**Dore Neighbourhood Forum**

**Steering Group meeting 11th January 2017**

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

**Apologies**

1. Apologies were received from Jen Donnelly.

**Membership**

1. CP remarked on the volume of work facing the SG and queried whether we should seek more members in the SG. After discussion it was considered that it would be difficult for new members to get up to speed with matters at this stage. However, it was agreed that we should seek others to assist in addressing discrete issues, perhaps especially when Sheffield City Council produced its Local Plan in March.

**Minutes of the meeting held on 23rd November 2016.**

1. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

**Matters arising on the minutes.**

1. Several of the matters arising were covered by agenda items. But, with regard to minute 3, it was noted that John Mason was joining the Village Centre WG. It was also reported that the Councillor in charge of considering the car parking issue had called a meeting on 18th January. KS would be attending on behalf of the DVS. It was agreed that the DNF would not be represented at this meeting as the village centre parking proposals did not emanate from the DNF, although car parking problems in Dore overall would be highlighted as a concern to be addressed.
2. With regard to minute 14, the similarity of approach by the DNF and the PDNPA to the challenges facing the Green Belt was welcomed. In terms of the sequential nature of the development proposals, it was stated that Options A to D were being considered together but that option E was supposed to be only used to the extent that there was a shortfall under the other options.
3. The possibility of our own Green Belt review (minute 15) was to be deferred for the time being.
4. Referring to minute 19, DC circulated again the provisional document he had prepared a few months ago on the Basic Conditions Statement. This was going to be a critical document as without compliance with this the DNP would not be accepted. DC noted the importance of the question of *sustainable* development.
5. With regard to minute 20, CP referred to the précis of the steps/advice relating to the production of a NP that he had previously circulated on 30th November 2016. He also laid on the table a summary of the key points arising from this previous document. Discussion on this centred on the areas where Sarah Smith clearly disagrees with our text and our interpretation of particular Council policy documents: for instance relating to CS26 and CS31 and density and character issues, as well as her view that there is clearly brownfield land in Dore. These points may become significant in the context of the Basic Conditions Statement. It was felt that some of this disagreement may have arisen because of the tone of our narrative. It was agreed that this should be reviewed to reflect the fact that we did wish to be supportive of the Council in meeting its objectives where this was possible. **PR will prepare revisions** to this and circulate them to SG members. However, with regard to some of Sarah's other criticisms, we may have to disagree with her. For instance, when the Housing WG looked at the different housing areas in Dore, it concluded that each area did indeed have its own specific characteristics, whereas Sarah seems to believe that some of those housing areas have no character and that we have confused "density" with "character". **DC will ask the Government appointed** advisors for a view on this. Sarah was also upset about our criticisms of past Council planning decisions which appeared to stretch the Council's own policies; but these could be relevant in the context of Evidence supporting our proposed Policies. As such, these comments may better be placed in an appropriate appendix.
6. On minute 23, DC reported that the PDNPA had agreed in principle to prepare the main Map for incorporation in the DNP. This was welcomed. It was noted that this would save the DNF a considerable sum.
7. On minute 26 it was agreed that a new Policy should be added to the DNP about the intention to create a local heritage listing as advised by Historic England.

**Minutes of the sub-committee meeting held on 6th December 2016**

1. The minutes were noted and approved. DC reported that he had spoken to Sarah Smith concerning the methodology that the Council were using in their review of the Green Belt. Although she had responded in a general way, **DC would now write to her** asking for a formal and specific response. It was important that the public was made aware of the approach being used; and the Government's policy was that the planning authority should consult and pre-warn any Neighbourhood Forum on Green Belt Review progress affecting their area.
2. DRB reported that he had written to the DVS chairman informing him that the DNF would not be making a grant application for the period up to the end of March 2017 but that there may be a need for some minor funding by the DVS over the next few months. The chairman accepted this.
3. It was noted that DC had arranged a meeting of the Village Centre WG for 18th January.
4. It was noted that in due course the Housing WG would need to be recalled.

