

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

Steering Group meeting 10th June 2019

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

Apologies

1. There were no apologies.

Minutes of the meeting held on 15th May 2019.

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

Matters arising on the Minutes.

3. With reference to minute 3, JD reported that she had approached the company and given them extracts from the DNP so that they could produce an alternative version for us to consider. Unfortunately she had not yet received the example. They had indicated the rate they would charge for doing this; and **the SG agreed** that this rate was acceptable. It was agreed that there were three critical steps in the process: we had to approve the design; we would need to proofread their final version; and we would need confirmation that they would be able to complete the job within our timescale. With regard to this last point, it was noted that if we decided to submit a draft version of the DNP to the SCC, this could be the currently designed version, with the more user- friendly version being ready for the final submission and subsequent publicity. **JD will chase the firm for the examples and circulate them to SG members. JD will also seek clarification** that the firm would be able to schedule the work to meet our timelines. Clearly, if we liked their alternative, then the first requirement would be for us to have a settled text for the Plan: this should be available very shortly after the meeting of the Forum.
4. With regard to minute 10, the holiday schedule, JD will re-circulate this so that SG members can add to it if appropriate.
5. With regard to minute 14, DC reported that the most recent version of the Plan which he circulated today (10th June) incorporated all the suggestions from CP for additions to the Glossary, apart from one which had been addressed elsewhere in the Plan.
6. All other matters arising were covered by other agenda items.

Progress on DVS re-designation.

7. DRB reported that he had sent the formal application to both the SCC and the PDPNA on 23rd May. The two authorities have agreed that SCC will lead the process.
8. He further reported that on 3rd June he had received formal notification from SCC that the submission for re-designation had now been validated and that SCC had agreed with Adele that the formal 6 week consultation will run [from Wednesday 5th June to Wednesday 17th July 2019](#).
9. Following a request from SCC, we have since received posters for display in Dore; and also a pdf version of the poster which has on it two links — one to the SCC website and one to the PDPNA's website — ;and these are now on the DVS website. An announcement has also been put on the Dore and Totley Facebook page.

Forum meeting 19th June 2019.

10. In terms of general progress, DRB noted that he had been in touch with SG members in the period since the last SG meeting about most of the actions noted at that meeting; and the remaining issues to be resolved were itemised on tonight's agenda.
11. With regard to publicity, all the actions noted at the last meeting had been completed— the banner, notices on the website and noticeboards, Facebook page and Twitter.

12. CP noted that he had produced an updated set of slides. There were no further comments on these, and so they were agreed. **CP will give the final version** of these to KS tomorrow and **KS will then produce** these in Powerpoint format. **KS will also arrange to print out 50** copies of these for the Forum meeting.
 13. It was agreed that it was important that a **list of Policies** was available for people attending the meeting and also some were needed in advance to be placed in Hartleys. After discussion it was agreed that the simplest way of aggregating the Policies was as an extract from the main Plan document. So the action needed was:
 - **JD compiled** that extract and emailed it to DC (this is in “word” & so amendable).
 - **DC will amend** Policy wording for the grammatical corrections identified by DRB.
 - **DC will, for consistency,** use Roman numerals for sub-sections within Policies.
 - **DC will then email** this final version of the list of Policies to all SG members.
 - **JD will then produce** 20 copies and provide these (**in a box**) to Hartleys asap.
 - **PR will note** these for the evidence record.
 - **KS will arrange** for the copies (50) needed for attendees at the meeting to be done in the DVS office prior to the Forum meeting.
 14. The presentation arrangements were discussed. KS reported that the projection would take place onto the wall at the end of the Hall farthest from the stage. This meant that the chairs stored at that end would need to be moved; and **all SG members agreed** to be at the Hall promptly at 7.30pm.
 15. In terms of the equipment, JD had determined that her laptop and projector were compatible. These would be used for the meeting and **JD would operate** the displays.
 16. **PR would bring his** projector as a backup.
 17. The speaking texts for each slide, as produced by CP, were accepted as providing a good framework.
 18. In terms of presentations, KS will formally introduce and close the meeting; CP will introduce the background to the meeting and the work undertaken to date; DC will speak to the slides; CP will close that section of the meeting. Finally, DRB will seek the authority of the meeting to the four questions posed in the last slide (19).
 19. In terms of questions KS, as chairman, will note that questions will be sought after each speaker has completed his presentation.
 20. **CP will prepare a brief agenda and send this to KS.**
 21. **KS will arrange for someone** to man the door to admit only DVS members or accept new requests to join.
 22. DRB will take the minutes of the meeting.
- Progress towards finalising the Neighbourhood Plan.**
23. DRB had proofread the text of the DNP version 22nd May from DC and there were a number of corrections needed. It was noted that these were not points of principle, rather grammatical etc corrections. DC noted that he had not yet incorporated these.
 24. CP and DRB had both commented on the need for amendments related to DN5 and DN6; and CP had sent a further email with proposed critical text amendments related to DN5 and DN6 and associated text, which he felt essential to be included.
 25. DC reported that immediately prior to this SG meeting, he had now produced a revised version of the DNP (dated 10th June) in which he had sought to incorporate these critical points. DRB noted that he had read this and there were a couple of points that needed further tweaking. **DRB will send those to DC who will make the changes.**
 26. In terms of finalising the text of the DNP, following the incorporation of these critical items there were no other textual changes proposed. DC did note that he had just received an updated planning document (220 pages) from the PDPNA. However, it was agreed that we should now call a stop to further amendments.

