**Dore Neighbourhood Forum**

**Steering Group meeting 3rd May 2017**

Present: Christopher Pennell (CP), David Bearpark (DRB), David Crosby (DC), Jen Donnelly (JD), Thelma Harvey (TH) and Pat Ryan (PR).

**Apologies**

1. Apologies were received from Keith Shaw

**Minutes of the meeting held on 15th March 2017.**

1. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

**Matters arising on the minutes.**

1. The SCC document setting out their approach to the Green Belt Review has been circulated to members, as had CP's correspondence with Simon Vincent.
2. DC had sought to amend the Draft DNP to reflect the matters referred to in minutes 4, 7, and 11 to 21. **DC noted that** he still needed to speak to Historic England. **PR will prepare** a text in respect of Transport etc., covering in particular references to other forms of Transport.
3. The AECOM advice to identify where there was a void between Strategic Policies or where there is some particular local specificity was noted.
4. DC suggested that there was still the possibility of AECOM carrying out a health check on our Draft prior to its pre-submission to the SCC. **DC will contact them** to find out how speedily they would be able to do this.
5. DC noted that he was seeking to ensure that the text in the DNP was comprehensive, thus minimising the need for a Glossary.
6. With regard to the question of suitable photographs to be incorporated within the DNP, the list presented by CP earlier in April was agreed, together with one of the shop frontage on Causeway Head Road and looking down from Bradway (Oxcroft Close was suggested), showing the setting of Dore adjacent to the Peak Park. **DRB is to contact John Doornkamp** to pursue the production of these photographs. In addition, we will incorporate photographs of each of the housing areas; and DC already has suitable ones. The wording of the captions to these will be important.
7. With regard to minute 24, **DC and TH will meet** to discuss what is available.
8. **CP noted that** he had reminded Geoff Wilson that he had agreed to provide a more extensive note of the consultation meeting with Long Line residents.

**The Basic Conditions Statement.**

1. DC noted that a NP had to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of a Local plan and not all of the minor policies. Accordingly he was pruning the draft document to reflect this.
2. The draft Conditions Statement provided by DC was discussed; and while it was thought that it was a good succinct summary, CP observed that although other NPs that he had looked at did have a short summary similar to the one from DC, they also had as an appendix a much more comprehensive and detailed document. The advice provided online by Planning Aid also recommended the incorporation into a Basic Conditions Statement of an extensive range of matters. Their advice stressed how important a document this was, as it was the opportunity to demonstrate that the NP should proceed to referendum. **DC will look at this again** in the light of this advice and produce a more extensive document.

**Consultation Statement**.

1. PR reported that he was continuing to work on this separately at the moment. When it is completed, it can be inserted into the draft NP being prepared by DC. In the current draft DNP, DC had written it so that there were a number of "hooks" available on to which additional material could easily be added. The précis of consultations provided by PR would go into the body of the DNP, with the fuller statement being an appendix.
2. **TH was continuing** to develop the much more extensive document setting out all consultations undertaken. In this context, it was noted that the WGs were actually part of the consultation process, with residents joining them in order to provide their views and input.
3. It was noted that some consultees had not responded to the contacts made. It was agreed that these contacts should still be shown in the schedule of consultations; we had sought to consult but could not enforce a response! **PR, TH and DC will meet** to discuss the availability of information about consultations which took place earlier in the whole process, before the formal establishment of the DNF.
4. It was noted that all consultees would have to be consulted again at the pre-submission stage.

**The Evidence Base.**

1. PR spoke about the details shown in each of the Tables shown in his summary of the Policy and Evidence V7. Some would be incorporated within the main Plan; **PR and TH were meeting** to ensure that all the responses were shown in table 4; and table 5 was a developing document.
2. It was suggested that the evidence that was to be included within the text of the DNP document could be highlighted in green boxes at intervals within the text.
3. **CP will complete** the final analysis report of the questionnaire responses so that this could be part of the evidence base. It was noted that a response rate of about 10% was most acceptable.

**Next Steps towards a NP.**

1. The document previously circulated by DRB was considered. With regard to the question on page 2 about EU compatibility, DC said that he believed that this was something that the SCC would do. **DC will speak to Sarah Smith** to confirm this.
2. With regard to the question about lead authority, DC stated that the SCC had confirmed that they would be the lead authority with regard to taking any such actions.
3. The meeting agreed that, prior to the pre-submission of the draft DNP, we needed to call a meeting of the DNF in order for it to give its approval to the proposed draft DNP. The draft Plan needed to have that authority.
4. With regard to the second document circulated (CP and DRB), it was agreed that all of the items listed under "fresh input work" **should be completed in time for the next SG** meeting. With regard to items 3 and 4 in this list, **CP and DC would meet** to decide on the questions and then Maureen Cope and Jenny Pennell would conduct the survey. **CP would complete** the questionnaire analysis, **DRB would speak** to the photographer. The other matters had already been discussed, with actions agreed.
5. It was reiterated that the Peak Park had agreed to complete the Map; but this could not be formally requested until certain issues regarding the boundaries had been resolved. **DC will speak to the PDNPA** to ascertain the timeframe in which they could produce the Map once we had finalised it.
6. **DC will speak to Sarah Smith** to see how speedily she could respond to another draft document. Depending on her response, we may or may not be in a position to send one to her in advance of the next DNF meeting.

**Latest Revision of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.**

1. DC reported on the updated version of the DNP which he had circulated and noted that in a number of areas he had put in wording as "pegs" onto which additional text could be added and Policies inserted.
2. It was agreed that the best way forward was for **each SG member to review** the latest draft and respond to DC, copying their comments to other SG members.
3. DC noted that the NPPF stated that those preparing a NP should discuss with their Local Authority about their Plan being in compliance with the Local Authority's emerging policies. However, Sarah Smith's minutes of the Village Centre Workshop meeting held, says that we *should not* refer to emerging policies! As a consequence he intended to amend the text so as not specifically to refer to these as emerging policies; but he still intended to refer to them within the body of the Plan.
4. It became clear that most members so the SG had not received the email from DC about the Workshop meeting. **DRB will recirculate** this to all members.
5. DC noted that we needed to have a discussion about the Community Infrastructure Levy so that we have a formed view. Sarah Smith has advised that we should seek to estimate what this could amount to.
6. It was noted that **DC needed to produce** the consolidated detailed housing character appraisal.
7. CP felt that the narrative regarding the Green Belt was extremely important. Although all green Belt was important, the green Belt surrounding Dore was especially critical, as it was such a narrow strip and extremely sensitive in respect to views into and out of the PDNP. **CP will write a narrative** for the draft NP in respect of this.

**Focus of the next SG meeting.**

1. In terms of future meetings, it was agreed to set dates for the next two SG meetings; and these were agreed for Tuesday 6th June 2017 at 19.30, with the following meeting being fixed for Wednesday 5th July 2017 at 19.30.
2. As CP was away in the week preceding the first meeting, it was agreed that the agenda would be circulated 10 days in advance; and that the agenda would treat matters arising as completed (unless there was a particular concern) so the meeting could concentrate on the key issues as expressed in the Next Steps documents.
3. It was agreed that we should work towards there being a meeting of the DNF in the early Autumn, probably early in October. This should then enable us to make the pre-submission well before the end of 2017.
4. In this context, it was noted that the next issue of D2D would have a deadline for copy of about 24th July, with the publication date being about 18th August. We would need to meet this deadline if we are to have a DNF meeting in October. This emphasises the need for substantial progress at the SG meeting on 6th June, with the 5th July meeting being the last meeting before finalising matters for the D2D issue.

David Bearpark

7th May 2017.