

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

Steering Group meeting 6th April 2016

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

Absence

1. David Heslop was not present.

Minutes of the meeting held on 9th March 2016.

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

Matters arising on the minutes.

3. Minute 5, information packs: AP has now prepared a pack of all agenda and minutes. **AP will meet** with CP to verify what else should be part of the pack viz guidance letters.
4. Minute 5, WG secretaries: CP has written as agreed.
5. Minute 6: See the separate item on the agenda.
6. Minute 13: Two new people have joined WGs.
7. Minute 14: One WG has a new chairman. It was noted that despite the efforts to ask others to assume the chairmanship, we cannot force people to take on that role.
8. Minute 15: This was sent out on 18th March.

Publicity and website coverage.

9. Concern was expressed that at the moment the absence of many of the appropriate documents from the website was letting down the process. The need for an upgrade of that part of the website had been discussed at the DVS committee: the problem is finding someone to do this. The view was expressed that, if necessary, we should pay to have that section of the website produced commercially. KS reported that he had spoken to Matthew and that if the documents that we wish to show there could be emailed to Matthew, in the format that we wish them to be shown, then he will upload them into that section of the website. It would be a speedy job for him. **AP undertook** to email the documents, including the several guidance documents issued to WGs, to KS by the weekend so that **KS could forward** them to Matthew on Saturday. The option of developing a new section on the website was not pursued further at this stage; we will need to see how the current proposal works out.
10. Later discussion on this same topic agreed that the documentation on the website should consist of 3 categories of documents: the formal minutes, agenda and guidance notes issued to WGs; the key documents for each WG (e.g. vision and objectives and any maps relevant to the WG); and the highlights/précis summaries referred to elsewhere in these minutes.
11. There was discussion about the prominence of the Forum information on the introductory page of the website. **KS undertook** to ensure that the Forum was the permanent first item in the news section of the website.
12. When the website has been populated with all the documents, notices to that effect will be put in the noticeboards (**AP**) and highlighted on Streetlife (**KS**).
13. PR suggested that we should leaflet all the houses in Dore with key information about what the Neighbourhood Plan was all about and what we were doing and that this should be a Forum circulation rather than from the DVS. **It was agreed** that a leaflet should be produced, in the name of the DNF, as opposed to the DVS; although DRB pointed out that it was the DVS that was the designated body as the Dore Neighbourhood Forum and that this was the c.1,000 members of the Society, not the DVS committee. As such **it was agreed** that the circulation of the leaflet could be made with the distribution of the next copy of D2D, which was scheduled to commence on 20th May. The leaflet needs to focus on a limited number of key banner headline issues. **JD, CP and DC will produce** brief sample sections for the Open Spaces, Green Belt and Housing WGs respectively and circulate them to SG members for comment. **DC will identify** individuals in the other WGs who could produce something similar. Based on these samples, **AP will produce** a dummy leaflet for circulation to SG members; and **AP will speak** to Amyra about the production of the leaflet. The **SG agreed** to fund the cost of this: **AP to**

inform CP when he has an estimate of the cost for this. *{Note: it was subsequently decided that distributing the leaflets with D2D would be too late and that a hand delivery with SG and WG member help would have to be organised in early May}.*

14. DRB reminded that the Council do press us to try to engage with as many sections of the community as possible; and referred to PR's suggestion that we send information to organisations within Dore. This principle **was agreed** and **JD undertook** to speak to the Dore Primary School about us sending information using the school's email list of parents.

Summer Consultation Event.

