



**annual
review
2019-2020**

CITY OF DURHAM TRUST

The Trust, founded in 1942, is a non-profit-distributing company limited by guarantee, registered in England and Wales, No 377108. Registered as a charity, No 502132.

Founder:

The Very Revd Cyril A Alington,
DD Dean of Durham 1933-51

Patrons:

Roberta Blackman-Woods PhD
Bill Bryson, OBE, HonFRS
The Very Revd Michael Sadgrove, MA

Governing Body of Trustees:

J Ashby, B.Sc., MPhil, MRTPI
E A Brown, Dip Hort (RHS)
T J A Clark, BA, DPhil
S Childs, B.Sc., M.Sc. (Co-opted)
R Cornwell, BSc (Vice-Chairman)
A G Green, BA, MA, PhD
R D Hird, MA, MRTPI, LTCL

Honorary Treasurer

M C Reed
Normanlea
Albert Street
Durham City
DH1 4RL

Honorary Solicitors:

Blackett, Hart and Pratt, LLP
Aire House
Mandale Business Park
Durham
DH1 1TH

Examiners

Pullan Barnes
Chartered Accountants
49 Front Street
Framwellgate Moor
Durham
DH1 1TH

M Hurlow, CMLI, IHBC (Co-opted)
J J Lowe, MA(Ed) (Chair, and acting Honorary Secretary)
M Phillips, MA, MCLIP
B Ravelhofer, BA, PhD
M C Reed, CBE, MA, DPhil, FCILT, FCIHT, FRSA (Treasurer, and acting Company Secretary)
L Szablewska, B Soc Sci, PhD

Registered Office of the Trust:

Blackett, Hart and Pratt, LLP
Aire House
Mandale Business Park
Durham
DH1 1TH

Honorary Secretary:

Appointment pending

Bankers:

Co-operative Bank plc
21 High Street
Durham
DH1 3PL

SEVENTY – EIGHTH ANNUAL REVIEW BY THE TRUSTEES, 2019 – 2020 (August 2020)

This document completes the Annual Review of the work of the Trust since the last AGM in May 2019. It follows a first part published as an Extraordinary Bulletin last April. This is an unusual procedure but reflects of course the disruption caused by the coronavirus pandemic. However, we can now announce that **the next AGM will be held at 7 pm on Wednesday 30th September**, albeit in the unusual mode described in the section given below.



Image courtesy of Richard Hird

Despite the lack of public gatherings, the work of the Trust has continued, largely through use of email and with online trustees' meetings in June, July and August. Trustees continue to consult and to respond to local planning applications and consultations, and this business is recorded in a monthly log while face to face meetings remain suspended. An officially allowed temporary suspension of parts of the Trust's Articles of Association is still in force, to meet Government regulations during the pandemic.

The Trust has been unable to stage any public talks since Martin Roberts's lecture last October, "Early Durham Architects". Dr Jon Gluyas, Executive Director of the Durham Energy Institute, had to cancel his lecture of March 14 due to a bereavement, though the pandemic was already casting its shadow on public gatherings at this time. There is now a backlog of interesting talks to be rescheduled when we can.

Sights of the old City closed and deserted in full daylight were both beguiling and very sinister. A local care home was in the national news for recording 25 deaths from the virus in an outbreak affecting three quarters of its residents. The Office for National Statistics listed the Newton Hall and Brasside area alone as already suffering 9 deaths connected to Covid 19 by April 18, more than for some small countries.

The pandemic must change the City for the longer term, but to ask how this must affect the specific concerns of the Trust is still to raise far more questions than answers. An item circulating on social media imagines one future historian asking another "which quarter of 2020 is it that you specialize in?" Trustees have drawn on their varied experience and expertise in online exchanges about what sort of Durham City might emerge after this tragedy, for better or worse. The main thoughts are summarized in a special section of this report, "Durham City Futures".

ARRANGEMENTS FOR CITY OF DURHAM TRUST AGM 2020

Despite Covid-19 restrictions, the Charity Commission requires us to hold our AGM by 30 September. Trustees have decided that it will have to be held electronically and it will take place at 7.00 pm on Wednesday 30 September.

