

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

Steering Group meeting 12th March 2019

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

Apologies

1. No Apologies, all present.

Minutes of the meeting held on 20th February 2019.

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

Matters arising on the Minutes.

3. With reference to minute 6, KS noted that he had today written on behalf of the DVS to the PCC with a proposed plan for the future of the Church Hall. Also, on 9th March he had received from the SCC the confirmation that the Hall had been registered as an Asset of Community Value.
4. With regard to minute 18, DC reported that his computer system had crashed and, as a consequence he was not confident that the latest version of the Plan that he had circulated was a thorough one. DRB referred to the email he had sent on 8th January, identifying c.50 amendments needed, and noted that none of them were corrected in this latest version. KS commented on ways in which version control could be ensured. DC was unsure of the validity of any of the versions on his computer. However, it was noted that he had sent earlier versions to all SG members. It was agreed that **JD would take over responsibility for updating versions of the Plan**; and to begin with she would, in liaison with DC, find an earlier circulated version as the base and then produce a new updated version. **DC would continue** to be the person with responsibility for amending the text in the Plan. **JD will ensure that** a fully updated version of the Plan was circulated in advance of the next SG meeting.
5. With reference to minute 20, Sarah Smith (SS) would be sending amended minutes of the meeting held on 5th February.
6. No action has yet taken place on minute 24. **CP will contact Geoff Wilson.**
7. With regard to minute 30, DRB reported that he had had an initial brief exchange of emails with SS informing her that we would be making an early application for re-designation. He had now completed a revised application in the prescribed format and had also prepared a further narrative addressing actions taken in response to the several recommendations from SCC relating to the initial awarding of Forum status to the DVS. He outlined his approach and clarified a few points which were outstanding; and **the SG agreed that DRB should now make the application**, including notifying SCC that the DVS were recommending to their AGM that the membership subscription was increased.
8. It was noted that all other matters arising had either been actioned or would be addressed at other agenda items this evening.

Report back on 12th March SCC meeting.

9. CP reported that the tenor of the meeting had been broadly positive. SS will be sending us a written statement in the near future which, it was stated, would be a lengthy one addressing the key issues.
10. In advance of this, CP had circulated a preliminary note of the meeting. The first key point was that the SCC would maintain a housing target of 2098 new homes a year, despite the fact that an earlier Government calculation methodology (which had now

been revised upwards) had suggested a significantly lower figure; the period over which this would apply might prove longer than previously thought.

11. With the higher overall housing target, there was renewed likelihood that Green Belt releases might be contemplated in Dore. DNF raised at the meeting that, if such releases in the setting of a National Park were at the least desirable end of the development spectrum, what could be done to prevent them being the first development prospects of choice on the part of developers in place of much needed brownfield developments? SCC did indicate that it was possible for “released” GB sites to be safeguarded from immediate development and delayed until later in the cycle.
12. The SCC felt that the wording of DN6 may be too vague. They were also very critical of our DN5, believing that it is more restrictive than previously, and they do not feel that our housing areas appraisal is sufficient for making criteria based judgements. They drew our attention to a garden policy in Hayle Neighbourhood Plan (copy circulated at this meeting) as being a good approach to adopt. DC noted that he believed that this could be a reasonable way forward. **It was agreed** that we should follow this approach and that **DC would produce alternative wording based on the Hayle approach**, which he would circulate to members.
13. After discussion it was **agreed that we would keep DN6**, because it did demonstrate the approach that we were adopting.
14. Advice was received that the Reg18 document was expected to include a specific housing requirement for each Neighbourhood Area, but there was no clarity as to when this would be known; indeed the publication of a Local Development Scheme might take a further 4 weeks. Accordingly the SCC advised that we used a form of words that would allow our DNP to be adopted in advance of this, but that recognised that such a housing requirement may be forthcoming.
15. Amongst other matters discussed, SCC had not realised that we had reduced the number of open green spaces in the DNP. Also, SCC Housing Officers would be sending to us a suite of housing statistics which would help us in evidential terms.
16. Finally, it was noted that we needed to look carefully at the interplay between NPPF paras 11(d) and 14. This would be considered **further at the next SG meeting**.

Timetabling the SG’s future work.

17. It was agreed that by the next SG meeting we needed to have a clear idea about exactly what needs to be done, by when and by whom. This was especially important as it had proved impossible to arrange another SG meeting before the already agreed subsequent meeting date of 15th May.
18. In terms of scheduling this, after discussion it was agreed that we should seek urgent external assistance on creating a simple Gant chart of tasks and a timeline, which could then easily be updated by SG members. **KS undertook to seek this assistance as a matter of urgency and inform SG members of progress.** If this proved impossible to arrange, then we would default to using a simple table of tasks.
19. The first critical task was to complete the updating of the text of the DNP, as this impacted a number of other needs, such as the Basic Conditions Statement. It would also influence the view of the SCC as to whether we needed to have another SEA/ HRA screening review.
20. It was also important to decide sooner rather than later 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 simple textual changes. In this context, it was noted that PR had produced 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. It was also noted that if we decided that we did need another DNF meeting, by preference it should be before the summer (so as not

to delay the submission of the DNP), and this therefore required us to make an early decision on this.

21. It was agreed that for the SG meeting on 3rd April:

- **DC would ensure that the text of the DNP** was fully updated within the next 2 weeks, including the amendments which DRB and CP had already given to him and appropriate references to the NPPF as updated in February 2019.
- **JD would circulate the updated and corrected version** of the DNP in advance of this SG meeting on 3rd April.
- **DC and CP to propose an outline** of their thinking on how the Housing chapter and policies should now be approached in light of the SCC advice.
- Based on that, and the listing previously produced by PR, **the SG to decide** on whether another DNF meeting was necessary; and if not, then what form of communication with members would be undertaken.
- We would confirm the usefulness of the expected Gant chart or, failing that, agree an alternative approach to scheduling and allocating the remaining tasks to be completed before submission.

22. It was further agreed that at the following SG meeting on 15th May we would:

- Decide on the new wording for DN5 and DN6.
- Then seek to agree the final wording for the DNP overall.

23. It was also noted that in terms of scheduling, allowance needed to be made for an extensive proof-reading of the document.

24. **JD agreed to prepare** a spreadsheet of future holiday commitments of SG members.

Each SG member to ensure that this information was passed to JD.

Green City Strategy and Green Commitment.

25. PR reported that after reading this document he felt that it displayed some excellent principles; and there were some useful statements that we could adopt for the DNP; and incorporating appropriate quotations from this into the DNP **should be listed in the Gant chart**. It was unfortunate that it appeared that there was no funding available to support it.

February 2019 NPPF.

26. It was noted that SS had informed us that there had been an updated version of the 2018 NPPF issued on 19th February 2019. She advised that the changes were not critical ones.

27. It was agreed that **DC would ensure that any references in the DNP** to the NPPF would be changed to refer to this latest version.

Future SG meetings.

28. The next two meetings were confirmed to be Wednesday 3rd April (JD gave her apology) and Wednesday 15th May.

29. Due to the inability to find a date in-between those dates which suited most members, CP proposed that where necessary, smaller groups could meet to discuss particular issues, reporting to all SG members via email.

David Bearpark
13th March 2019