

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

54th Steering Group meeting, 14th January 2021

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

Minutes of the meeting held on 7th October 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, it was agreed that this had now been overtaken by events.
3. With reference to minute 6, DC reported that he thought that SCC did appear keen to limit Green Belt development. CP noted that he had attended (virtually) several planning meetings; and had been impressed by the extent to which both officers and all Council Members had talked about how they had a duty to protect the Green Belt.
4. With regard to minute 7, it was pleasing to see that we had got the right decision.
5. Regarding the comments we had made on the Council's Issues and Options Consultation document, it was noted that we would not hear anything further until the next iteration of the SCC Plan, at which point we would see the extent to which our comments had been listened to.
6. **CP will be preparing** another report for the next edition of D2D.
7. With reference to minute 20, we had commented on the Examiner's questions.

The Examiner's Report.

8. In general, all members felt that the Report was a positive one. The Examiner had cut out a lot of historical and superfluous material, although this did also mean that a lot of the "emotional" element of the Plan had been lost.
9. It was particularly noted that the Examiner had accepted that the DNP, as amended by his recommendations, did meet the Basic Conditions; and that he had been very warm about the Consultation process we had followed. It was also noted that a lot of the professional advice that we had followed in preparing the DNP had been stripped out.
10. It was agreed that we should use the paper from CP as the starting point for the discussion on the report, beginning with his appendix as well as his more detailed analysis.
11. It was noted that the advice from Debbie was that we should only focus on factual errors, and not see this as an opportunity to negotiate or challenge the content of the Report.
12. The first BP (bullet point) in the appendix (the absence of a date of the DNP) was agreed as a legitimate one to raise.
13. With regard to the 2nd BP (para 67) it was decided that this was likely to be viewed by the Examiner as further unnecessary and superfluous narrative; and so it was agreed that this should not be pursued.
14. CP's third BP was agreed — the Examiner's third BP was a duplication of what had been said at para 89.
15. In CP's longer analysis of the Report, he also raised a point about the CIL. It was agreed that we would not pursue this.
16. In terms of Open Access Land it was agreed not to enquire further of the PDNPA as to whether they have a more accurate planning policy than our original.

17. With regard to the Examiner's para 102, the title change meant that it would now have wider application than with the previous title, applying to the whole of the DNP Area.
18. Returning to CP's appendix, it was agreed that in respect of the fourth BP, we should definitely raise this point about the Objective background to the terminology that we had used. Otherwise, the slight change to the title of DN2 was not of concern.
19. Looking next at CP's longer analysis, it was agreed that the lengthy section relating to para 116 should not be part of our response. This appeared to be very much a *negotiation*, rather than a point of fact. DC also noted that his understanding of the process was that this stage was to be solely related to factual matters (as Debbie had stated), but that after the Examiner had produced his final Report, there was then a stage at which the LPA and the Qualifying Body had a period in which to discuss and negotiate over modifications to the Examiner amended DNP. **DC will research this and circulate** the actual reference to this point, so that we can be quite certain of this step in the process. **CP will also speak** to Peter Marsh to see what that the Broomhill NF did. [NOTE: subsequent to the meeting, DC did research this and circulated confirmation of the process as he had explained it]
20. Moving back to the appendix, and its fifth BP, it was agreed that in respect of para 111 of the Report, we should dispute the quoted terminology "valued landscapes".
21. There is a minor typographical point in his para 121, where the word "to" is used twice.
22. At the 6th BP of CP's appendix, we should raise the point about the 5th BP in the Examiner's para 126.
23. With regard to CP's 7th BP, the principle of this was agreed. However, some re-phrasing was needed to weed out parts that were presently written as a "challenge" to the Examiner.
24. Members were pleased that the DNP section relating to Long Line had been accepted.
25. Moving on to the Housing section of the DNP, although the Examiner had removed whole swathes of narrative, nevertheless his amendments retained the intent behind the Policy, but lost the specific wording which restricted tandem developments. It was felt that the narrative that had been removed, rather than having been wasted, could be viewed as having been instrumental in convincing the Examiner that the Policy was sound.
26. With regard to DN6, on balance it was realistic to accept what he has said, as it conserves the intent that the provision of smaller homes in Dore will be supported.
27. CP's point at the 8th BP of his appendix, regarding the clarity of the Examiner's intentions (at his para 150) about the DNP paras 6.19 and 6.20 was supported.
28. Moving on to Local Green Space, the outcome here was also welcomed. In terms of defining and mapping the boundaries clearly, **DC will contact the person** in the PDPNA to obtain this.
29. CP's 9th BP (re para 6.25) was agreed.
30. Similarly, CP's 10th BP (re para 141 of the NPPF applying to Local Green Spaces) was also agreed.
31. Looking next at Policy DN8, it was noted that our proposed Policy did need amending; and it was agreed that at least his amendment salvaged something. The Examiner's recommendations with regard to Policies DN9 and DN10 were accepted.
32. It was felt that the Examiner had not fully appreciated that Policies DN11 and DN13 were addressing different areas, and as a consequence our view was that Policy DN13 should not be deleted.
33. All the other recommendations by the Examiner were accepted as factually accurate.
34. In general terms it was pleasing that what we had proposed as Proposals had survived, albeit to be termed "Aspirations" (which was in fact the title of that section within our DNP).

35. **CP will now prepare a revised** response to be sent, via Debbie, to the Examiner. He will circulate it to SG members asap for comments, so that a final version can be agreed by the beginning of next week.

Timetable to the Referendum.

36. It was noted that in normal times we might now reasonably expect that this would be held at the same time as the May local elections.

37. However, with the impact of Covid, it was not now clear whether or not these Local Elections would be delayed. We will just have to wait and see.

Grey (Call for Sites) site at Dore Moor.

38. It had become clear that the proposal for the use of the Dore Moor Garden Centre site, together with a large additional amount of adjacent land, was from the DLP consultancy in respect of a proposed retirement village.

39. Whilst the proposal was, in principle, an interesting one, it would be in an entirely inappropriate location. It would be intruding significantly into the sensitive landscape adjacent to the National Park, and would have significantly more impact than the proposal just rejected by the SCC on Long Line.

40. Ironically it would also be located immediately adjacent to the Ethel Haythornthwaite memorial plantation!

Any Other Business.

41. The question of the OS licence for the DVS had been raised by John Eastwood. It was noted that this had been confirmed at the time of the preparation for the DNP. **KS will advise JE.**

42. A date for a further meeting of the SG was not confirmed. This will be arranged by email when considered necessary.

43. KS was thanked for again arranging this meeting via Zoom.

David Bearpark
18/01/21