Trustees will meet on 15 September to make final arrangements, including an email address for members to contact to register for the meeting and plans for postal voting for members who are unable to take part electronically. These arrangements and the AGM agenda will then be published in a special Bulletin sent to all members on 18 September. Any member wishing to stand for election or nominate someone as a trustee or officer please email chair@durhamcity.org by 31 August.

If you do not already receive communications from the Trust by email but are willing to do so, **please send your email address to** membership@durhamcity.org. We shall of course continue to send mailings to those who wish to receive them through the post, even though we have your email.

THE NEW TRUST WEBSITE

Look out for the launch soon of the Trust's new, updated and vastly improved website, created by Sue Childs with the support of Roger Cornwell and "Cornwell internet". As well as offering Information about Trust meetings, publications, and the names of officers and trustees, it will work as a news site, archive, calendar and magazine. It will also host occasional reviews of material likely to be of interest to members, beginning with Douglas Pocock on *Durham City in 50 Buildings (2019)*, by Derek Dodds. Next year should see a response to Martin Roberts's long-awaited new edition of Pevsner. The "News" section has a blog facility for members to comment themselves on local developments.

THE EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC OF THE COUNTY DURHAM PLAN: AN EYE-WITNESS ACCOUNT BY JOHN LOWE, CHAIRMAN OF THE TRUST

The Examination in Public was held at the Glebe Centre in Murton, a controversial choice of venue as it is on the Eastern fringe of the County and not well served by public transport. The hearings took place on eleven days from 22nd October to 4th December, with an additional day on 6th February.

The whole examination process was very closely controlled by the Inspector, William Fieldhouse, following strict standard protocols. These govern the submission of documents and posting them on the official website, setting the order and content of the topics for each day's hearings, deciding who would be allowed a seat at the table, issuing follow-up questions and action points for the Council to deal with. The Inspector was assisted by the Programme Officer, Annette Feeney, who acted as the sole channel of communication with the Inspector; no direct written or spoken communication with him was permitted other than during the public hearings.

The Glebe Centre is a modern building with a large central hall where the hearings were held. Participants sat around a large square of tables with the Inspector seated in splendid isolation at one side, Durham County Council officers and their QC to his left, agents representing house-builders to his right, and representatives of the public, such as ourselves, facing him. When full this amounted to over twenty people with microphones shared between two. The Inspector opened every session with a reminder of the procedural rules and an invitation to participants to introduce themselves. This ensured that everyone learned to make use of the microphone, though in practice some often forgot to do so in their eagerness to make their point.

The Inspector walked in unaccompanied and unannounced at the start of each session, though I often felt he should have been preceded by a fanfare of bugles; he was a commanding presence and there was never any doubt who was in charge; the vast majority of speakers addressed him as "Sir" like obedient schoolchildren. The Programme Officer was very approachable and sat at a desk in a corner of the room, always helpful with queries we might have. The house-builders' agents were, by and large, a sombre-suited lot, though one or two showed signs of personality. The Council officers constituted an ever-changing team depending on the specialist knowledge required for the session's topic. There were usually three or four of them at the table at any one time, with others on the substitutes' bench ready to help out at a moment's notice. They were not usually very senior officers but most displayed an impressive grasp of detail as they responded to the Inspector's forensic examination. They were also supported by a very polite and pleasant QC who intervened to good effect on a number of occasions.

And then there were the representatives of the public such as ourselves. In order to reduce the competition for places at the table, the Trust formed the City of Durham Coalition with the Parish Council and the Friends of the Durham Green Belt. This was much appreciated by the Inspector and Programme Officer. Other allies on the public bench were representatives of those opposing the Northern and Western Relief Roads, CPRE and the Green Party. One of the key criteria for being allowed a seat at the table was that you had to have made a prior written submission about the topic in question. The way this worked out sometimes meant that the Green Party's representative, Jonathan Elmer, was the only public representative at the table and he performed admirably. Just occasionally the Inspector allowed a representative from our Coalition a seat despite not having made a prior submission, and this appeared to be just to even up the contest with the house-builders' agents.

