

# CITY OF DURHAM TRUST

## BULLETIN

Number 90

Autumn 2020

Registered Office: c/o Blackett Hart & Pratt, LLP  
Aire House, Mandale Business Park, Durham. DH1 1TH

[www.durhamcity.org](http://www.durhamcity.org)

### TRUST OPERATIONS DURING THE PANDEMIC: FORTHCOMING ONLINE TALK ON KEPIER

Prospects are still very uncertain for a return to old normalities. However, the work of the Trust in responding to planning applications and consultations continues by email and through the usual monthly meeting of Trustees, now staged remotely through “Zoom”. We are also delighted to announce that **Martin Roberts** is generously venturing to give his annual talk by Zoom. Martin writes:

*The historic buildings and gardens at Kepier are some of the City’s great heritage treasures. Both have received renewed attention from architectural and garden historians and archaeologists in recent years and the talk will update Trust members on what has been discovered and how this informs how we should look at the site and its historical context.*

The illustrated talk will be given on **Thursday 10 December at 7.00 pm**. To request a link to Martin’s talk please email [francis.pritchard@durham.ac.uk](mailto:francis.pritchard@durham.ac.uk) . Please do this by the day before if possible.

### TRUST AGM

As required by the Charity Commission, the 2020 Annual General Meeting took place on 30 September, but online and through the technical expertise of Francis Pritchard, who had generously offered his help. Normally, the AGM minutes appear shortly before the next such meeting, a year later, in order to be approved. However, it clearly makes sense to make them available at once, so they are being first printed in this expanded bulletin. The Trustees’ meeting of 20 October approved the minutes, and re-elected **John Lowe as Chair** and **Roger Cornwell as Vice Chair**.



*Kepier Gorge, now safe from roadbuilding*

The AGM opened with a brief talk giving a critical overview of proposed changes to English planning laws from our new patron, former MP **Dr Roberta Blackman-Woods**, a recognised planning expert. The main administrative business of the AGM was an endorsement of the proposal to change the Trust’s status to that of a Charitable Incorporated Organisation. (More on both these items below). Finally, we can announce that the vital post of Hon. Secretary has been filled, after a gap of more than a year. **Dr Lucy Szablewska**, the membership secretary, was unanimously elected to an expanded role, though some of the broad range of tasks Douglas Pocock performed will remain distributed among other Trustees.

## THE FINAL COUNTY PLAN

Monday 21 September saw the publication of the final report from **Mr William Fieldhouse** as Inspector of the County Durham Plan, after a period of consultation on proposed main modifications. The Plan lays out the development of the County till 2035. Trustees welcome the clarity that a definite plan brings at last to the future of the County. The Council formally adopted the new plan at its meeting of 21 October and it should be visible on the Council website.

Mr Fieldhouse's report effectively draws a line under more than a decade of hard work from officers in the unitary council, as well as from numerous interested bodies, including the Trust. Overall, the Plan is an exercise in "sustainable development" in the sense allowed within the National Planning Policy Framework, i.e. a scheme of managed growth and expansion, if only edging toward something many environmentalists or climate change activists would find "sustainable" in a more absolute, ecological sense. The pandemic hit late in the Plan's examination process and the Inspector writes that it is still too early to predict its social, economic and environmental effects.

**Relief Roads.** Members will already know of the Inspector's earlier rejection of the proposed two relief roads. His final report takes especial pains to highlight the "substantial long-term harm" the roads would have caused to Durham's environment and heritage, while having negligible impact on what traffic congestion there is in the City.

**Urban Extensions.** The Plan includes a housing requirement of 24,852 dwellings to be built in the County by 2035, a rate of delivery of 1,308 a year. Many members may be disappointed to learn that, as part of this, significant urban extensions to Durham City have now been endorsed on land currently in the Green Belt. These are plans for 1,700 dwellings on 108 hectares at Sniperley Park, 420 dwellings on 19 hectares off



Sherburn Road and 50 dwellings on 1.9 hectares at the former police skid pan and derelict land at Aykley Heads. However, the report deletes any anticipation in the Council's draft plan that the grass plateau at Aykley Heads might later be removed from the Green Belt as part of an adjacent business park.

