

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

Steering Group meeting 27th July 2016

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

Apologies

1. Apologies were relieved from Thelma Harvey, Andy Pack and David Heslop.

Minutes of the meeting held on 29th June 2016.

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

Matters arising on the minutes.

3. Minutes 3&4. DC reported that he had provided another 10 sets of minutes, making 20 in total. These were in the DVS room. KS would be sending the additional 10 sets to MS this weekend for uploading onto the website.
4. Minute 5. DC had received a positive response from the PDNPA, which had done this for other bodies, but was waiting for formal confirmation. **DC will pursue** then for a firm commitment.
5. Minute 9. DC had sent the up to date Draft Plan to SCC, copying the document to all WG and SG members. He had also asked SCC for answers to specific questions.
6. Minute 13. DC had told SCC that we accepted their offer but had not received a reply yet. Nor had we received any further information about our request for better maps for our Plan documentation. **DC will contact** SCC again about these issues.

Dore Show.

7. KS said that the SG would have a gazebo, table and chairs available to it prominently in the Old School car park. In terms of material for this event, it was agreed that we should produce leaflets designed to highlight the key points in the Draft Plan so far in order to stimulate interest in the October Open Meeting. We need good copies of the plans for this display. We also should have a few enlarged versions of this information to draw people to the stall. **DRB will contact** AP and ask him to speak to DC about the key items to be incorporated in this leaflet and then for **AP to design** a suitable leaflet and circulate to SG members for comment.
8. In terms of manning the stall, several members of the SG are away on 10th September. **PR will** be there and will organise things for the day. **DRB will contact TH** to see if she also can attend. **DC will identify** a few members of the WGs to be there as well.

Review of Working Groups progress and current Draft Plan document (agenda items 5 & 7).

9. To begin with, DC was congratulated on the thorough Draft Plan which he had circulated to members and the SCC. It was an excellent Draft. Each WG was then considered in detail and areas identified where the SG needed to address specific matters within the Draft or provide further input into the Draft.
10. Peak Park. It was felt that greater stress should be placed on the fact that the consultations had shown that Dore residents warmly supported the importance of preserving the views both into and out of the Peak Park not just for the benefit of Dore but also as an important attractive feature for the City of Sheffield as a whole. It was noted that there was less text relating to this WG than with the others, primarily due to the fact that it was felt that we could rely on the fact that we were supporting the clear views of the Peak Park Authority itself. It was felt that there was currently no need for a further meeting of the WG.
11. Green Belt. It was acknowledged that the SCC was currently reviewing their policy on this, together with their overall City Policy review. With this in mind, and in view of the fact that it was clear that developers were circling, it was agreed that the wording should be strengthened to make clear our support for the current policy of the SCC which is to severely restrict any development in the Green Belt. Following the WG Consultation Workshop on 25th May, we had produced a record of all the comments made by people who had attended the event. It was agreed that in a similar way we should produce a formal record of the Consultation undertaken with residents of Long Line. **CP undertook** to ask Geoff Wilson to formalise the notes that he

had taken to meet this need. The need for information on the ownership of the sports pavilion land adjacent to Hathersage Road was agreed. We should then consider writing to the owners requesting that it is tidied up. [this information was found by land registry search during the course of the meeting]. We could also consider making application for a designated footpath across that site. It was felt that there was currently no need for a further meeting of the WG.