The Inspector made it clear at the outset that he would adopt an inquisitorial role to test the soundness of the plan. He did so rigorously but with a pleasant manner. However, it wasn't always possible to "read" him and he was often non-committal in his response to participants. Another aspect of the inquisition was his issuing of supplementary questions and action points (67 in all) for the Council to deal with. These were very searching and required a great deal of homework between hearings. Many of these action points in particular have resulted in the Council proposing to make main modifications to the plan in order to make it sound. It has proposed 210 such modifications that have since been the subject of a further round of consultation in June and July. The Trust has responded to just over a third of them, either to support them or suggest significant amendments.

It's not possible in the space available to give a blow by blow account of the hearings, but the outstanding outcome has been the Inspector's decision to ban the construction of the Northern and Western Relief Roads. They were, of course, blocked by the previous Inspector in 2015, but the Council persisted in pursuing them. This time they have learned their lesson and given in more gracefully. The most dramatic



moment of the whole EiP came when the Inspector asked whether the Council would be able to make the appropriate main modifications if he were minded to disallow the roads. There was an audible silence from the Council officers and the QC had to step in to assure him that it would accept this decision. However, it was not until much later, the end of February this year, that he formally announced his decision. This decision is of such moment that it is worth quoting the Council's acceptance:

The northern and western relief roads for Durham City proposed in policy 23 have been found at Examination to not be consistent with national policy or justified. Overall, the adverse impact of the roads, individually and collectively, would be substantial. No mitigation

measures have been identified that would reduce the harm to a level such that it would be outweighed by the limited benefits the roads would bring.

This statement fully vindicates the years of hard work put in by Trustees and our colleagues in other groups to ensure that the Green Belt is protected and these roads are not built. Unfortunately, we have been less successful in preventing the adoption of plans to build large numbers of houses in the Green Belt at Sniperley Park and at Sherburn, at least at this stage. We have yet to see the Inspector's final report following the consultation on the main modifications. We live in hope that at least some of our responses to them will persuade the Inspector to modify some of the Council's proposals.

Taking part in every session of the EiP was a demanding but very worthwhile task for a number of Trustees. It proved to be a very open and thorough examination of the Council's proposed plan. We can be pleased with the outcomes that we know about and there might be more to celebrate when we see the final report. Our participation and well-informed contributions have undoubtedly enhanced the Trust's reputation among local campaigners and we continue to work closely with them on the many issues facing Durham City.

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The independent examiner appointed to review the Durham City Neighbourhood Plan concluded that it meets legal requirements, subject to the modifications recommended in his report, and the County Council has now decided to accept those recommendations. The Plan can now proceed to a local referendum. The referendum should be held in May 2021.

EROSION OF THE ENVIRONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE SITE

The architectural historian Alec Clifton-Taylor wrote almost 40 years ago that “at Durham nothing, absolutely and positively nothing, must ever be permitted to intrude upon the great views.” However, this is just what is happening. While the new walkway at Riverwalk makes new and stunning use of its backdrop, the Council’s Planning officers seem unwilling or unable to prevent elsewhere what are often dismissed as “minor” encroachments on the great views. Two images of a shocking degradation are copied here, both taken by the Chairman of the Trust. That on the left is of the emerging new County Hall near the Sands, viewed from the bottom of Sidegate, and the other is of the Milburngate Development, taken from the pedestrian refuge in the middle of Framwellgate Peth. A re-examination of the planning process in the latter case might at least ascertain how it happened, and what, if anything, can be done.



Other impacts on the long views arise from recent developments at Maiden Castle, the warehouse-like buildings of the new sports centre. Further obstruction is threatened by the multi-storey car-park to be built at the Sixth Form Centre near the new County Hall. Is official World Heritage status really to be held such a triviality, as opposed to its demanding from planners a no-tolerance policy for even the smallest hint of damage? In the last major rebuilding of the inner city of the 1960s and 1970s views of the peninsula and the historic centre were carefully protected by the then planning authority, and that was before either World Heritage status or the establishment of the conservation area.

