

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

Steering Group meeting 14th March 2018

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

Apologies

1. Apologies were received from Thelma Harvey.

Minutes of the meeting held on 14th February 2018.

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.
3. It was noted that those items mentioned on the agenda had been completed. After further discussion about using Survey Monkey, it was agreed that, at this stage, it would be more relevant to be organised by the DVS. **JD will liaise** with KS over this.

Minutes of the sub-committee meeting held on 6th March 2018.

4. It was noted that in minute 9, the reference should be to DN7, not DN17. Also, minute 4 refers to amalgamating a number of the slides, whereas the decision was to *group* certain slides together for the purpose of pausing for questions.
5. Otherwise, the minutes were agreed as a correct record.
6. **Forum meeting arrangements.**
 - With regard to the checklist of actions for the Forum meeting, DC has still to provide KS with his timings for each slide so that KS can produce the finalised schedule of slides. **DC will provide this** to KS asap.
 - **KS will then re-circulate** the slides.
 - JD needed to ask the schools to publicise the meeting. **JD will do this asap.**
 - KS noted that it had now been possible to email all DVS members who had provided email addresses and this amounted to 723 members. This was welcomed; and, as a consequence it was agreed that it was no longer necessary for the banner to be altered and displayed (the meeting is just for DVS members!).
 - All other actions mentioned in the minutes had been undertaken.
 - It was agreed that in his introduction **KS should** emphasise that there had been 2.5 years of consultation and widespread publicity; and so the purpose of this meeting was to concentrate on the resultant Policies and not debate the details of the Plan.
7. **Amendments to the draft Plan.** The following amendments were agreed:
 - The wording of the final paragraph in DN12 should be changed to read “Where boundary walls, gate piers, fences and gates make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, proposals for their demolition will not be supported.”
 - Wording should be added into DN16 to state that arrangements should be made to avoid an increase in on-street parking in developments.
 - In paragraph 5.22, the word “vehicular” should be removed.
 - In DN7, the final sentence of the Policy before the listing of the proposed local green spaces should be deleted.
 - At the end of paragraph 11.8, an extra sentence should be included in line with the proposal from KS in his email of 10th March 2018.
 - Also, on page 7 of the Plan, in the ante-penultimate paragraph, the reference to the Forum meeting should be changed to March 2018, with that change also being applied to the ante-penultimate line on page 8.
8. It was agreed that these changes did not need formally to be put to the Forum meeting, provided that the meeting did, as recommended, give to the SG the authority to make minor changes to the text of the Plan.
9. **DC will make the above changes** to the text of the Plan.

Sarah Smith's emails (8th and 9th March 2018).

10. There was extensive discussion on these emails, based on views already shared and the late email of 14th March from CP, which itemised the key points to which we needed to respond.
11. It was agreed that the answers to the points in CP's email were:
 - That the website version of the Plan is the same as the one sent to Sarah.
 - Also that it is still possible for us to make minor changes to it.
 - Our assumption is that the pre-submission process will start no later than 6th April.
 - Sarah seems most definitely to be confusing and wrongly linking the three aspects being considered: SEA Screening, Equality assessment and Conformity with SCC Policies. For example, even if we were judged to be not in conformity with SCC core policies, this in itself would not mean that an SEA was required.
 - The emphasis in everything about the SEA is whether or not any *negative* environmental impacts are identified.
 - It was noted that the current SCC Core Strategy existed before the NPPF was produced and, as such, it is out of step with the NPPF in not taking account of NPPF paragraph 53 on residential gardens, whereas we are trying to be up to date with emerging guidance.
 - However, it was agreed that we should remove the word "significant" from paragraph 6.14 of the draft Plan, as this word was not used in the NPPF.
 - With regard to Sarah's point about equality, this surely does not make any sense. We could consider emphasising that DN6 would release larger homes to meet the needs of young families.
 - The reply would be sent to Sarah and not to the head of department.
12. **CP will prepare a draft reply** to Sarah and will circulate it to SG members for comments, prior to emailing it to Sarah (and Adele).

Pre-submission Consultation.

13. Minute 12 of the minutes of the sub-group meeting of 6th March were discussed and the conclusions as set out in those minutes were endorsed by the SG.
14. Additionally it was agreed that PR would work with TH in aggregating comments received (5th bullet point).
15. With regard to locations where the Plan could be inspected, it was suggested that additional locations could be the Methodist Church lobby, the Christ Church office on Townhead Road and Tolley Library. Other ideas welcome!

Timetabling Issues.

16. The earliest dates for the next stages in the process were considered to be:
 - Pre-submission process to commence on 6th April.
 - Pre-submission stage then completed by 18th May.
 - At this point we need to consider responses received, produce a full schedule of those responses and consider whether any changes are needed to the Plan. It was decided that we should allow a month to complete this.
 - Therefore by 18th June we should be ready formally to submit the Plan to the two local authorities. Perhaps the most critical question in this stage would be whether the SCC challenged the Plan as not being in conformity with the Basic Conditions. It was unclear at this point how long the local authorities could take in concluding their consideration of the Plan. DC believed that the government had recently tightened up the regulations concerning this timescale. **DC will investigate this and inform SG members.**
 - Following this, the Plan is then sent to the External Examiner. Again at this point it was unclear how long this process would take; and **DC will investigate** this too.

17. There was concern at the remaining length of the process but it was recognised that this was beyond our control.

Any Other Business.

18. KS reported that there was a gardening club meeting arranged for 21st March, which unfortunately arose because we had been obliged to change the date of the DNF meeting. However, a planned meeting of the Dore Show Committee has been moved so that members could attend the Forum meeting.

Next Meeting.

19. The next meeting of the SG was arranged for 19.30 on **Tuesday** 3rd April, the primary purpose being to review the DNF meeting and finalise the pre-submission process.

20. JD and DRB apologised in advance for their absence from this meeting.

David Bearpark
18th March 2018