

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

Steering Group meeting 17th April 2018

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

Apologies

1. Apologies were received from Thelma Harvey and Jen Donnelly.

Minutes of the meeting held on 3rd April 2018.

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.
3. With regard to item 3, DC outlined the regulations regarding the timescales within which different stages of the whole process should be completed. In particular, the SCC will have a six week period in which it has to carry out its post-submission consultation process and appoint the external examiner; and it has an eight week period to finalise the process after the completion of the referendum. Unfortunately there were not prescribed periods for all the stages between these points. It was noted that we may wish to consider a special edition of Dore to Door in advance of the referendum.

Review of the Pre-Submission launch.

4. It was agreed that it had gone well. In her absence, the significant involvement by TH in sending out the vast majority of the consultations was noted.
5. In terms of the drop-in sessions, at the moment CP would be on his own on the evening of 26th April, with DC joining him for the session on 12th May.
6. After discussion, KS suggested that he will handle any attendees on Friday mornings, this opportunity having been primarily advertised simply as an opportunity for people to consult a hard copy of the Plan.
7. PR is ready to log and analyse any responses received. It was suspected that comments from landowners may very well be towards the end of the 6 week period.
8. CP noted that he has requested, and subsequently received, acknowledgements from the major consultees to whom he had written. **CP will check with TH** whether she asked for acknowledgments; and if she did not, then it was suggested that she seek them from the larger ones to whom she had written.

Basic Conditions Statement.

9. DC outlined his approach to this and stressed that he would like thoughts and comments on all aspects of it. He noted that he had made the document more user friendly than other such Statements he had seen, in that he had outlined what each NPPF Policy covered rather than simply quoting the Policy Number.
10. CP stated that he had a potential revised wording in respect of section 7 of the document, which he circulated. **SG members should read** and comment on this.
11. **All SG members were requested** to let DC have any comments on the Statement, whether comments of substance or simply grammatical corrections.

Sustainable Development.

12. The email from CP, dated 2nd April, was discussed. It was agreed that the logic was correct, although it was not something for the Basic Conditions Statement.
13. After discussion it was agreed that if we did not get this logic across, then it may not be recognised by those considering the Plan, by which time it would be too late. So, it was agreed that it should be incorporated within the introductory section of the Plan, although in an encapsulated form. DC suggested that the most appropriate place would be around paragraphs 1.5 to 1.8. **CP will prepare a shortened version** for incorporation and discuss it with DC. **CP will then circulate their agreed** version to SG members for comments.

Consultation Statement.

14. PR summarised the approach he had taken with this and observed that it was up to date so far. He was concerned that we needed to have sufficient time in which fully to address the comments and arguments put forward by developers. We needed to be able to respond with detail.
15. It was agreed that at the next SG meeting, there should an in-depth discussion of the Consultation Statement; **so SG members were requested thoroughly to read** the document in advance and not to hesitate to give PR interim comments.

Communications with SCC.

16. The e-mail of 6 April from Rob Murfin was discussed. The meeting welcomed the interest he had shown in the Dore Neighbourhood Plan and the clarity of his message but were concerned that he believed that SCC had provided more positive support to the DNF than the SG recognised. There was no doubt that many local planning authorities had interpreted the duty to support neighbourhood forums more generously.
17. There was particular concern that the date for the provision of the SEA screening opinion had slipped so much from Sarah's original forecast and that there seemed to be some confusion within SCC as to the purpose and methodology for this process despite Locality advice about having early discussions and action on screening. While SCC was saying that the opinion would be available to us prior to the submission of our Plan that would represent a huge delay on reasonable expectations, even more so if the opinion came to the entirely surprising conclusion at that late stage that a full environmental assessment was required. It was agreed that **CP would draft a reply to him and circulate that draft to SG** members before sending it."

Any Other Business.

18. There were no matters raised.

Date of next meeting.

19. As previously agreed, the date of the next meeting of the SG is on Wednesday 16th May at 7.30pm in the DVS room.

David Bearpark
17th April 2018.