Michael Hurlow, coopted as a trustee this year, brings to the Trust his expertise of as a member of the local body overseeing protection of the World Heritage Site. He writes: “Contextually, the change in Durham’s historic area commercial provision from retail to leisure uses has brought pressure that challenges the townscape quality of buildings and the historic core.” This corrosive pressure is being felt in the combined effect of developments some of which, considered singly, may seem of minimal impact. Examples suggested by Michael include the prominently lit “The Library” sports bar upper terrace on Saddler Street, dominating areas from Elvet Bridge; the terracing on the Boathouse Inn, also near Elvet Bridge; the obtrusive branding signage for the “ZiZi” restaurant on Saddler Street; the upper terrace bar at the Revolution pub, affecting views upstream at Framwellgate Bridge, and the signage for “Psyche” overlooking the bridge from the opposite bank. The Trust objected recently to the proposed lit terrace for the top of the new County Hall, citing its intrusion into the long views. The terrace has since been approved. Finally, a brightly lit clerestory at the top of the new St John’s Library on the South Bailey was a factor that counted against it in consideration of the Trust’s architectural awards for 2019.

THE CLOSURE OF CROOK HALL; RESTORATION OF REDHILLS

Members will probably have heard the news in June that the business of **Crook Hall and Gardens** has entered into liquidation, an early major casualty of the economic impact of the pandemic. The Trust remains in close contact both with the Council and the former owners. It will keenly support any measures to sustain the Hall and gardens as the treasured and publicly accessible asset which Maggie and Keith Bell built up over the years. There are said to be some positive possibilities, but no definite way forward has yet emerged. John Lowe has thanked the Bells on behalf of the Trust for the wonderful contribution they had made to the life of the City.

More encouragingly, the Council has approved major repairs to **Durham Miners’ Hall** with its famous Pitman’s Parliament. Funding from the Council and the Durham Miners’ Association has been

complemented by a National Lottery Heritage Grant of £400,000. This success recognizes the symbolic importance of this building to the communities of County Durham. The wider vision of the Durham Miners' Association has been to create a community and arts hub on this site. It has been consulting interested members of the public on how Redhills can best be "renewed and returned to the people".

UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENTS

The University Masterplan describes a growth in student numbers from 15,500 in 2017 to an envisaged 21,500 in 2027, an extra 6,000 students. The University Estate continues to expand rapidly, and the £32 million pound "Sports and Wellbeing Park" at Maiden Castle has opened, with facilities for community groups as well as the University. A £40 million Teaching and Learning Centre opened on South Road last October, as described in the last bulletin. A delayed £40 million "Mathematical and Computer Sciences" building is due to be completed this September.

The new academic year 2020-21 also sees the University's 17th college, the first since Josephine Butler College in 2006 (when just under 11,500 Durham University students were based in the City). The new college, currently called "**South College**", is sited at Mount Oswald and houses both undergraduate and postgraduate students, with 492 bed-spaces in various forms. Some facilities may be open to the local community. **South College** will accompany at Mount Oswald a University Hub block and a new building for the already existing **John Snow College**, making a total of some 1000 bed-spaces. **John Snow**, formerly in Stockton, was based for 2019/2020 at Rushford Court, site of the old County Hospital.

Public concern continued to grow during 2019-2020 about the impact on the City of the University's ten-year extension plan. While the University brings great cultural vibrancy and economic benefit, student domination of central Durham's residential space remains controversial. The University's stance remains that it aims to house between 50% and 55% of its student population in University or University-affiliated accommodation by 2027. The current figure for "living in" is around only 40% (for comparison, Oxford University achieves 70%). Clearly, the addition of 1000 new bed-spaces only nibbles at the projected huge increase in student numbers by 2027. The Masterplan envisaged "four to six" new colleges by 2027. That makes for two so far (if one counts **John Snow** as new). What then of the possible contribution of all the large purpose-built student accommodation blocks now so prominent around the City? The Parish Council, in its submission to the County Plan examination last November, analyzed the likely contribution of the various PBSAs already built or envisaged towards achieving the goal of 50-55% of students "living in". Its analysis highlighted a very probable shortfall, for even if all currently projected accommodation blocks are built, it is still unlikely that enough of them would be fit for official recognition as "University-affiliated". Would not the intense student pressure on local housing stock remain?