"Compensatory improvements" such as tree and hedgerow planting, foot and cycle paths are proposed for the remaining Green Belt, and for the new Green Belt boundaries to be consolidated as "permanent". Provision is expected for foot and cycle paths throughout the larger estates, and the proposed mitigation and landscaping includes a 25 hectare "long park" at Sniperley. The Plan envisages that building there could commence in 2022/23 with 85 dwellings to start with, then about 135 a year.

The new housing estate to be built on the hillside south of Sherburn Road would be bounded by Bent House Lane to the west and by the A1 to the east, where the new Green Belt boundary should be well wooded to attenuate traffic noise. Landscaping measures are stipulated, safeguarding the appearance of this area as a backdrop to the World Heritage Site in long views from the west. Also, "[t]he design will protect the character and integrity of Bent House Farm, Old Durham Beck and Old Durham" – Old Durham includes the newly restored Old Durham Gardens. Early October saw Banks Property losing no time with a draft masterplan, aiming to submit a planning application before the end of the year for 450 houses in their part of the newly allowed area, with a masterplan for the whole area for 500 (*not* 420) houses.

Concerns arise. Will the Plan's drafted safeguards be adequate to ensure sufficient provision of housing of the affordable kind, something lacking in recent house building around the City? Another anxiety is that both the Sniperley and Sherburn Road developments will merely become more large car-dependent estates. That is just what Banks Property's perfunctory masterplan already looks like. For Sniperley, the Inspector's report states that developer contributions should support "sustainable transport" measures so that "the residual impacts on the wider road networks are not severe". The Inspector thinks it "a reasonable prospect" that the Sniperley traffic can be accommodated, referring to proposed measures for the A167, including the Sniperley roundabout and its approaches.

All must now depend on how deeply and seriously “sustainable transport” measures are implemented. Campaigners against the relief roads may need to remain wary. For comparison, the Newton Hall estate nearby is moderately well served by buses and walkways, but also a space of front-garden car parks where the vast majority of people to be seen outside are as figures passing in cars.

Finally in relation to Green Belt boundaries, the planned business park at Aykley Heads removes one hectare of green belt land comprising the current County Hall southern car park. The Inspector sees this as an opportunity: this space could be used for “a high-quality gateway building” on the approach to the City. The report also goes some way towards forestalling the Council’s lax approach to discouraging access to the business park by private car: “parking provision [should be reduced] to the absolute minimum required to serve the proposed development and as a maximum will limit the number of spaces to no more than the current provision of 1281 spaces”.

The Plan forbids any ancillary developments in the business park which could compete with the pressured City centre, such as significant retail provision. This effectively blocks the prospect of just such development given in the Council’s outline application last summer. Controversially, this outline was published at a time when the Council had already received the Inspector’s guidance on the issue of ancillary development and had incorporated it into a proposed main modification of the County Plan. This contradiction has been the occasion for an individual Trust member’s corporate complaint, still ongoing.

**University Expansion and Studentification.** The report engages the divisive topic of the studentification of Durham City by interpreting university expansion in terms of the national policy that planners “should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt”. Accordingly, the Inspector sees his role as seeking to accommodate and manage that expansion but not to constrain it. It is reckoned that the expected 6,000 additional students to be brought to the city between 2017 and 2027 could in fact be housed in the various purpose-built accommodation schemes, either already built or soon to be built.

