

## **Dore Neighbourhood Forum**

### **Steering Group meeting 20th February 2019**

Present: Christopher Pennell (CP), David Bearpark (DRB), David Crosby (DC), Pat Ryan (PR) and Keith Shaw (KS).

#### **Apologies**

1. Apologies were received from Jen Donnelly.

#### **Minutes of the meeting held on 9th January 2019.**

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

#### **Matters arising on the Minutes.**

3. With reference to minute 9, it was noted that this was still outstanding and that it could not be completed until after the March meeting with Sarah Smith (SS).
4. With regard to minute 17, DC stated that he had completed the response online using survey monkey and so did not have a copy of it.
5. KS had mentioned this matter (minute 18 refers) to Local Councillors but could not give them details, due to the absence of a copy of the response.
6. With reference to minutes 19 and 20, KS reported that the PCC has appointed a team to review options and report back to the PCC at the end of March. The DVS sub-committee was proposing to write to the PCC with its proposed plan, copying it to the DVS committee. The scrutiny committee had recommended the approval of the application to declare the Hall an asset of community value; but at the moment there was not a cabinet member with the responsibility to sign off that recommendation.
7. PR reported that, with regard to minute 32, he had a complete record of every electronic item that has been produced and he backs this record up regularly.
8. With regard to CIL (minute 34), CP reported that he had written to the Government's chief planning officer to seek advice on the approach apparently being taken by SCC. The reply received agreed that this approach was not in line with Government policy. CP will write back requesting that the Government Officer challenge SCC over this.

#### **Forward timetabling.**

9. CP noted that the indications received at the meeting with Sarah Smith (SS) were that the next step would be the publication of a Local Development Scheme, something which is normally the first step in the whole process of producing a new Local Plan! At the meeting it was stated that this would be in March; but SCC's minutes of the meeting now said "in the next few months"!
10. Even if this was published in March, it was also clearly stated at that meeting that the process of producing and adopting a new Local Plan would not be finalised until 2022.
11. After discussion, all present agreed that the perpetual delays by the SCC in publishing the next stages in the development of its Local Plan, when viewed alongside this latest advice, had now reached the stage where we simply should not wait any longer before preparing formally to submit our DNP, because we had a duty to maintain the enthusiasm of the Forum and the community for the Neighbourhood Plan.
12. We had, sensibly, decided to submit under the terms of the 2018 NPPF and had already amended the DNP to reflect the new elements of that, as well as amending wording to take account of SCC comments. It was agreed that we would now concentrate on finalising the DNP so as to submit it over the next few months.
13. It was noted that we could not finalise the DNP until the meeting had taken place with SS about housing (scheduled for 12th March). And at that meeting we may also obtain further clues about the SCC emerging policies regarding housing. It was expected that SCC would confirm that they were using the Government's lower housing numbers.

14. There was discussion as to whether we would need to call another DNF meeting to agree the amended version of the DNP. It was agreed that whether or not this was necessary would depend on the extent of changes of matters of principle, as opposed to textual changes. When we have prepared our final version of the DNP, we will compare it to the one put before the DNF and then make a judgement as to what, if any, further communication was needed with the full Forum. To assist with this, **PR offered to produce** a listing of all policies as they stood when we went into the Pre-Submission Consultation and the policies as they stand following that consultation and the clarification meetings with SCC .
15. In this context it was noted that the Forum had delegated matters to the SG.
16. In terms of timing, CP outlined the various elements that would need to be addressed. It was agreed that **CP would set out his summary of the elements** that we would need to address and circulate it to SG members. Then at the next SG meeting the workload could be assessed and timings agreed.
17. If it was subsequently felt that a Forum meeting was required, then it was agreed that our preference would be for that DNF meeting to be in the second part of May. We would hope that this would give us time to complete the changes to the DNP, would ensure that it took place before the summer and would allow publicity of the meeting to be incorporated into the next issue of Dore to Door, the publication date for which is 17th May. Any decision on this timing would take place after consideration of the tasks remaining.
18. **DC was asked to provide another updated version of the DNP** to reflect all the narrative suggestions and the corrections to the text discussed so far, including those at this evening's meeting. **DC would aim to produce this by the end of this week and would label** the resultant version as new DNP version 3.
19. It was agreed that the meeting of the SG following the meeting with SS would focus on agreeing a final text for the DNP.

