

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

Steering Group meeting 12th October 2016

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

Apologies and resignation

1. Apologies were received from Andy Pack and Keith Shaw. It was reported that David Heslop had, with regret, resigned from the Steering Group.

Minutes of the meeting held on 24th August 2016.

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

Matters arising on the minutes.

3. With regard to minute 11, it was noted that CP had written to all members of the WGs and a copy had been circulated with the agenda.
4. All other matters mentioned on the minutes of the last meeting were covered by substantive items on the agenda for today's meeting.

Consultation Event on 1st October.

5. CP thanked all involved in assisting with the event. It had been a successful afternoon, with more than 60 people attending. Whilst we would have liked to have more attending, the event certainly succeeded in its objective and all attending had engaged in lively and challenging debate. **CP** will comment on the Event in his article for the next edition of Dore to Door. A number of particular points for the SG to address came out of the meeting as follows.
6. Overall, it was pleasing that there was substantial support for most of the policies, but some constructive criticism suggested the need for some re-thinking.
7. It was noted that in a number of instances, comments were made about the lack of some detail or of clarity over some of the wording. This was primarily a consequence of the reduction of the text of the Draft DNF displayed which was done to make the displays more compact. Most of these comments would be addressed when the full text for the DNF is presented.
8. On a related topic, it was agreed that we would produce a glossary of terms so as to avoid mis-interpretation or misunderstanding. **TH** agreed to do this. Also **DC had in hand** an improvement in the maps for the Plan.
9. We should continue to encourage more people to get involved in the DNF process; and it was pleasing that at the Event, two more people had expressed a wish to be involved. With reference to our attempts to involve younger people with families, it was noted that JD had used the school email system to email all parents about the Event.
10. With regard to further consultation, it was agreed that we should also consult the CPRE, which had previously been very involved in issues on the fringes of Dore. **CP** will arrange this.
11. There may be other informal bodies that we could consult: a Friend of Whirlow Brook Gardens had commented on the absence of consultation with them. We did not know that they existed!
12. With regard to the Village Centre WG, it is now important for us to follow up with the Consultation already planned; and we need to be sure that we involve residents as well as businesses. Residents who expressed particular concerns at the Event could be invited to join this WG. **DC to progress** these points.
13. In this context, there were several concerns expressed over the danger of deflected parking to other residential streets as a consequence of the proposed centre parking proposals. It was noted that this was a DVS proposal, rather than one emanating from the DNF; however, this was an issue to which we needed to give further thought.
14. It was noted that we have not so far quoted the capacity of the local infrastructure as a limiting factor for new residential development. If we do this we have to be able to offer clear evidence and this is by no means easy (could the school be expanded?). It is better for us to rely on the Council's own guidance as set out in CS31.

15. In the context of possible demands for further residential development, it was emphasised that we should be clear in referring in the Plan to the importance to the City of Sheffield in having the SW area of the City recognised as a prestigious residential area, attracting skilled professional and entrepreneurial people to come to Sheffield and assist its economic and cultural growth.
16. In referring to the distinctive character of our area, we need to be more specific about exactly how each local area within Dore has its own specific character, so that any attempts to develop in those areas have very clear standards by which to be judged. Accordingly, as advised by Historic England, we need to develop our Policy DN 3 so that it clearly defined those characters adequately.
17. We should see to what extent we should incorporate issues raised by the Dwell project, for instance the complete absence of pedestrian crossings in Dore.
18. Clearly one of the most controversial issues in Dore, both in the village centre and adjacent to the railway station, relates to car parking. We need to recognise that as a SG developing a Neighbourhood Plan for Dore, we are not expert enough in such issues to be able to set out the preferred solution to these problems. Our approach should preferably be to highlight the nature and extent of the problem, using this to pressurise the Council to devise solutions that are acceptable to residents. It was agreed that some members of the SG should attend the next Transport WG to develop this approach.
19. The question of the current consultation relating to the possible extension of supertram was raised. Again it was felt that this needed a lot more thought as there were both advantages and disadvantages to any suggestion of its extension to Dore along the Abbeydale Road, not least the impact on local bus services. Should this be a part of a developing Neighbourhood Plan?
20. It was agreed that we should have an annexe setting out all the Proposals within the Plan (as well as these being shown within each relevant section). **DC will produce** this.
21. It was noted that within the Transport section, Proposals 4 and 11 are the same. **DC will ensure** that this is corrected.
22. **CP would consider** whether a smaller group might meet to progress the changes above in the period up to the next SG meeting.