**Comments on our Draft Plan from SCC and PDNPA.**

1. DC had circulated lengthy documents showing the comments made by these two authorities and his observations on these. In addition, DRB had circulated his comments on both of these other documents. It was felt that a number of the Housing Policies (particularly numbers 6 to 13 and possibly also numbers 1 to 5) could be modified to address the comments received; and **DC will undertake this rewriting**.
2. It was also agreed that it was important to tackle the whole of the comments received, so that we had an updated draft DNP ready for when the Council produced its new draft Local Plan.
3. **A sub-committee meeting**, of CP, DC and DRB, was arranged for **10.00 Friday 20th January** at CP's home to review these comments and our responses to them.

**Draft Article for D2D**.

1. CP reported that he had received a number of comments so far. The suggestion from PR that the article be segmented with headings in order to maintain readers' interest was agreed. CP would review the article in the light of comments received but would maintain the essence of it.
2. The questionnaire referred to in the article was going to be inserted in D2D. The planned date to do this was **16th February**; and as many people as possible would be welcome to assist with this. Amongst the issues to be resolved was how this would be returned. The idea of a FreePost return was raised; but on investigation it appears to be a complicated process and would take several weeks to arrange. We could provide an address (CP volunteered his), place a box in the grocers and point to availability every Friday morning in the DVS office. It will also be available on the DVS website for downloading and **KS will arrange for this to be in place**; although apparently it is not possible for responses to be made online.
3. It was suggested that the introduction to the questions should refer to the NPPF definitions of a Green Belt. It may be sensible also to include a statement about the nationwide need for more housing, so that we could not be accused of leading people's answers.
4. Another suggestion was that there could be a "free response" section on the form in order to encourage views. Additionally, it was noted that in advice about the structure of questionnaires it is recommended that the forms allow space for statistical information e.g. name/address/age.
5. It was also proposed that we consider sending copies to the school and local groups such as the guides. After discussion this was thought to be unnecessary, not least as many of the secondary school pupils come from outside the area anyway.
6. **KS will check with John Eastwood** as to the final deadline for the questionnaire to be with him; and then will inform SG members.
7. **CP will produce a draft** questionnaire by the weekend, for circulation to SG members for comment.

**Building the Evidence Base.**

1. PR had investigated this and he summarised the requirement as being, firstly, that only Evidence relating to the Policies set out in the DNF is needed and only that which is relevant. There were four clear sources of Evidence: from our Consultation, from self generated work (such as our Village Design Statement), from existing Council and National planning frameworks and from demographic data. DC commented that this provided a very good précis of what was needed.
2. It was also necessary for the Consultation and Evidence documents to be cross referenced with the relevant DNF Policies.
3. It was agreed that **PR would address** the demographic data. **DC would identify** the Evidence from the SCC and National Planning frameworks, **with CP doing the same** in respect of the PDNPA. With regard to the Consultation, **TH would consult with DC** about the earlier chronology of consultations; and then **TH would summarise** this and send it to PR, with **TH and PR** **then meeting** to blend it together. It was noted that the DWELL project had produced data and that this was available on their website. It was further noted that DNF could claim that the very existence, purpose and practice of the DVS was to research and protect the development of Dore --- the Society and its archive was "living" evidence.
4. It was agreed that our target for the completion of this work should be within the next month. We could then work on ensuring that the cross-referencing with the DNF Policies was completed; and **DC would consider** which members of the WGs may be able to help with this. Completion of this work would ensure that we were then prepared to re-focus our efforts in reading and responding to the SCC draft Local Plan which was supposed to be put out for consultation in March.

**Consultation Statement.**

1. A first draft of this had been circulated prior to the meeting and this was welcomed as showing the relevant framework necessary. Discussion of the next steps was covered under the previous item.

**Forward Timetable**.

1. The first requirement was the preparation of the questionnaire for D2D.
2. There would then be the need to stuff the copies of D2D with the copies of the questionnaire; and this was reported to be in the morning of Friday 16th February in the scout hut. **KS agreed to raise this** with DVS Trustees at the next DVS committee meeting to seek volunteers.
3. Thereafter, it was agreed that the key priority was to complete the work referred to in the above minutes, so that the essential Statements were in readiness before the issue of the SCC draft Local Plan. As indicated, this work was targeted to be completed within the next month.
4. When the SCC draft Local Plan was produced we would need to focus our efforts on responding to this. It was believed that the consultation period would only be about 6 weeks.

**Date of next Meeting**.

1. The next SG meeting was agreed for Wednesday 15th February at 19.30. Also, as mentioned at minute 17, the sub-group will meet at CP's home on 20th January.

David Bearpark

14th January 2017