#### **Meeting held with Sarah Smith (5th February).**

20. CP referred to the note that he had circulated following the meeting, together with the minutes as sent by SCC. The meeting had been an amicable one and there had been agreement on a number of the matters that had been at issue. **CP and DC would be responding** to the minutes provided by SS with a few suggested amendments.
21. The SCC had stated that the SEA/HRA screening report had been approved for signature, although there would be a delay before the actual signature due to the departure of Rob Murfin.
22. CP raised the issue of the proposed change in wording to DN14, which he had circulated previously. After discussion of this, it was agreed to adopt the approach to the revised wording as proposed in his email. **DC will create revised wording for DN14 and circulate it to SG members.**
23. CP then raised the question of revising the wording for DN2. He noted that SS had accepted the distinction we were making in our wording but argued that landscape character assessment in itself could not be used to prohibit development. CP accepted this point and, as a consequence, had created a revised proposed wording for DN2, together with a lengthy preamble setting out the background to what was proposed. He also noted that he would add further wording to the preamble, referencing Citywide Options for Growth. It was agreed to adopt the wording proposed for DN2 and the preamble. **CP will add the further wording mentioned** and pass to DC. **DC will then incorporate all of this** into the latest version of the DNP.
24. In terms of the Long Line landowner consultation, which SS advised needed to be included, it was thought that Geoff Wilson had sought their views. **CP will contact Geoff Wilson** to check whether he had tried to seek the views of the landowners as well as residents.

### **Planned meeting with SS on 12th March.**

25. This meeting could possibly be more contentious than the last one. **CP and DC would meet to prepare** for this detailed discussion on housing matters.

### **Renewal of Dore Neighbourhood Forum Designation.**

26. CP noted that DRB had circulated copies of the original SCC designation documentation, together with extracts of the relevant Acts setting out what was required when making an application for designation. DC had also circulated a copy of the original application that he had made in 2013.
27. DRB noted that it appeared that there was no specific reference within the legislation to re-designation and it would seem from the way it had been approached by other Forums where this had been sought, that basically the same approach was needed as with an initial application.
28. DRB also noted that with the original application, SCC had raised a number of matters which were not specified in the Acts. Hopefully those were now behind us.
29. DRB raised the question as to whether such a re-application should first be approved by the DNF. However, he also pointed out that the original application had, obviously, been submitted before the creation of the Forum. It was agreed that it would appear that as it was the DVS that had made the application and received the designation, that the application for the re-designation should be in the name of the DVS. **KS will ensure that** this will be an item for the next DVS committee meeting next week, so that the proper authority can be demonstrated for the application. This was agreed.
30. In terms of timing, it seemed to SG members that it was logical that a re-designation would take effect from the final date of the original 5 year approved period. Therefore, there seemed to be no advantage in delaying this application. **DRB undertook to take the lead** in preparing the application for re-designation.

### **Keeping the Forum informed.**

31. As mentioned during previous items this evening, the SG would need to decide if a meeting of the Forum would be needed to agree the revised DNP prior to its submission. It was agreed that this decision would be made after the 12th March meeting, when we had compared the two versions of the DNP (see minute 14 above).
32. There was an update article in the issue of Dore to Door just distributed.

### **Current DNP text.**

33. DC noted that he had already incorporated all the corrections identified by CP and DRB last month.
34. As mentioned earlier this evening, at minute 18, DC will circulate his latest version.

### **Basic Conditions Statement.**

35. DC also noted that all changes would also impact on the Basic Conditions Statement.

### **Corrections to previous Steering Group minutes.**

36. In the minutes of 12 December 2018 at paragraphs 15, 27 and 28 there are references to SG members meeting SCC Planning to discuss the "ADAS proposal"; and there are further references to "ADAS" in the minutes of 7 November 2018 at paragraph 19, and in the minutes of 9 January 2019 at paragraph 15. To avoid any confusion, the word "proposal" should be changed to "representation" because the references are to discussions to be held with SCC to discuss representations made by commentators, including ADAS, on our Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan where ADAS made several suggestions or proposals about ways in which we should recast our text. These discussions were not about – nor could they be – the ADAS involvement in a planning application on Long Line, but related to the Local Planning authority's duty to advise a Neighbourhood Forum on its developing Neighbourhood Plan and any representations made on it."

**Future SG meetings.**

37. It was agreed to arrange a number of future meeting dates. It was agreed that the next four meetings should be fixed for *Tuesday* 12th March, Wednesday 3rd April, *Tuesday* 30th April (this date being an amendment from the one discussed at the meeting) and Wednesday 15th May. **CP will clarify the availability** of all SG members for these proposed dates.

David Bearpark  
21st February 2019.