This creates a context for residents in the older areas of the city that may even feel like being trapped in a process of settler colonization. Householders in central Durham were shocked last January to receive a letter from a local estate agency and student letting service offering to buy their house on facilitated terms, implying it would fetch them a stronger price as rented property.

A NEW BUS STATION

A planning application was submitted in April and approved in August. Several Trustees had had a useful meeting with Council officers to discuss this scheme and the Trust strongly welcomed the concept of a replacement bus station built on the same footprint as the old, rather than, as proposed earlier, on the site of the roundabout at that part of North Road. Although the capacity of the new station is barely any greater, clear improvements are planned for pedestrian space, access and facilities, and for ease of bus movement. Construction from Spring 2021 will last about 14 months.

Trustees still felt that more could have been done to integrate the plan as a key element in regenerating North Road. The building is given a rather monolithic large office block appearance in its frontage on the road, and some alterations in materials and design were suggested for it better to harmonize with adjacent buildings. The choice of the normally attractive but relatively bright Dunhouse stone for the façade, for the high central plant room and rear parapet, may jar slightly in long high views towards the World Heritage Site and in views back towards the railway viaduct. Finally, improvements to accessibility from the railway station are not part of the current plan but remain desirable.

DURHAM CITY FUTURES, AFTER COVID 19: A SUMMARY OF TRUSTEES' THOUGHTS

Huge questions now open up. With the severe recession trustees worry about an overhasty easing of some planning restraints in the guise of emergency legislation, and the scapegoating of an already compromised planning system.

Traffic. The lockdown, albeit at enormous cost, was a revelation of what the City and its suburbs could be like freed from the noise, violence and pollution of thousands of cars. In July the Council announced its response to national calls to improve provision for cyclists and pedestrians, a disappointingly small set of measures in outlying areas of the City. Its draft “main modifications” to the County Plan remained committed to increasing road capacity for cars. Concerns exist that national advice to avoid public transport if possible may risk a more lasting demonization in favour of the private car. Tourism in Durham is already especially hit, as day-visitors who would normally come by train and coach stay away.

City Centre Retail. The pandemic has shifted into fast-forward processes already affecting the **future of the high street**, intensifying the need to consider the status and impact of large out-of-town retail parks such as the Arnison Centre or Dragonville (with the likely addition now of a small retail park at the site of the current Eddis Business Park, Framwellgate, recently approved, subject to government agreement). Government plans to relax restrictions on converting commercial buildings to residential use must accelerate the metamorphosis of the City centre from urban shopping area into an extended student campus with scattered food, drink and supermarket outlets. Durham’s special indoor market must correspondingly now gain in significance.

Great challenges now face the retail consultant Graham Sout, hired by the Parish Council to advise on business support in the City. It was notable even before the pandemic that many metres of new shop front along the new Riverwalk had remained boarded-up for months. The largely food-and-drink outlets on this site are also set to be duplicated by very similar plans for the new buildings under construction at Milburngate, which will also include another cinema. How viable can such continued investment in leisure uses be, all on top of the facilities already at Walkergate?



The University. The pandemic hit the University hard. Classroom teaching was suspended on March 16th and most students headed home early to participate in urgently improvised online sessions and then new summer exam arrangements. The current plan is for all students to return to the City and for teaching to be in a “blended” mode for the near future, that is, with face-to-face contact for some modules but with much online (all, if that becomes necessary), and with the teaching day extended by 2 hours to 8 pm.

Might the pandemic have an effect on the University’s controversial expansion plans? The *Times Higher Educational Supplement* has been writing this summer of the “death knell for decades of university expansion in England”, with loss of income from international students coupled with the Education Secretary calling for a major “rebalancing” towards further education. Durham University’s chief finance officer sees a “significant reduction in international student recruitment” for next year, but Durham seems less severely impacted overall than many other universities. As of August 2020, proposals for new or expanded HMOs are appearing at much the same rate. Do these, however, suddenly acquire a new status as health hazards, crowding disparate groups of young people together, even as the colleges are trying to develop a social distancing policy?