Mr Fieldhouse acknowledges, however, that “[d]espite the increasing availability of purpose-built accommodation, many students are likely to prefer to live in shared houses”. Here, the report’s stance on the continuing loss of family homes to shared student housing goes quite a long way towards recognizing the arguments of the Trust on this issue. The Council’s interim policy on restricting houses in multiple occupation becomes the confirmed policy of not allowing new HMOs and, importantly, any extension of bedspace in an existing HMO, if “more than 10% of the total number of residential units within 100 metres” are already occupied by students. This wording should cover PBSAs as well as former family houses. Exceptions to the no-more-than-10%-within-100-metres rule should only be allowed if either (1) “commercial uses are predominant within the 100 metre area” (e.g. with a first-storey flat in a shopping centre, a target of some recent applications, though Council planners have concerns about noise), or (2) if “an area already has a concentration in excess of 90% of council tax exempt [i.e. student-occupied] properties”. The Trust had actually argued against any such threshold at all, fearing that any specific percentage could soon be contorted amid the casuistry of a planning appeal.



A final point on the University offers some slight encouragement to those who fear Durham City becoming known as the campus with the Norman cathedral: “whilst the Plan should be effective in accommodating the currently identified growth in student numbers, the limited size of the city and its particular physical and historic character mean that there may be limited capacity for further growth in the city in the longer term”.

**Retail Centre.:** The pandemic has turned parts of Durham City centre into a dystopian stage-set, with rows of deserted shops. This gives new urgency to that part of the County Plan which considers the future development of such sub-regional retail centres alongside that of the future of “district centres”, especially the Arnison and Dragonville sites.

The Inspector’s report acknowledges both the pressure on the centre and the popularity of the competing retail parks and it attempts a balancing act whose stability is now being tested: it aims “to ensure that development in and related to those [district] centres, which have the character and appearance of retail

parcs, protects the roles of the city centre” and of other, local shopping centres, but it also aims to encourage such retail parks “to evolve and diversify over the Plan period such that they increasingly perform a town centre role”. To help that last purpose, Mr Fieldhouse states that support should be given for *non-retail* facilities within those district centres, “providing other main town centre uses”. This policy is at odds with a concern in the Trust’s submission, about the “tendency for professional practices, such as accountants and solicitors, to vacate the city centre for locations such as the Belmont Industrial Estate, which is only conveniently accessible by car”. However, to help protect the old centre, the Inspector endorses the policy that the size threshold at which proposed retail developments in outlying locations should be assessed for their impact be reduced from 2,500 sqm to 1,500 sqm for convenience goods and to 1,000 sqm for high value household items (“comparison goods”). In addition, developments over 400 sqm should be assessed for their impact on the smaller, local shopping centres. The Trust had argued that local shopping centres such as those at Langley Moor and Framwellgate already provide something of a town centre role but with better access than the retail parks.

The expanding lines of abandoned shops in Durham City centre might suggest that this part of the County Plan is already insufficient, as do national statistics from the Local Data Company showing shops in high streets closing at about five times the rate of those in retail parks. Besides, “district centres” which consist of warehouse-type blocks around an enormous car park can never have the mixed social, cultural, architectural, historical and civic life of a true town centre.

**Conclusions?** For those of us pondering the quality of current planning for Durham City, particularly after the crisis of legitimacy associated with the Council’s siting a new County Hall on flood-prone riverbanks at the Sands, perhaps three final points emerge. Firstly, it is striking that the Plan originally submitted by the Council was judged unsound. It was only finally rendered “sound” with the large number of “main modifications” emerging from the examination process, including the significant input of the Trust and its allies. In this sense, the final County Plan, if still limited in some ways, is a vindication of the indispensable role of public engagement in the planning process. Secondly, whereas it is common for local authorities to defend their home area against what seem damaging proposals from regional or national bodies, the experience of Durham City, even with its world heritage status, has been significantly the reverse. It is an outside figure from a national authority who has repulsed the destructive relief roads.

Finally, a plan is one thing, its implementation another. We believe that bodies such as the Trust and the Parish Council should be involved from early on in the development of genuine, environmentally responsible masterplans for these new estates for Durham City, allowing only the highest quality principles in design. *It cannot now be the old business-as-usual, with local voices with expertise allowed only as belated consultees on bog-standard schemes.*

## THOUGHTFUL POLICY OR “PUB TALK”? THE NEW NATIONAL PLANNING PROPOSALS

Two significant government papers on planning policy in England have been released for consultation recently, and the Trust responded to both. The main context is clearly the government target of building at least 300,000 new dwellings each year and of accelerating housing supply in the south, but Durham City would not be unaffected.

