town should be added. Broadband for each house should be ambition
- The Framework document should have an appraisal of risk, ie future lack of transport provision through spending cuts, potential lack of primary and secondary school numbers due to changes in demographics
- Carbon footprint is not covered, including fuel poverty, lack of public transport
- Town centre retail boundary restricts expansion of retail
- Shortage of b&bs, over supply of self-catering. Need equivalent of shop front scheme to address this
- Lack of business support due to re-structure of Enterprise Agency.
- Apprenticeships – there are new higher level apprenticeship schemes, degree equivalent. Possible to reference this within the document?
- Add The Hub as a regeneration project to reflect its importance in developing skills and young people generally, offering youth hostel type accommodation

- Education and training. There is a real risk that school age children will not support existing schools. This should be recognised in the study
- Community benefit of regeneration should be stated
- Under the evidence heading: should be something about tourism as walking, cycling and activity tourism, as being pursued by HoT
- Key projects list should include tourism
- All projects should say something about the future and future investment – looking ahead rather than staying the same – optimism!
- Shaw Bank – ambition for combining Sports Centre with Rugby Club and Hub activities such as canoeing, biking etc to create a ‘Sports Village’
- Heart of Teesdale to be seen as a regeneration project, not just nature project
- Hamsterley Forest should be referenced at end of document, recognising its importance to tourism in the area

**Issues for DCC to follow up:**

None.