**Dore Neighbourhood Forum**

**Steering Group meeting 4th October 2017**

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

**Apologies**

1. Apologies were received from Keith Shaw.

**Minutes of the meeting held on 13th September 2017.**

1. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

**Matters arising not on the agenda:**

1. Matters arising under items 1.3.3, 3.4, 4.5, and 5.6 of the minutes of the last meeting had been completed, as noted on the agenda for the meeting.
2. With regard to item 2.3.5, this advice had now been received, but only on the evening of 3rd October; the day before our meeting and several days later then promised.
3. As referred to in minute 6.8, TH is working on the pre-submission consultee list.
4. At minute 7.9, DRB has no current absences to add (although a number of evenings with commitments in October), although he will be away at some point in November, dates not yet confirmed.

**Proposed Forum meeting on 24th October.**

1. CP raised the question as to whether SG members thought that we could still produce a Plan that we were confident with for this planned meeting, bearing in mind the tasks still to be completed in the light of the advices received from Sarah and the NPIERS Healthcheck. It was noted that if we were still to hold the meeting, the Plan must be completed at the latest by 9th October in order to be on the website on the 10th, with a digest being available at the same time. The unanimous decision was that, with regret, this was not achievable and, therefore, the proposed Forum meeting should be cancelled.
2. This decision lead to a number of immediate needs. **DC will notify the King Ecgbert** School of the cancellation of the room booking; and would check for an alternative date (see item 11 below). **CP will notify** Sarah, Adele, the Village Centre Residents Group, members of the WGs, members of the DVS committee and Hartley’s Cabin and the Dore Cafe. **CP will also put** an announcement of the postponement on NEXT DOOR.
3. **CP will write** an explanatory note to be sent to all DVS members for whom we have email addresses (and speak to Kath Lawrence about sending this out); and also prepare a notice for the DVS noticeboards and for display in village shops. **CP will also** informJohn Eastwood and write an article for Dore to Door explaining the decision (acknowledging that this will not be published until after the date of the proposed meeting).
4. PR stressed, and others agreed, that we could now not ease off as there was so much to do and that we should develop a timetable for each activity so that we ended up properly prepared well in advance of the next deadline that we set ourselves.
5. The debate then moved on to when the new date for the Forum meeting should be. It was accepted that we could not guess when the SCC would produce their consultation document, given the several lengthy delays that had occurred to date, and so this could not be a factor in choosing the date. Although a number of the items flagged up for review may only take a short time to amend, others had more substance; and in practical terms the time available before the Christmas period was less than two months, with Christopher now away for two weeks. Also, the revised draft would have to be ready for publication about three weeks before the meeting date. The decision was taken to schedule the Forum meeting for the end of February 2018, the week after the schools half term: **DC will check** with King Ecgbert’s if Wednesday 28th February was free to book.
6. Working on this timescale would mean that the revised draft Plan would need to be completed by the end of January.
7. In terms of the timescale subsequent to this, there was only a limited discussion but it was noted that after the Forum meeting we would have to print up our draft Plan, taking account of any comments received at the Forum meeting; and that we would have to be clear that this was then the final version. It was currently unclear to members; but it may not be possible to alter a draft Plan once it has been sent in for the pre-submission stage, or perhaps it could be altered after this until the final version had formally been submitted to the planning authority. This needs to be checked.
8. It was also noted that we needed to allow sufficient time for a considered proof reading to take place.

**Comments from NPIERS Healthcheck**.

1. DC noted that this was an important document as it will also go to the Examiner. He had spoken to Deborah who had apologised for the terseness in the document and because she had been unable to incorporate in her comments the hoped for advice on improving our Policies etc so that they were compliant. She was still offering to do this.
2. The question was raised as to why we didn't just wait until we had revised our draft Plan and then seek this further advice. DC argued that it would be helpful to have a fuller document from her now, both for the further advice it would contain which would help us, and also because it should mean that her finished document would hopefully be a better one for the sight of the Examiner. Otherwise the current one received, which at this stage was only a *draft* wouldbecome the one sent to the Examiner.
3. **It was agreed** that we should engage NPIERS to expand their comments on the Plan sent to them; and that we should budget for a further two days work from Deborah on this. **DC will draw up a short brief** to be sent to Deborah and would circulate this to SG members tomorrow, so as to receive any comments before he contacted Deborah.
4. The possibility was raised of us seeking further consultation advice from Deborah after we have completed our revision of our draft Plan. **It was agreed** that we could decide on this at a later stage; but such further advice could be very useful in preparing our draft, not least in terms of our thoughts about a revised Housing Policy. **DC** believes that we can not have a second formal Healthcheck; but he **will check this** with Deborah. If the answer is no, then we would have to view this as us simply engaging her as a consultant.

**Policy Reviews**.

1. It was agreed that the most important Policy to be reviewed related to Housing. There was concern that the overwhelming views of the community were for limited new development in Dore and yet we had to meet the terms of the NPPF which required that we were in conformity with the need for sustainable development and the local authority’s strategic plans for further housing. A number of thoughts were put forward on this; and **CP offered to draw up** a first possible wording along the lines discussed.
2. Further thought for debate was provided by Sarah’s observation in her September 2017 advice, that if the Dore community felt that there was a particular need in Dore for a certain mix of properties (bearing mind, inter alia, the higher than average proportion of elderly people living in Dore), then perhaps we should consider a planning policy requiring a particular housing mix. However, DC observed that it was virtually impossible to specify that a particular development should, for instance, be comprised only of bungalows. Nevertheless, this is an idea that could be considered further.
3. **It was agreed** that we should extend our wording so that it did not restrict development to the same footprint: it was noted that there had been several recent new buildings that were in a former garden and yet simply fronted the highway (i.e. were not backlands development).
4. The need for a stronger evidence base in respect of the proposed Local Green Spaces was raised. **PR is to give some thought** to this in order to try and initiate further consideration of what else is needed in order to address the Advice criticisms received.

**Next Steps.**

1. It was accepted that there was insufficient time and evidence available for us sensibly to construct a plan this evening for all the further action needed. In this context DRB quoted from his own summary of the many outstanding tasks facing us. **DRB was asked to circulate** the note from which he had quoted so that it could be a starting point for the completion of a comprehensive list of tasks to be addressed.
2. This process would then be set fully in motion at the next meeting of the SG which, due to the cancellation of the Forum meeting, would now be on Tuesday 24th October.
3. In the meantime, **DC would circulate the updated version** of the draft Plan. He had already updated it to take account of virtually all the comments received on his latest draft circulated last week; and re-circulating it now would enable all SG members further to review the current version of the draft Plan, acknowledging that significant parts of it are likely to change substantially as we continue our review.
4. In this context, CP raised the possibility of the draft being sent in a form which enabled other SG members to amend it as they were considering it. This would be discussed further at our next meeting.

**Budget.**

1. **DC undertook to make sure that** the next meeting of the DVS committee would be advised of the further likely costs associated with the DNP process. This would cover the immediate additional work by Deborah, together with a possible further cost of consultation and printing when we have completed our next draft Plan. Overall, the costs being incurred on this project were still significantly less than were first envisaged.

**Date of next SG meeting.**

1. As indicated above, it was agreed that the next meeting of the SG would be on **Tuesday 24th October** at 19.30 on the DVS room. [Please note that this is a Tuesday and not our normal Wednesday evening]
2. **Note:** CP suggested that any SG member who felt moved to draft some change of approach to a Policy area should feel free to do so; but should advise others in advance and then put an “aunt sally” to the 24th meeting.

David Bearpark

5th October 2017.
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