“Changes to the Current Planning System” primarily concerns changes to the way in which the housing need of an area is calculated. The Trust disagreed with key aspects, pointing out that using a proposed algorithm for calculating such need would crudely disregard varying local conditions and needs. The paper’s proposed remedy of simply making more land available for building would merely give profit-makers greater opportunity to pick and choose sites. The main obstacles to new house building have actually been financial, with developers deliberately constraining supply in various ways in order to keep prices high. Most recent new housing in Durham City has been of the lucrative “executive” sort, while a lack of affordable or first-time buyer dwellings has meant many workers in the City needing to commute from outlying areas. Other proposals were seen as likely to exacerbate the local problem of landlords buying up properties to rent, largely to the growing student body.

The other document has a rather silly title for a white paper, “Planning for the Future”. Its publication in August was met with widespread dislike, even dismay, across England, especially in constituencies in the

south that would normally be expected to support the current governing party but where the pressure on green spaces is the most unremitting. Roberta Blackman-Woods's sharp presentation on the paper at the Trust's AGM underlined Trustees' own opinions: the White Paper is based on misleading premises. It repeats commercial caricatures of the current planning system as a wasteful obstacle course. In fact, 90% of planning applications are approved each year and blockages in the supply of new housing have largely arisen from developer exploitation of market forces in a context of economic austerity.

The current system requires planning applications to be considered and publicly aired, on a case by case basis. The White Paper would make things far more front-loaded through a crude zoning policy, requiring future local plans to slot all areas under their remit into one of three categories ("growth", "renewal" and "protected"). Either simplistic or just impracticable, such tagging must negate the complex or hybrid character of real places. For areas set for "growth" consultation with the public would be reduced to some engagement about the initial overall outline. Local people would later become powerless spectators at the edge of construction sites.

The White Paper voices welcome aspirations on design standards, heritage and conservation, on building regulations and carbon neutrality, and on the use of software to enhance local plan design and use. However, it is very thin on issues of implementation. This leads to fears that many welcome ideas are sugar-coating for a centralising and standardising agenda whose remit is to ease the path of developers. The new proposals would entrench and make permanent a loss of democratic accountability already being felt here in the current system with the trend for the Council to leave important planning decisions to its civil servants under "delegated powers", rather than to a committee of elected local councillors.

Finally, it is unclear what effect the proposed legislation would have on existing local plans, such as the new County Plan or the proposed Neighbourhood Plan. Would these have to go back to the drawing board, a nightmarish prospect? In this respect the government officer with the Orwellian title of "Chief Planner" has advised that work on current local and neighbourhood plans in England should continue as before, since any changes that might arise from future legislation are far-off and their means of possible implementation yet to be outlined. It would surely be a long-term, labour-intensive, costly and probably messy business.

## OTHER DEVELOPMENTS

**A "History Centre" at Mount Oswald.** Plans have been approved to restore the grade II listed Mount Oswald Manor House in its spacious green setting on the southern outskirts of the City, extending the building and turning it into a "vibrant and interactive local history hub". This will bring together archive, heritage and registration services at one location. There is already a website for the new centre: [www.durham.gov.uk/historycentre](http://www.durham.gov.uk/historycentre).

The Trust largely supported the scheme and is keen to be involved. An exhibition space will aim to retell the history of County Durham through artefacts, archives and photographs, including the anticipated gathering together of material relating to the Durham Light Infantry. The Durham Register Office currently at Aykley Heads will also move. The scheme has recently won funding of almost £1.5 million from the European Regional Development Fund in recognition of its extensive low carbon measures, though more details of architectural design would have been welcome, given the challenge of attaching a contemporary build to a historical building.