12. Housing. The Draft did not display the data relating to areas 7 & 8. **DC to add** this. A number of the characteristics shown need to be raised up to be a Planning Policy. And the wording needed to be strengthened in several areas, particularly in the pen portraits of the 8 housing areas which needed to pin down their distinctive characteristics (**DC for action**). The feedback from the 25th May Event was mixed in this area, primarily because there were several comments about the need for affordable housing. However, this had already been discussed by the WG and it was felt that with the ongoing development of the King Egcbert site, the primary opportunity for this had been lost. This was despite the DVS's strong attempt to get the SCC to insist that such housing was provided within that development. (it was noted that SCC had approved this development despite the fact that it breached several of their own planning policies). It was felt that there was currently no need for a further meeting of the WG.
13. Open Spaces. It was felt that we should try and seek more evidence of the usage of the Green Spaces. It was also noted that we still need to arrange two further consultations, with the King Egcbert Governors and the Abbeydale Sports Field, which the WG had agreed should be carried out. It was intended that these would be written consultations; and **CP and DC will** liaise to do this. We also needed to identify ownership of the parcel of land adjacent to the Tootley Brook Open Space. **KS will pursue this**. Following the 25th May Event, it was noted that there were several interesting comments which, whilst not strictly related to the development of this Plan, may interest the DVS as community matters. The possibility of another WG meeting was left open for the time being.
14. Neighbourhood Centre. It was noted that further consultation was planned by the WG in this area; and 3 members of the WG were very keen to undertake this. **DC will meet** with these members and structure the Consultation for them to carry out. **DC will inform** the WG as a whole that this is happening; and another meeting of the WG was likely in due course.
15. Conservation. **CP**, as the Chair of the SG, will be arranging a consultation with the residents of the lower end of Dore Road about the idea of a new conservation area there. There will then probably be another meeting of the WG.
16. Sustainable Transport. It was felt that there was a need for revision to the wording of the Policy at the end of the Transport text. Otherwise, there was no need for a further meeting of the WG.
17. Annex B. This was a first rough draft from DC. At some stage, the SG needs to consider this fully, particularly as to the ranking by priority of the Proposals. It was agreed that **all SG members should** read this ready for a discussion at the next meeting of the SG.
18. General. It was agreed that **CP and DC would liaise** in order to write to every member of the WGs to inform them of what was happening. It was noted that amendments were needed to the numbering system of the recommended Policies and that a couple of the maps needed to be changed. **DC to address** these.

The October Consultation (1st October)

19. DC confirmed that the Hall at King Egcbert was booked from (he thought) midday until 17.00. The Hall must be cleared by 17.30. (Subsequently I found DC's email of 6th May, which referred to the booking being from 10.00 to 17.30. **We need to consider** whether this influences the timings we adopt for our sessions ---- see item 23 below).
20. It was reported that the original facilitator was now unable to assist on that day. He has recommended another person (Amanda Wilson) whom CP, DC and DRB had met. She had a very good cv and was very experienced, including in Neighbourhood Planning events. She also lived in Sheffield. The SG agreed that we should proceed with her assistance. The cost would be £400 a day (plus any expenses); and, bearing in mind preparation and writing up afterwards, it was expected that a total of 3 days would be needed.
21. At the meeting, Amanda had made a number of recommendations: that we should identify key questions for discussion, that we should organise the Event in a "cafe style" format, that there should be an initial brief presentation, then each table to discuss key questions, followed by feedback and a general conclusion session.

22. Amanda is going to write to us with ideas and proposals relating to how we handle the Event.
23. For the time being, it was agreed that we should consider arranging matters so that we could have two complete sessions during the day, so that we could attract people who could only manage certain times.
24. It was also agreed, as recommended by Amanda, that we should provide refreshments: this would encourage people to attend, especially for the earlier session.
25. Relating to this, the SG then considered a note (entitled Terms of Reference for sub-group) from CP about planning for the Event. (A copy of this note is attached for convenience). After discussion it was agreed that items 2,4,5,6 and 8 should be **handled by CP, DC and DRB. DC would** continue to be responsible for item 1. Item 7 was deferred for further consideration when we were clearer about the arrangements agreed for the Event.
26. With regard to item 3, it was agreed that we should have a leaflet produced which set out how the Event on the day was being structured and the timings (and availability of refreshments presumably). This could be made available in the shops and the schools, as well as on the noticeboards and the website. It was not felt that another individual house distribution was needed on this occasion. **PR undertook to handle this in liaison with AP. DRB will forewarn AP.**

Timetable Issues for the Progress on our Plan.

27. It was agreed that, in the light of the delay by the SCC in producing their own revised Local Plan, the SG could plan for its further actions in a more relaxed timescale. It was noted that there was little that we could do with regard to the statutory requirements until we had a Draft Plan in place.

Next Meeting.

28. The next meeting of the SG was agreed for 7.30pm on Wednesday 24th August 2016.

David Bearpark
29th July 2016