Will long-term financial commitments already made force the University to continue to expand its estate, or might new financial pressures see plans to demolish the Elvet Riverside Building and Dunelm House suspended? In the case of the latter this would be to the relief of people campaigning to save an internationally significant piece of brutalist architecture. If so, will this building, built to accompany the Grade 1 Listed Kingsgate Bridge, both engineered by Ove Arup, who designed the Sydney Opera House, receive the conservation it requires? What of investment in the proposed prestigious Business School on the attractive site near Bath Bridge?

In the longer term the “blended” model for teaching, with students present in Durham for both direct and online sessions, must be a less financially sustainable use of both teaching and accommodation space than the provision of some online courses for students based entirely outside the city. In early April, a proposal emerged from the office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor for Education calling for a drastic revision to the University’s basic educational offer, making online teaching not an unavoidable emergency measure but a permanent and very substantial element, creating online-only degrees and effectively sidelining the old collegiate residential model. This policy was rejected in the University Senate. Leaked to the public, its hastiness was satirized in “Online Off-Message” in Private Eye. Clearly, however, online provision is set to be the new arena for competition between higher educational institutions, after the competition for new buildings and sport facilities. Durham residents may be interested to hear that one point in favour of extensive online provision is known to have been the finite “carrying capacity” of Durham as a small and historic city.

A policy of massive expansion based on funding from international students coming to live in Durham now looks out-dated. All in all, coupled with new, intense financial stresses, the University Masterplan for 2017-27 must be ripe for reconsideration by whoever emerges as the new Vice-Chancellor next year.

The topic of Durham after Covid is multi-faceted and extensive. The new website will enable members to add to the debate themselves.

AYKLEY HEADS: “A THIRD-RATE SCHEME IN A FIRST-RATE SITE”?

One response to the pandemic may be to act just as before but to praise old plans as exactly suited to the post-Covid world. The Council is seeking official permission from itself for its much-advertised **business park at Aykley Heads**, now suddenly described by the Council leader as “a future model for business parks in the post coronavirus world”. In fact, anachronistic references in the application betray it was essentially drafted last year. No reference is made to the uncertainties induced by the pandemic. Eastern County Durham is already a land of business parks, and a genuine assessment of need must test the repetition of old claims of huge latent demand for office space, especially given the new major trend for home-working.

The application’s immediate focus is a proposed 3-storey office block west of Salvus House. However, it is also an outline application for the *whole*, large Aykley Heads scheme over 20 years. The staggered approach could suggest space for some welcome flexibility, with better acknowledgement of the demands of the climate emergency and sustainability. However, there are suspicions that to seek outline approval now aims to pre-empt measures that might come into force with the main modifications to the County Plan (especially restrictions on ancillary developments like retail and leisure outlets, which could compete with the beleaguered city centre). Routes for walkers and cyclists remain inadequately defined, and ought to be clearly separated. Overall, the outline plan mostly exploits the attractiveness of the parkland landscaping already there as the context for what risks being a set of tall, obtrusive blocks along an important approach to the City centre. Despite premature pledges of government funding support, trustees are urging that the application receive the full scrutiny demanded by the prominence of Aykley Heads in the City’s green setting.

PERSONALIA

The Trust’s long-serving honorary secretary, **Dr Douglas Pocock** stepped down at the last AGM. His absence has been partly met by the redistribution of the various tasks he came to take on over the years. This is perhaps a more equitable arrangement in certain ways. Nevertheless, the role of Honorary Secretary is still vacant, though the duties involved would not be the full gamut of tasks that Douglas performed, but are open to discussion and agreement. Expressions of interest should be sent to the chairman, chair@durhamcity.org.



The talk Douglas gave on stepping down is available as a Trust publication, available through the website. *Durham: “A Perfect Little City”?* surveys developments since 1995 when Bill Bryson described Durham as a “perfect little city”.