The "History Centre" should be a valuable and attractive place. The application does, however, illustrate two problematic issues already mentioned in this bulletin. The siting of the scheme at Mount Oswald is part of the worrying trend for important civic facilities to abandon the old centre. How many tourists, for example, will make the trip out to the exhibitions? Secondly, this was another planning application listed as to be decided under "delegated powers". Trustees objected "surely an application of such significance for the City, indeed the whole County, should be decided by Committee, even in these difficult times".

**Dunelm House.** The excellent student paper *Palatinate* has added its voice to those defending this distinguished piece of brutalist architecture, still threatened by possible demolition in the University's Estates Masterplan. The main strand of the article draws on the recent "RetroFirst" campaign in the *Architects' Journal* for policies to incentivise "retrofit" over demolition. It argues that whatever the still hypothetical merits of some replacement for Dunelm House in terms of reducing carbon emissions, a full



consideration of the huge emissions associated merely with the construction process bolsters the case for the retention and repurposing of this familiar landmark, not for destroying it. Dunelm House also forms a celebrated composition with Kingsgate Bridge, not itself threatened though now visibly in need of upkeep.

Finally, we understand that the public inquiry into Kier's encroachment on **common land at the Sands** (the old coach park) is to be held on Tuesday 26 January 2021.

## **THE CHANGE TO CHARITABLE INCORPORATED ORGANISATION STATUS: WHAT IT MEANS**

The AGM of the 30 September 2020 supported unanimously the resolution that the Trust change its status from being both a registered charity and a company limited by guarantee to that of a so-called Charitable Incorporated Organisation, a new and popular form of governance for eligible charities. CIO status grants most of the characteristics of a company limited by guarantee, but avoids the requirement to register with Companies House.

Members will see no change in the Trust operations, but its administration becomes simpler and cheaper. It would save the annual registration fee with Companies House and dual reporting to both Companies House and the Charities Commission. The switch has also been a chance to modernise the wording of our constitution, the "Memorandum and Articles of Association" originally signed on 29 October 1942, almost 80 years ago, when The City of Durham Preservation Society Limited was founded (the name was changed to "The City of Durham Trust Limited" in 1966). The new 25-page constitution is based on the template provided by the Charity Commission and does not differ substantially from the original. It will be published on our website and sent electronically to members. A printed copy will be provided on request to any member unable to access the electronic version. Contact the Chair at our registered office.

## **MEMBERSHIP**

Numbers remain healthy at c. 400, if down from about a hundred more in the 2000s, perhaps as long-term residents are displaced by students, but in the mid-1970s it was 280. Members tend to be mid-life or above. If every current member recruited just one more, our strength would double. Mention the website or pass on the bulletin.

## **MINUTES OF THE 78TH (VIRTUAL) ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF THE TRUST (DURING COVID-19 RESTRICTIONS) ON WEDNESDAY 30 SEPTEMBER, COMMENCING AT 19.00.**

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE. The Chair (John Lowe) welcomed all attendees to the virtual AGM and shared instructions on how to speak/vote. Apologies were received from Liz Wilkie, Keith Cummings, Michael Sadgrove, Adrian Green, Gary Hindmarsh and Marie-Therese Pinder. Two new Patrons were gained this year - the author and former Chancellor of Durham University, Bill Bryson and the former MP for the City of Durham, Roberta Blackman-Woods. The Chair welcomed the latter to the meeting. She thanked the Trust for the honour of becoming a Patron and pledged to work with the other Patrons to promote the Trust's crucial work. She then gave an informative talk on "The Planning White Paper: enhancing or eliminating local democracy?", answering questions raised afterwards. She was thanked by the Chair and agreed to share the slides from her talk with members.

2. MINUTES OF THE 77th AGM (22 May 2019). Following corrections of the Registered Charity Number and an amendment to Para. 5 (regarding the procedural election of the Chair), they were accepted as a true record.

3. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES. On Para. 4b) John Pacey stressed the need for the Trust's membership to be sustained and asked about changes in the membership level so far in 2020. The Membership Secretary (Lucy Szablewska) confirmed numbers were stable (losses compensated by new joiners). John Pacey will share ideas with Trustees on expanding membership. The Vice-Chair (Roger Cornwell) urged members to get friends to join now as they would get 15 months' membership for the price of 12 months. Lucy suggested a note for the AGM minutes to include membership types/figures in the next AGM report in 2021.

4.REPORT OF TRUSTEES AND PRESENTATION OF THE TRUST'S ACCOUNT (year ended 31 December 2019) –presented by the Honorary Treasurer Malcolm Reed. Malcolm reported that the accounts had been tricky to gather together in this unusual year and thanked the Independent Examiner for their speedy turnaround despite the fact that they too were working from home and it had not been possible to hold the usual meetings to finalise the accounts. However, the summary of the Accounts had been circulated to members in the Annual Review and the full accounts were available on the Trust's website. Reserves are fine as, despite lower publication sales during the lockdown, expenditure will be lower in 2020 (no room hires etc after March) but he agreed that funds need to be built up going forward by increasing membership. Malcolm asked if there were any questions regarding the published figures. There were no questions. The 2019 Annual Report and Accounts were unanimously adopted.

5.APPOINTMENT OF HONORARY OFFICERS OF THE TRUST. The Chair explained that the Chair and Vice-Chair are required to stand down annually at the first meeting of the Trustees after the AGM and it is up to the Trustees whether to re-appoint them. Hence, they don't appear in this list of Officers to be appointed at the AGM. Proposed by the Chair, and carried by acclaim, the following were elected: Dr Malcolm Reed as Honorary Treasurer, Dr Lucy Smout Szablewska as Honorary Secretary, Azets as Independent Examiners, and Blackett, Hart & Pratt, LLP as Honorary Solicitors.

6.APPOINTMENT OF TRUSTEES. The Chair paid tribute to Paul Beard, a long-standing Trustee who retired this year, and thanked him for his valuable contribution. Three Trustees who are retiring and willing to continue, John Ashby, Prof. Tim Clark and John Lowe, were proposed and re-elected. Trustees co-opted during the year, Michael Hurlow and Sue Childs, were proposed and confirmed.

7.ADOPTION OF CHARITABLE INCORPORATED ORGANISATION (CIO) STATUS. This issue was raised at last year's AGM and since then Trustees have given the matter careful consideration and judge that it is the right change to make. A summary of the issue was provided to all members with the AGM agenda, along with the full text of the resolution for the City of Durham Trust to convert to CIO status. Trustees have agreed the new CIO constitution draft (25 pages) and the next step is to seek Charity Commission approval. The Chair asked if there were any questions regarding the new constitution. None were raised, so the Chair read out the resolution. The resolution was carried by a unanimous vote (show of hands at the meeting and 25 postal votes). The Treasurer reassured members that the charity number and bank accounts remain the same. John Ashby thanked John Lowe for the phenomenal amount of work he has put into this.

8.CHAIR'S REMARKS. The Trust has had notable success in this unprecedented year with the improvement of the County Durham Plan via our involvement in the EiP and the consultation on the Main Modifications (with the Trust commenting on over 60 of them). [To highlight the collaborative nature of Trustees' work, the Chair invited colleagues to describe aspects of such work]. Sue Childs highlighted the strong cooperation the Trust had with the Parish Council, community organisations and local campaign groups, to strengthen stances and share seats at the EiP. On transport matters Malcolm Reed agreed the collaboration between local groups was very helpful, and he noted the difficult job of the Inspector and his insightful but subtle tweaks on sustainable transport issues. The Chair thanked Malcolm for his transport expertise. John Ashby also acknowledged the crucial work of the local relief road campaign groups and recognised what a vital cause the interim policy on HMOs was to chase down (with Roberta Blackman-Woods also involved), but he thought it was disappointing that it took an independent national Inspector to bring DCC back in line on this. John Pacey acknowledged the wonderful expertise of Trustees that had been shared during the EiP, the excellent summary of the EiP experience printed in the Trust's Annual Review, and he hoped to continue the collaboration on ongoing sustainable transport issues.

