

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

53rd Steering Group meeting, 7th October 2020

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

Minutes of the meeting held on 16th September 2020.

1. The minutes were agreed as a correct record. **CP will arrange** for them to be posted on the DVS website.

Matters arising on the Minutes.

2. With regard to minute 2, CP reported that he had chased Chris Heeley on 17th September but had not received a reply. There was concern that this was a pattern with the politicians at SCC, where difficult queries were just ignored. It was agreed that **CP will write** to Simon Vincent, Colin Ross and the Chief Planning Officer, to request confirmation that at any planning meeting the correct information about the status of the DNP is presented.
3. With reference to minute 4, CP reported that he had submitted a budget to the DVS committee, which would agree the full DVS budget at its next meeting.
4. CP noted that, with respect to minute 25, he had received clarification from the SCC that in fact there were no appendices 10 to 12 to the Issues and Options document.
5. CP also noted that he had provided information, as indicated in minute 27.
6. Minute 31 referred to the briefing meeting that had been arranged with SCC. CP reported that this had been a very positive and helpful meeting. DC stated that he gained the impression that the SCC were not keen on development in the Green Belt.
7. With reference to minute 35, CP reported that following the submission of a revised set of documents for the proposed development on Long Line, he had revised and submitted the objection on behalf of the DNF. He had recently emailed this to SG members. DC had also prepared an objection for the DVS; and there had been strong objections from CPRE, the Wildlife Trust and the Residents of Long Line.
8. All other matters arising were referred to as agenda items.

Dore Neighbourhood Plan.

9. With regard to the Consultation, it was agreed that the DNF should be entitled to see any comments that may be made during the Consultation period — they will, after all, be sent to the Examiner. **CP will write to Debbie Merrill** at the conclusion of the Consultation period (26th October) to request this information.
10. With regard to the Examination, it was noted that we had today received confirmation that three candidates had been approached for consideration to be the Examiner. [This point had been referred to in Minute 10 of the last SG meeting].

SCC Issues and Options Consultation.

11. It was noted that the DVS committee had now prepared a response to this document, supporting the points being raised by the SG on behalf of the DNF.
12. The meeting then concentrated on reviewing the latest draft response from the SG, which had been updated by CP and DC, and circulated to SG members.
13. During this discussion, there were a number of minor grammatical corrections which were identified, and these were noted by DC and CP for correction.
14. It was noted that although in the SCC maps Dore was referred to in several market areas, the most appropriate one was Area 7, as this was the one that most closely reflected the Area of the DNP.

15. As the discussion proceeded, a number of points were debated, the key ones being:
- In the second paragraph of Q3, the wording should “agree” with the intention that new housing development should occur close to.....; and refer to the fact that this what SCC itself suggests.
 - Under the final para relating to Q20a, we should make a reference to the wording in the box on page 41 of the SCC document.
 - Under Q20a, we should bring in the proposed comment relating to biodiversity.
 - There needs to be a response to Q22b, to state that our explanation of our answer to Q22a is in the following paragraphs.
 - In the first sentence on Q23a, after “We strongly support” put the next 3 points as bullet points, and not as continuous text. Then “We observe that...” as a new para.
 - Then the next para should commence along the lines of: “So, the following paragraphs set out our suggestions about other options to be proposed”.
 - It was agreed to keep the headings of “growth” and “renewal” for the suggestions at the subsections a) to d). However, under d) we should make references to the absence of other arguments for retaining as Green Belt the areas mentioned e.g. Norton being Brownfield, and low Green Belt scores and biodiversity. It was also noted that Green Belt must have a feeling of permanence.
 - It was noted that if the SCC final Plan does not include sufficient land for development, then it will be an easy target for attack by developers.
 - With regard to Q26, it was agreed that something should be said here about High Landscape Value.
 - It was thought that the wording in point 4 under Green Belt was very Dore specific. Accordingly, it was agreed that the first para under 4 and the first bullet point should be combined as one paragraph. The following bullet points should then be prefaced by wording such as: “In that context, our answers to your Q24 about the specific grey sites set out in the Dore Area are set out in the following paragraphs”.
 - Then the para after point 5 in this section should commence with: “So, returning specifically to Q24 and the grey sites shown, our appraisal.....”
 - The table was agreed, with a number of grammatical corrections, and variations to several of the references to transport. Also, the insertion of a little more about the protection afforded by the Open Spaces Act. It was noted that it was impossible to identify any SCC reference numbers to these specific sites.
 - With regard to Q29, it was agreed that we should suggest that out of the current SCC policies, the High Landscape Value Policy should be retained.
 - It was agreed that we should expect to be consulted by the SCC Planners as they develop their thinking on the Green Belt sites marked on the HELAA map. We should add wording to this effect in our response to the SCC document.
16. **DC will now amend the draft, pass it to CP who will review it, following which CP will then circulate it to SG members.**
17. With regard to keeping Dore informed, CP will write an update article for D2D, although it was recognised that the publication dates for this meant that matters would have moved on by the time that it was published.
18. It was noted that NPIERS, on the advice of the SCC, has only allocated 5 days for the Examiner to review the DNP. This suggested that it was not viewed as complicated.
- Any Other Business.**
19. There was no other business, other than to thank KS for again arranging the Zoom.
- Date of Next Meeting.**
20. A **provisional** date for the next meeting was agreed as Wednesday 28th October, via Zoom, mainly in case there were questions from the Examiner or if s/he had a decision to report. **KS would again make the arrangements if this meeting was required.**

David Bearpark
8th October 2020