The focused and seemingly tireless leadership of the Trust’s Chairman, **John Lowe**, has been crucial in establishing a new effective modus operandi for considering and responding to planning applications. He

has also overseen the Trust's adaptations to the constraints imposed by the pandemic, and taken the lead in suggesting the switch of status to being a recognised Charitable Incorporated Organisation.

After long service as a trustee **Paul Beard** has decided to retire, with thanks and good wishes from all his colleagues.

Paul was a key figure in persuading the Council to support restoring Old Durham Gardens, and, with his horticultural expertise, a founder member of The Friends of Old Durham Gardens. He passes on the demanding role of overseeing the Trust's membership data to **Dr. Lucy Szablewska**. Lucy was confirmed as a new trustee at the 2019, after years of being responsible for the minutes of Trustees' monthly meetings, a role taken up very ably by **Jan Hutchinson**.

Two new trustees have been co-opted since the last AGM, subject to confirmation at the next one. **Michael Hurlow** is a landscape architect supporting the World Heritage Site Coordinator. His detailed, expert commentaries on weekly planning applications have already become invaluable. **Sue Childs** took on the considerable task of expertly updating and redesigning the Trust's website, including a blog which will allow members to comment themselves on local developments.

Finally, warm thanks are due to **Mary Sales**, a former Chairwoman and long-serving Trustee, who has stepped back this year from the job of overseeing distribution of the bulletins.

NEW PATRONS

Over the past 18 months these bulletins have sadly had to report the death of two of the Trust's three distinguished patrons, Sir William Whitfield and Sherban Cantacuzino. Trustees debated which two people to invite as new patrons for the Trust, to join the Very Revd Michael Sadgrove, former Dean of the Cathedral. They were delighted when their two first choices were both happy to accept. Both add great prestige to the Trust, with their relevant expertise, experience and reputations. Their names will be familiar, **Bill Bryson** and **Roberta Blackman-Woods**.

The famous travel and popular science writer **Bill Bryson** has been closely associated with Durham since he celebrated it in *Notes from a Small Island* in 1995. From 2005 to 2011 he was Chancellor of the University, which renamed its main library after him. Among many other awards, he was made an honorary fellow of the Royal Society in recognition of his gift for communicating science. He is vice-president of the National Churches Trust. **Dr Roberta Blackman-Woods** served as Professor of Social Policy and an Associate Dean in the School of Arts and Social Sciences at the University of Northumbria, having previously been Dean of Social and Labour studies at Ruskin College, Oxford and head of policy at the Local Government Information Unit. She chairs the Board of Governors of Northumbria University. Members will know her of course as Durham's MP from 2005-2019. She has a uniquely close knowledge of the City.

PROPOSAL FOR CONVERSION OF THE TRUST TO A CHARITABLE INCORPORATED ORGANISATION

A decision pending for the next AGM is a technical but significant change in the legal status of the Trust, one which trustees support. The proposal is that the Trust, which is currently both a registered charity and a company limited by guarantee, adopt the format of being a Charitable Incorporated Organisation. This is a recently formulated status which offers the benefits of corporate status (principally limited liability for trustees and the ability to make contracts and hold assets in its own right) but without the burdens of being a company registered under the Companies Act or making returns to Companies House. Such a change has already been made by sister organisations such as The Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne. A full account of the proposed change and a proposed updated constitution and statement of the Trust's aims will be presented at the AGM.

Finally, some readers may have noticed that the title of this yearly overview document is now "Annual Review", not the earlier "Annual Report". The change is to avoid any possible confusion with the identically named "Annual Report," the official summary of Trust business approved by trustees and submitted to the Charity Commission.

The Trustees

TREASURER'S REPORT ON 2019 ACCOUNTS

Preparation of the Trust's 2019 accounts has inevitably been delayed by the effects of lockdown and the interruption of the normal cycle of meetings. However, Trustees approved the financial statement at their on-line meeting on 16 June, and the full statutory report and accounts will be available to Members once the final wording of the accompanying narrative for 2019 has been agreed with the independent Examiner. As usual, however, this Bulletin contains the summary accounts for 2019, which have already been approved by the Examiner.