The Chair recognised the dedicated and talented team of Trustees we have, including Prof. Tim Clark's excellent editing of the Bulletin/Review, and Richard Hird's regular excerpts from the local/national press. Sue Childs has been working with Roger Cornwell and Matthew Phillips to prepare a new interactive website which will be important for new membership. The Chair also recognised Matthew Phillips's valuable work on the publications; Jan Hutchinson's excellent note-taking and summary documents; John Ashby's quick editing of DCC's weekly planning application lists; and Michael Hurlow's expert responses to them—allowing the Chair to submit, often lengthy, responses to DCC (e.g. 28 pages re the recent Aykley Heads hybrid application). Recent successes include revisions to the bus station plans and the refusal of some HMO applications. The Trust is continuing to collaborate with the Parish Council and Freemen to press the case against DCC's occupation of the Sands common land. The closure and sale of Crook Hall was noted with regret and the Chair repeated his plea for all members to help recruit new members as we approach the 80th anniversary of the Trust's foundation.

9.ANY OTHER BUSINESS. Lucy Szablewska thanked John Lowe for being an excellent Chair-working so hard behind the scenes, and for recruiting two such high profile Patrons. The Chair thanked Francis Pritchard for his technical assistance with this virtual AGM. The Chair thanked all attendees for their contributions and drew the meeting to a close at 20.35.

*The Trustees*

## TRUST PUBLICATIONS AND GREETINGS CARDS

With Christmas approaching it seems a good time to remind members that the Trust offers a range of publications about the City and that some could make good gifts, such as Douglas Pocock's collection of poetry about Durham, *Durham in Poetry*, £4.50/£3.50, or his *In the Steps of the Masters: Durham in Paintings*, £5.00/£4.00. A full list of publications and larger images of the greeting cards appear on the website, <https://durhamcity.org/publications.php>

**Cards:** All cards come with envelopes. Most designs are left blank for your own message, but one has a printed greeting as indicated below. Stocks are good for all 7 cards, if down to 40 in the last two shown.



*A view of Durham from the north-west* Anonymous, late 18th century

No greeting. A6 (149x105mm). £0.40/£0.35



*Durham (view from Aykley Heads)* John Dobbin, 1854

No greeting. A5 (200x140mm). £0.45/£0.40



*Durham Cathedral, south-west view*

Engraved by B. Winkles after a picture by C. Warren, 1850

No greeting. A5 (188x148mm). £0.30/£0.25



*The view from Maiden Castle near Old Durham* William Hutchinson, 1787

No greeting. A6 (149x105mm). £0.30/£0.25



*Durham (view of River Wear, Castle, Cathedral and Framwellgate Bridge)*

Walter Holmes, 1980

No greeting. A5 (210x158mm). £0.30/£0.25



*Lord Londonderry's statue viewed through the window of Durham Guildhall (photograph)* Jean Rogers, 2008

"With best wishes for Christmas and the New Year". A6 (105x149mm). £0.30/£0.25

Only 40 left in stock.



*Durham Cathedral from Framwellgate Bridge, from "The antiquities of England and Wales"* by Francis Grose, 1775, S. Sparrow, 1773.

No greeting. A5 (210x145mm). £0.30/£0.25 Only 40 left in stock.

The lower prices given above represent the members' discount. A contribution to post and packing will be calculated as follows: £2.00 for purchases totalling up to £10; £3.50 for purchases over £10 and up to £20; and £4.50 for purchases totalling over £20. Orders are most easily made through the website. Otherwise, send a cheque made out to "The City of Durham Trust" with all needed details to City of Durham Trust publications, 35 Archery Rise, Durham, DH1 4LA.