15. A lengthy discussion took place on the nature of Consultation events. Rather than moving straight to a draft DNP Event, DRB suggested that it would be helpful to have an earlier public meeting at which the WGs could display their progress and seek input and comments from the public. This would enable the SG to ensure that all WGs had carried out appropriate consultation and hopefully get more involvement from the community. Potential problems with this approach were raised; and this led CP to the observation that although we are going to put all the minutes on the website, they were not necessarily very helpful as the various documents discussed at the meetings and amended and then approved, were not attached as part of the minutes. **We needed to give some further thought** to this issue; but having a WG workshop would enable all such documents to be displayed. **It was agreed that a WG workshop** should be held. This would not take the place of individual consultations that a WG may do. Also, it was right that others in the community had an early chance to comment on all the proposals (the Conservation Group should rightly meet specifically with the residents who may be affected by a proposal for another conservation area but the wider community should also be given an early opportunity to comment).
16. Each WG will need to put together a précis of what they are doing and their proposals to date. Based on the brief highlights being produced for the leaflet (see point 13 above) **JD, CP and DC will expand** those highlights into a broader summary for the purposes of the WG workshop. These will be circulated to SG members for comments and will subsequently be sent to the other WGs as examples of what is needed. **DC will then identify** individuals in the other WGs who could produce something similar.
17. This workshop will basically consist of seven stalls displaying material from each WG, including especially the vital documents not incorporated with the minutes as referred to earlier. It was agreed that either the Church Hall or the Methodist Church Hall would be suitable for this event. It was agreed that a weekday evening was appropriate and a date of 25th May was agreed. On Monday **JD will check** on the availability of the Church Hall for 18.00 to 21.00, with the workshop to start at 18.30.
18. It was agreed that there must be one more meeting of each WG during April so that progress can be made and preparation for the workshop undertaken. **DC will ensure** that those WGs which have not yet arranged their next meeting will do so and meet during April.
19. Discussion then moved onto the subsequent stages. It was agreed that the WGs should meet again early in June, following the workshop, and produce their updated recommendations for the SG by the end of June. The SG would then need to reflect on those recommendations and use them to produce a Draft Neighbourhood Plan. This would need to be completed by the end of July in order to go out for consultation. It will need to be distributed to all households in Dore and placed on the DVS website.
20. It was agreed that the Exhibition/Public meeting to present the Plan to residents should be earmarked for the second half of September; and a provisional date of Saturday 24th September was agreed. **DC will speak** to the room booking service at King Egbert's to make this booking (probably from c.10.00 to 17.00); and subject to confirming that this is booked, **DRB will speak** to Martin Dudley to book his organisation which, it has been agreed, will organise the process and summarise the event for us. It was **also agreed** that we will have a stall at the Dore Show, which is on 10th September.
21. Following this public meeting, the SG will need to consider the results of the public consultation and then present the Draft Neighbourhood Plan to a meeting of the DNF. Early November was thought possible for this, although no specific date was proposed. DC noted that at stages in this process we will also need to keep the two local authorities informed of our progress.

22. KS had presented a document summarising what we said to the first meeting of the DNF in November 2015. It was agreed that what was being agreed at today's meeting did not conflict with those details.
23. In the context of publicity in D2D, **KS will** advise the editor that he needs to reserve one full page in each issue of the magazine for information about the DNF. **CP will write** an article for the April edition, incorporating the key banner points for each WG; the copy deadline is 26th April. The publication date of this issue (20th May) means that it should, just, make all households aware of the WG workshop on 25th May.
24. The publication date for the following issue of D2D will be c.19th August, with the deadline for copy being c. 25th July. This seems to fit in with the next stages of the process.
25. **CP will write** to all WG group members setting out the timetable and indicating what they need to do to prepare for the WG workshop.

Working Groups.

26. DC noted that one important question arising from the Transport Group was whether or not we wanted to press for more park and ride capacity. This needed to be linked in with the work of the FoDaTs group.
27. Concern was expressed that the Peak District WG did not have sufficiently wide a membership to represent a range of views rather than over-focussing on criticism of the land management of Blacka Moor. DC has spoken to Dawn Biram about this.
28. CP wondered whether the wording of the vision statements for the Peak District, Green Belt and Housing Areas could be amended to appear less self-serving for Dore. Although what the WGs were saying was essentially the same as in Sheffield Council's draft Plan, nevertheless it could come across as being "elitist" Dore. Care should be taken to re-present the views in a wider context than just Dore.
29. DC agreed to re-circulate the WG schedule when the next set of meetings had been arranged.
30. DC reported that the process related to the national funding available to the DNF was getting more complicated. The principle of the funding is agreed but there are still some more mechanics to go through. Sheffield Council will not agree to be the grant holding body, so we need to find an incorporated body that will hold the funds on our behalf. **Members to give** this some thought.

Next Meeting.

31. The next meeting of the SG was agreed for 7.30pm on Wednesday 4th May 2016.

SUMMARY OF KEY DATES

The following brings out from the above text the **key dates** agreed.

1. WG workshop Wednesday 25th May.
2. WG group updates to the SG by the end of June.
3. Preparation of a Draft Neighbourhood Plan by the SG to be completed by the end of July.
4. Publication of the Draft DNP during early August.
5. Public Consultation/Exhibition on Saturday 24th September (provisional)
6. SG then to conclude the proposed Draft DNP by mid-October.
7. Formal meeting of the DNF to consider the proposed Draft DNP. No date fixed, but *possibly* early November.

David Bearpark
7th April 2016