Bearing in mind that 2019 saw what Trustees hope will be the last tranche of exceptional expenditure in connection with the County Plan, and that the year's expenditure also included the costs of printing Dr Douglas Pocock's valedictory lecture, the financial outturn for the year was satisfactory, with expenditure exceeding income by less than £600. However, income was boosted by the receipt of two years' Gift Aid repayments within the financial year - without this, the deficit would have been significantly higher. Although the Trust still has substantial reserves to draw upon, regular income from subscriptions and publication sales is not sufficient to cover large exceptional outlays, and the present level of the reserves is mainly due to generous donations in previous years. While expenditure in 2020 will be lower than normal because of the suspension of meetings, publications income is also expected to be substantially lower because of the loss of sales opportunities during lockdown. Looking forward, therefore, the pressures on the Trust's finances are unlikely to decrease, so it will be important to retain and expand our membership base in order to underpin core activities.

City of Durham Trust Limited (The)

Balance Sheet At 31 December 2019

	Unrestricted fund £	Restricted funds £	31.12.19 Total funds £	31.12.18 Total funds £
CURRENT ASSETS				
Debtors	696	-	696	830
Cash at bank	<u>11,711</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>11,711</u>	<u>12,268</u>
	12,407	-	12,407	13,098
CREDITORS				
Amounts falling due within one year	(313)	-	(313)	(448)
	<u>12,094</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>12,094</u>	<u>12,650</u>
NET CURRENT ASSETS				
	<u>12,094</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>12,094</u>	<u>12,650</u>
TOTAL ASSETS LESS CURRENT LIABILITIES				
	<u>12,094</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>12,094</u>	<u>12,650</u>
NET ASSETS				
	<u>12,094</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>12,094</u>	<u>12,650</u>
FUNDS				
Unrestricted funds:				
General fund			12,094	12,650
Restricted funds:				
Green Belt fund			<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
TOTAL FUNDS			<u>12,094</u>	<u>12,650</u>

City of Durham Trust

Detailed statement of financial activities for the year ended 31 December 2019

	2019	2018
	£	£
INCOME AND ENDOWMENTS FROM:		
Donations and legacies		
Donations	250	440
Gift Aid	1,836	1,205
Legacies	-	-
Subscriptions	2,727	2,768
Total	<u>4,813</u>	<u>4,414</u>
Trading activities		
Publication Sales		
<i>Bonomi</i>	-	4
<i>Christmas cards</i>	101	13
<i>Durham in paintings</i>	181	329
<i>Unallocated</i>	32	21
<i>Durham Cathedral Architecture</i>	1,507	1,867
<i>Durham in poetry</i>	51	25
<i>Trust architectural awards</i>	3	-
<i>Futures of Durham</i>	3	-
<i>A perfect little city?</i>	443	-
<i>Unmaking of the Market Place</i>	4	-
Total	<u>2,325</u>	<u>2,258</u>
Investment Income		
CAF account interest	1	1
Virgin money account interest	74	85
Total	<u>75</u>	<u>86</u>
TOTAL INCOMING RESOURCES	<u><u>7,213</u></u>	<u><u>6,758</u></u>
EXPENDITURE		
Trading activities: cost of goods sold and other costs		
Printing of publications	1,466	5,215
Total	<u>1,466</u>	<u>5,215</u>
Charitable activities		
Insurance	367	368
Restoration of Saddler St teapot	-	1,750
County Durham Plan	2,466	2,335
Plaques for Annual Award	220	-
Postage, stationary and secretarial	1,236	1,062
Subscriptions and grants to other organisations	346	116
Total	<u>4,635</u>	<u>5,631</u>
Support costs		
Management		
Meeting expenses	418	1,148
Agendas, bulletins, etc	950	871
Total	<u>1,368</u>	<u>2,019</u>
Governance costs		
Filing fee (Companies House)	-	13
Accountancy and legal costs	300	264
Total	<u>300</u>	<u>277</u>
TOTAL RESOURCES EXPENDED	<u><u>7,769</u></u>	<u><u>13,142</u></u>
NET INCOME (EXPENDITURE)	<u><u>(556)</u></u>	<u><u>(6,384)</u></u>