Grant Holding.

23. It was reported that the PDNPA had confirmed that they would hold the grant on behalf of the DNF. Unfortunately this had come too late to be of assistance with the expenditure relating to the 1st October Event, which would have to be funded by the DVS. In order to ensure that future expenditure would be covered, we needed to recognise the rules relating to this (we can only apply for funds needed within the next 6 months or before the end of the financial year, whichever is sooner; claims can only be for between £1,000 and £9,000; retrospective claims for work already carried out can not be made). **CP and DC will meet** to put together an estimate of our expenditure within the next two 6 month periods.
24. DC reported that he was in discussion with ACEOM, a consultancy provided by Locality to give some limited advice to Neighbourhood Fora. A junior consultant had received copies of our latest Report and related documentation and would be writing with her report by the end of October.

Central Dore Residents.

25. It was reported that there was now a formal Central Dore Residents Group, with the chairman being John Mason. CP had written to him; and it was agreed that CP, DC and JD should meet with this group. **CP to write** to arrange.

City Council Feedback.

26. The email received from Sarah Smith, our link person at the Council, had been circulated with the agenda. There was concern about some of her comments about housing density, which we thought were not in tune with Sheffield's current published position.
27. Also, there was concern about Sarah's suggestion that the Dore Neighbourhood Forum should itself separately approach different departments within the Council about the proposed Plan, rather than her doing this and being the liaison point with us. It was noted that the Council had received a substantial sum from the Government (thought to be at least £30,000) in respect of the Neighbourhood Fora in their area to cover the cost of assisting each Forum and they

should be using this to carry out such activities. **CP is to** consider writing to the Chief Executive about this.

28. **DC will contact** Sarah again about suitable dates for the retail workshop.

Website

29. In Keith Shaw's absence, it was not possible to get an update on progress with this. Although the problems in the speedy updating of the site had not undermined the publicity of the work of the DNF, it would have been more helpful if the website had been capable of speedy updating
30. It was however reported that there had been a positive response to the article in the last edition of Dore to Door asking for people with website experience to volunteer to help with the website. Keith was now waiting for a dummy website to be created so that he could evaluate the experience of those persons.

CP's big issues.

31. The items referred to in CP's document had been covered in the earlier discussions.

Forward Timetable and priorities.

32. **CP will write** an article for the next edition of Dore to Door, covering the 1st October Event.
33. **CP will also write** a summary for posting on the DVS website; and will attach to it Mandy's report on events on the day
34. The particular involvement of the CPRE many years ago in threatened development in Dore was reported. With this in mind, it was agreed that we should seek to arrange an informal meeting with that body. **CP to meet** with DC and DRB to discuss and pursue this possibility
35. With regard to other necessary consultations, the list prepared by CP was agreed. Those in the "intended" section not already mentioned would be initiated by the SG in due course.
36. There also needed to be informal consultations with the PDNPA concerning the implications of the Council's Citywide options for Growth document. **CP will initiate this.**
37. Formal liaison with the Sheffield City Council and the PDNPA would be scheduled for later in the whole process.
38. Textual changes needed to be made to the Vision and Objectives and Policy wording in the DNF arising from the 1st October Event. **CP would take** the lead on this, in discussion with DC.
39. It was stressed that the consultations discussed and the necessary meetings of the WGs needed to have taken place before the next meeting of the SG. **DC is to make** sure that the WG meetings are scheduled.
40. In the knowledge that the Council's updated draft policies are due to be released in January, at the next meeting of the SG we need to be in the position to have refined and updated our Draft Plan so that we are in a position to respond promptly and clearly to what the Council produces.

Any Other Business

41. There were no items of any other business.

Date of next meeting.

42. The date of the next meeting was agreed for 7.30pm on Wednesday 23rd November 2106.

David Bearpark
17th October 2016