

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

Steering Group meeting 23rd November 2016

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

Apologies and resignation

1. It was reported that Andy Pack had resigned from the Steering Group.

Minutes of the meeting held on 12th October 2016.

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record; except that it had since become clear that the reference in minute 11 to the Friends of Whirlow Gardens was incorrect. The body concerned was in fact the U3A gardeners group; and their representative had left comments at the last Consultation event.

Matters arising on the minutes.

3. Most matters arising were covered by agenda items. But, with regard to minute 12, it was noted that the meeting with central village residents was scheduled to take place in a few days time. With regard to minute 13 it was reported that a Council meeting planned for 8th December had been cancelled. Residents of Leyfield Road are opposing the car parking proposals. It was reiterated that these proposals were from the DVS, in conjunction with the Council, rather than emanating from the DNF. DC would recall WGs in January as appropriate to consider textual changes to the Plan.
4. All other matters mentioned in the minutes of the last meeting were covered by substantive items on the agenda for today's meeting.

Glossary.

5. TH was thanked for the Glossary she has prepared, which was considered to be very comprehensive. It was noted that further terms may need to be added to this as the Plan progressed.

Consultation meeting on Lower Dore Road.

6. The meeting with local residents about the proposed Lower Dore Road Conservation Area had been a good meeting and those attending were generally in favour of the proposal. Most concerns expressed related to the severe car parking problems in that area.

Meeting with CPRE.

7. An oral report was received about the meeting with the CPRE. They had confirmed their earlier concerns about the publicly reported review of the Green Belt by the Council, which was also available on the Council's website. The CPRE were also concerned that any building proposals in the four growth areas in the "confident bite-sized chunks" of the Green Belt away from the SW should be developed within a proper masterplan.
8. It was reported that further contact would be maintained with the CPRE.

SCC comments from Sarah Smith.

9. Concern was expressed that yet again the Council's timetable had slipped, this time to March. This constant moving of the deadline did not make our own planning easy.
10. It was noted that there was a requirement from the Government for all Councils to have completed the review of their Local Plans by the Spring of 2017, with the threat that if they did not do this, then the Government could take over the process. It was felt that Sheffield Council would still meet the deadline.
11. Concern was also expressed about the nature of some of Sarah's comments on our developing Plan, as expressed in the two lengthy letters she had sent. It was agreed that these were helpful in showing us what we needed to focus on; although DC noted that in some of her points she seemed not fully to take account of the Council's own existing published policies. It was agreed that we needed to have a document that provided a précis of her points and our responses so that we could decide what we needed to do. **DC agreed to produce** this document (see also minute 19 below).

12. It was noted that in her latest letter Sarah had emphasised the need for us to have a clear document summarising all the consultations we had carried out. It was agreed later in the meeting that this would be one of the documents that **DC would produce** (see minute 19).

Green Belt issues.

13. CP commented on his perception that developers were less interested in building houses in the City centre areas and were applying pressure for the release of land in the Green Belt, despite the fact that this would not satisfy the primary need, which is for more social and affordable housing. We could be facing huge opponents wanting to develop the Green Belt: he believed that the consultants DLP are fighting the Council's ranking of possible developments in the Inner City.
14. CP and DC will be meeting the Peak Park authority shortly and would take this opportunity to share views on the perceived detrimental effect on the Peak Park of any further building within the Green Belt on the edge of the Peak.
15. A query was raised as to whether we should engage Consultants to provide one own assessment of the Green Belt. This could be considered later in the process, although it was thought that probably we had sufficient information already.
16. It was noted that the Council's current policy document CS31 stated that there should be safeguards against development in the SW wedge of the City (between Glossop and Abbeydale Roads). However, the document from Sarah Smith now indicated that transport and infrastructure issues would not necessarily prohibit further housing development.

Main Actions needed and timetabling.

17. CP produced a list of the key actions that he considered were particularly critical for us over the near future. This list is set out on the final page of these minutes. Several of these key actions were subsequently specifically addressed in these minutes.
18. Several concerns were expressed that the constant delays in the Council's timescale should not mean that we should keep on deferring our progress in preparing our NP, especially as we could not rely on this being the last such delay. Our Plan had to take account of the Council's citywide Plan but we should press on with our NP now; and **it was agreed** that this is what we should do. It appeared possible that we may have to re-visit the part relating to development within the Green Belt but at least the rest of the NP would be ready.
19. It was agreed that we should produce three documents asap: the draft Basic Conditions Statement, a draft document on Consultation and a document summarising Sarah Smith's comments and our proposed responses to these. DC already had two of these in outline form; and **DC would now produce** drafts of these for SG members asap. **TH will look at** Sarah Smith's suggested methodology relating to Consultation and produce a report on this.
20. Concern was expressed that SG members should be reminded of all the future steps needed in order to bring the DNP to fruition. **CP will produce** a list of the advice that exists showing links to the sources of support and guidance in respect to the preparation of a NP.
21. **CP suggested, and it was agreed, that he should prepare** an article for the next issue of Dore to Door, setting out the concerns now developing that the Green Belt may be under threat from the building of houses and that pressure from developers may lead to development in that area being given precedence, rather than being used simply to meet the overall targets for housing after the use of inner city sites.
22. CP suggested that another meeting of the SG was arranged for early December. After discussion it was felt that this may be difficult to arrange in the light of other commitments. However, it may be possible for a few members to meet to discuss further some of the key actions and how DC might be helped with the workload, so that the next SG meeting was better prepared to make decisions.

Other Business

23. It was noted that the Council was becoming less helpful to the whole process, apart from Sarah Smith's advice letters. For instance they were not now willing to provide an improved map for the DNP area. This was something that we would now have to source and pay for privately.
24. Looking ahead to the production of the draft DNP, it was noted that Sarah had advised that we did not need to distribute a hard copy to every household in Dore. It would be acceptable to put it online, with hard copies available in a number of locations, e.g. the Library & the DVS room.

25. DC thought that it should be possible to put together a bid for grant funding in the region of £1,500 to cover the period to the end of March 2017. DC would progress this.
26. CP had replied to Historic England welcoming their idea of local heritage listing and he was confident there would be volunteers to help with this listing in due course.

Date of next Meeting.

27. The next meeting of the SG was agreed for 19.30 on Wednesday 11th January 2017.

List of Key Actions needed to be considered over the near future (see minute 17).

- * deepen our research into how the Green Belt review is being handled by SCC and whether their methodology had been consulted on
- * consider doing our own Green Belt review
- * create a group to look at national guidance on producing Neighbourhood Plans which can advise where we are OK in what we are doing and where we might be falling short
- * specifically consider what evidence base we need; what consultation we should be conducting and how it should be managed, recorded and taken into account; what a Basic Conditions Statement would look like and entail.
- * ask DC to circulate to us all any SCC advice received on the form of our Plan and its policies BEFORE new Steering Group members joined the process last November
- * consider how are we going to produce a high quality digitised map for the finished Plan
- * produce a staged timetable from now to the referendum with some estimated realistic timescales
- * investigate the nature and degree of support we are entitled to receive from our planning authorities
- * better reflect in our Plan the sequential hierarchy in Citywide Options for Growth and its implications for Dore and do we need to go public on our concerns before March
- * consider how to re-approach the Housing Areas section of the Plan to answer some of the SCC criticism and advice
- * consider how the Neighbourhood Centre policy section needs to be re-written.

David Bearpark
27th November 2016