**Dore Neighbourhood Forum**

**Steering Group meeting 6th June 2017**

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

**Apologies**

1. None. All members present.

**Minutes of the meeting held on 3rd May 2017.**

1. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

**Quick Check on Progress on key items:**

1. DRB reported that he had received a number of photographs from John Doornkamp, which he was **passing to CP** to look at. Also, John Eastwood had confirmed that he had a large number of photographs of village events, which could be inspected when convenient. **CP and DRB** would seek to do this.
2. The questionnaire analysis had been completed and shared with members. PR had added extracts from it into the latest DNP draft from DC.
3. The survey questions for Dore businesses had been prepared.
4. **CP will** contact Maureen Cope and Jenny Pennell in order to get the survey undertaken. This to be completed before the next SG meeting.
5. It was considered that all the necessary consultations had been carried out, except for one suggestion. There had been several contacts with the PDNPA but these had not resulted in a formal response from them. **CP will send** to the PDNPA the relevant parts of the text and then arrange a meeting for DC and himself with them. The notes of that meeting will form part of our record of formal consultations, which TH can incorporate into the overall record. This to be completed **before the next SG meeting**.
6. It was agreed that it was not necessary to chase consultees for responses if they had not already replied. **CP will find** the letter received from Historic England and forward it to TH for her records. **CP will also pursue** again the summary of responses from Long Line residents which Geoff Wilson said he would prepare.
7. PR had completed the analysis of consultations for reflection in the draft DNP and had added them to the draft circulated by DC. PR requested that if there are any further changes, **DC should inform PR** so that he can amend his document.
8. The feedback from the Retail Workshop from Sarah Smith had been received and had been shared with SG members. It was difficult to understand and **DC was speaking** to Sarah again.
9. With regard to the strategic assessment of compliance with any EU regulations, DC had spoken to Sarah Smith who had confirmed that the SCC will be responsible for this. DC noted that there were three particular bodies that needed to be consulted.
10. Environmental effects had been identified. It was not believed that there were any and if there were, they were positive in effect.
11. We have all the evidence needed.
12. With regard to the necessary consolidated detailed Housing Character Appraisal, DC had completed this as a separate supporting document. **DC will circulate this** to all SG members, with any members' comments to be circulated.

**Actions on inputs needed for DNP text (CP & DRB's schedule previously circulated).**

1. DC believed that he had taken account of Sarah's comments on previous drafts.
2. Also with AECOM's comments.
3. Business survey already discussed.
4. The Retail Workshop feedback still needed to be included.
5. In terms of CP's previous thoughts on Green Belt, transitional housing densities and Heritage listing, **CP will review** the latest draft from DC to verify they are now adequately included.
6. The questionnaire results are now within the text.
7. It was felt that the text now properly reflects the necessary inputs relating to Evidence, Consultations and Proposals.
8. The Basic Conditions Statement is an agenda item.
9. DC has circulated his updated text for the DNP, which included addressing the Community Infrastructure Levy.

**Other Matters Arising on the Minutes.**

1. DC had previously suggested that there was the possibility of AECOM carrying out a health check on our Draft prior to its pre-submission to the SCC. It was thought that this may not be possible, in view of how long it took them to respond last time. However, **DC will contact them** to find out how speedily they would be able to do this.
2. With regard to the Map needed, DC reported that Sarah Smith had said that she would give him an AO size map of the SCC area of the DNP, on to which he will draw the relevant boundaries, which their technician can then translate clearly onto a smaller scale map. This should include identifying the green corridors.
3. **DC will speak to the PDNPA** to ascertain the timeframe in which they could produce the Map once we had finalised it
4. With regard to minute 32, **CP still needed** to complete this narrative which, following his return from holiday, he would now do if necessary in the light of DC's latest Plan redraft.

**The Basic Conditions Statement.**

1. DC noted that he had completed this document but that it was still a two page succinct statement.
2. This matter was discussed again, as some members of the SG observed that 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 principal document examined by the Inspector and the opportunity to demonstrate that the NP should proceed to referendum.
3. It was agreed that a small group should look again at this in order to judge the best way forward with this Statement. **CP will arrange** this.
4. If this is not completed before the latest draft is sent to Sarah (see item 37 below), DC should send his current short version, asking Sarah for her views.

**Progress on Consultation and Community Engagement Statement**.

1. PR reported that these were now virtually completed. The input in respect of Long Line was still needed.

**Progress on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.**

1. DC reported that he had circulated an updated version of the DNP; and PR had added to that ***boxed précis.*** This version has addressed the comments made previously about the earlier draft.
2. DC reported on a conversation he had had with Sarah Smith, following upon the email received from her. She had reiterated that she would respond with comments on our latest draft within 13 weeks. It was agreed that we should send the latest versions of our documents to her, noting that if we did this within the next week, then we would receive her comments by mid-September. This would give us time to absorb her comments and to either incorporate them or refer to them in the Draft DNP to be put to the DNF meeting.
3. However, before it is sent to her, DC needs to receive any further comments from SG members. In particular, CP still needs to read the document (having just come back from holiday). Also, CP is particularly concerned to make sure that the draft includes sufficiently strong references to the Green Belt and the categorisation of the narrow strip of land between the developed Dore and the edge of the Peak District National Park. Other SG members agreed with this approach. **CP will complete this** **to DC by the beginning of next week**.
4. Given the tight timescale, it was agreed that the best way forward was for **each SG member to send** any further comments to DC, copying their comments to other SG members. Again, this to be completed **by the beginning of next week**.
5. Following the incorporation of any further comments, **DC will then submit** the information to Sarah by the middle of next week, asking Sarah to let us have her comments asap but no later than 13th September (her 13 weeks).
6. CP raised the question of the density of any future development. DC observed that any development within existing developed areas within Dore could not be at higher densities than at present. This was because existing housing areas and gardens were *not* classed as brownfield.
7. **PR is to re**-**send** the Consultation document to DC.

**Timetable Issues**.

1. The next SG meeting was confirmed for 5th July, with a further meeting on 9th August.
2. A meeting of the DNF should be scheduled for the penultimate week of October: dates suggested were the evenings of 24th or 25th October, between 19.00 and 21.00. DC will contact the room bookings service at King Egcberts.
3. The draft DNP would be made available online, with a number of hard copies placed in the DVS room.
4. Following receipt of Sarah Smith's comments on the draft to be sent to her shortly and the outcome of the DNF meeting, we would then move to the pre-submission to SCC. The Council had 6 weeks in which to respond to this.
5. The next stage would be making the full submission of the DNP. It was noted that we should ask the October meeting of the DNF to authorise the SG to amend the Plan, within reason, to reflect important comments received from Sarah. This would remove the need for another DNF meeting prior to full submission.
6. CP will, after the next SG meeting, prepare an article for the next D2D. **CP will check** with John Eastwood to confirm the deadline for this.
7. **DRB will put together** a first attempt at setting out the remaining things to be done and by when. Other members to add/amend as appropriate. **KS will then use** this information to prepare an excel chart, which could be adjusted as we progress.

**Next SG meetings.**

1. The next meetings of the SG will be on Wednesday 5th July and Wednesday 9th August in the DVS room.

David Bearpark

7th June 2017.