27. Accordingly, it was agreed that **DC would now amend** the document for the grammatical corrections identified (see minute 21 above) and **then circulate it** to SG members as the final version.
28. **DRB would check this** next version for the accuracy of the amendments; but any further proofreading would await a decision as to whether we were to change to a more user-friendly version — which itself would need to be completely proofread.
29. This version of the DNP would then need to be put on the website — we had stated that it would be available there in advance of the Forum meeting. **DRB would confirm to KS** that the amendments had been completed and **KS would then arrange for the Plan** to be uploaded to the DVS website.

Supporting Documents.

30. PR summarised the purpose of the **Consultation Statement**, i.e. to show that we had reflected in the Plan what the community had indicated that they wanted. He also outlined the key elements of the Statement. In terms of the various comments made and changes actioned, it was not always clear cut which had resulted specifically from the Pre Submission Consultation and so he had simply précised the changes without attribution. This approach was supported. **CP volunteered to spend time** over the next few days contributing to PR's work on the final column responses to the P-SC comments.
31. **PR would then finalise this Statement and Clare would proofread it.**
32. After the Forum meeting, **PR would produce** the final version. **DRB would proofread the 12 page summary text.**
33. In terms of the **Basic Conditions Statement**, DC noted that this was an important document as it was the critical question in the publicity and examination stages: "does the Plan meet the Basic Conditions?".
34. CP noted that within the Basic Conditions Statement, it was important that the paragraph numbers quoted in reference to the NPPF had been correctly amended to refer to the latest version of the NPPF and that it included all the NPPF and Local Plan Policies quoted in full in earlier versions of the Plan. **CP will read** the Statement to check this.
35. It was agreed that we would be submitting the Plan on the basis of the earlier SEA/HRA screening opinion from the SCC. The SCC had already indicated that as part of their validation process they would need to satisfy themselves that any amendments to the DNP were not significant enough to require a new screening opinion.
36. DC reported that he had received an updated Village Centre Map from the PDPNA including the abutting housing areas. Also he had a new DNF Area Map but it was too large for him to open, so he needed to arrange for a smaller version. JD noted that free software (wetransfer) was available for such large documents.
37. PR noted that KS now had a full copy of the whole archive related to the supporting documents for the DNP, so there was now adequate back-up.
38. PR noted that in terms of Evidence, there were essentially two types: government and public documents, and reports/consultation produced by ourselves.
39. **PR agreed that he would remind** CP and DC of the list of evidence that he is offering in the documentation he is putting together for SCC, so that **CP and DC can check** to see if they thought anything was missing.

Submission.

40. DRB re-iterated that the information he had received from Sarah Smith (SS) was that the earliest that the Local Development Scheme could be put to a full Council was on 4th September; and that this presentation may even then simply set out the timetable for the publication of the Reg18 document, rather than incorporate that document's publication within the presentation of the Scheme.

41. He also noted that if we opted to submit a draft Plan, SS had offered two levels of consideration of this Plan by the SCC. The first was a Validation check that all the documents required had been submitted and that they contain the information relating to the necessary criteria. This review should be completed within 6 weeks. The second was also to advise on whether there were issues which may possibly lead to a less successful examination, and whether the information provided was at the right level of detail and the right approach as would be expected by the examiner. With this option, SS could not commit to this being completed within 6 weeks.
 42. The SG agreed that we must seek to make our final formal submission before the publication of the Reg18 document; but also that there was merit in allowing SCC to carry out a draft submission validation check, especially as it seemed clear that this would be completed well before the September Council, this allowing us to make our final submission before then.
 43. Accordingly it was agreed that we would make a draft submission and that we would opt for the first option offered by SCC.
 44. DRB noted that SS had requested information asap on when the DNF (whether draft or otherwise) would be submitted, so that she could schedule the validation process within the Council departments. After discussion, it was agreed that we should be able to finalise matters so that we could submit in the first week of July.
 45. **DRB will inform SS tomorrow that we will submit a draft (for their speedier validation check) and that it will be sent to SCC by Friday 5th July.**
- Date of next meetings.**
46. It was agreed to meet on Monday 24th June to agree the impact of the Forum meeting on the documentation and to finalise what still needed to be done to complete all the supporting documentation.
 47. There would then be another meeting on Wednesday 3rd July to sign off the package of documents for submission to SCC the next day.

David Bearpark
11th June 2019