

## Dore Neighbourhood Forum

### Steering Group meeting 16th May 2018

Present: Christopher Pennell (CP), David Bearpark (DRB), David Crosby (DC), Jen Donnelly (JD), and Keith Shaw (KS).

#### Apologies

1. Apologies received from Pat Ryan. Thelma Harvey was absent; **CP will contact her.**

#### Minutes of the meeting held on 17th April 2018.

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.
3. The several actions agreed had been effected, although with regard to item 17, CP had decided to delay writing; and the SCC had now replied regarding the SEA screening.
4. DC noted that he had added text to the Draft Plan relating to sustainable development.

#### Pre-Submission Stage Responses.

5. It was noted that so far we had received comments from Dawn Biram, the PDNPA (Adele) and John Mason.
6. It was agreed that, in line with the exchanges of emails between SG members, we should accept the amendment proposed by Dawn Biram.
7. DC noted that with regard to Adele's first two comments, he had spoken to her and had now made changes to the text to reflect her points. This action was agreed. Although the rest of Adele's comments were supportive, DRB suggested that text could be added to refer to the Environment Act 1995, as mentioned by Adele. This would support policies DN2,3,4 and 5. This was agreed; and **DC will add to the text** on pages 25 and 39. **CP will investigate** whether the Countryside Act 1949 should be amended to state the 1995 Act.
8. John Mason's comments were discussed. Taking them in order, it was agreed:
  - Page 15: the Forum does not cease as he suggests.
  - Page 82: it is the representative Forum.
  - Page 39: agreed.
  - Page 43-44: agreed.
  - Page 48: not a planning matter.
  - Page 56: CP will comment on this.
  - Page 58: after discussion it was agreed that the requested wording would be used, as the comments in the blue boxes were a reflection of residents' views, but did not form part of a proposed Policy. In addition it was agreed to add the words "that their view was that" shortly before the requested wording.
  - Page 58-59: no comments.
  - Page 60: noted that we simply quote Dwell, we don't *propose* this.
  - Page 61: it does show congestion.
  - Page 67 and 76: this proposal came from a consultant's report; and note that other residents do support this.
  - Page 72/76/79: some additional words have been added to make this clearer.
  - Page 75: note that there is mitigation.
  - Page 76: this view was noted; but the SG is minded to keep the proposal in, remembering that it is not part of the formal Plan.
9. **DC would make changes** to the text as agreed above.
10. It was noted that **PR would be requested, via these minutes**, to prepare a summary of all comments received, for consideration at the next SG meeting.

#### SCC Screening Opinion.

11. The conclusion that an SEA screening was not considered necessary was welcomed. It was agreed that **CP should write to Sarah Smith** (cc. Rob Murfin) to confirm that

the SG accepted this conclusion, so that the SCC could proceed with the next steps. It was also agreed that in this response we should not respond to any of the comments made within the detail of the Opinion: any responses should await the reply of the SCC to the Pre-Submission Consultation.

12. It was agreed that we should accept the second route proposed by Sarah for proceeding with the process.
13. DC noted that he had incorporated into the Draft Plan the phraseology used in the Opinion from the SCC.
14. DC will raise with Adele asap whether PDNPA has produced an HRA screening opinion, which is also urgently required.

#### **Basic Conditions Statement.**

15. DC laid on the table an updated version of this document: he has updated note 9 and used Adele's wording for DN1 re GSP3. **DC is going to contact Adele** with regard to points 10,11 and 12 at the end of the document.
16. CP queried why DC had ignored all the comments that CP had sent to him on 11th May. It transpired that DC had not received this document. **CP will send it to DC again**, and **DC will consider the queries raised** and amend the Statement to reflect the comments as appropriate. **DC will then circulate the amended** version to SG members so that it can be considered in the context of the proposed changes suggested by CP. It will then be discussed at the next SG meeting.

#### **Sustainable Development.**

17. The note provided by CP, subsequent to the last SG meeting, for a possible encapsulation section relating to sustainable development, and which it had been agreed would best be incorporated within the introductory section of the Plan, was discussed. There was general agreement with the logic and principles expressed, as was the concern that this needed to be recognised by those considering the Plan.
18. However DC suggested that, as written, it raised some issues that may be problematic. Accordingly it was agreed that we would wait to see the response from the SCC to the Pre-Submission Consultation, and depending on what they say, we may wish to incorporate something along the lines of the note from CP.

#### **Consultation Statement.**

19. This extensive Statement was welcomed as being extremely thorough.
20. DC observed that it looked very professional compared with other such Statements that he had seen. It was noted that PR had followed Locality advice in preparing the Statement; and it was agreed that although lengthy, it demonstrated the extent of the consultations undertaken. It was also noted that there was further supporting documentation behind this Statement.
21. The final phrase in the document referred to the detail of evidence being available on the DVS website. PR had referred to this in his covering email. It was agreed that **CP would speak to PR** concerning this.
22. **SG members** should continue to read the document and provide further comments.

#### **Risks to Timetable.**

23. The major risk had been a lengthy delay before receiving the Opinion concerning the SEA screening; but this has now been received.
24. The next hurdle would be in considering comments on the Pre-Submission Statement, particularly those from the SCC. When considering how critical SCC may be, DC did observe that in the SCC's revision of its own Local Plan, there would be something along the lines of the current CS26 and CS31. We still did not know when this Plan may be published for consultation. Some of the supportive reasoning in SCC's Screening Opinion suggested that they were perhaps less likely than before to criticise the DNP for seriously failing to conform with SCC's existing Local Plan.

**Any Other Business.**

25. There were no matters raised.

**Date of next meeting.**

26. Although the SG initially suggested 12th June as the date for the next meeting, subsequently it transpired that this was not convenient for DC. Accordingly it was agreed via email that the date for the **next meeting should be Wednesday 20th June**, at 7.30pm.

27. As at para 10 above, it was agreed that in advance of this next meeting, **PR would have scheduled** all P-SC comments received, with initial draft responses to them, which those SG members available in advance would help informally to prepare.

David Bearpark  
17th May 2018