**Dore Neighbourhood Forum**

**Steering Group meeting 6th December 2017**

Present: Christopher Pennell (CP), David Bearpark (DRB), David Crosby (DC), Pat Ryan (PR).

**Apologies**

1. Apologies were received from Thelma Harvey, Jen Donnelly and Keith Shaw.

**Minutes of the meeting held on 15th November 2017.**

1. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

**Matters arising not on the agenda:**

1. DC reported that he had spoken to the person in charge of facilities at King Ecgbert and had confirmed that the date for the meeting of the Forum is 28th February 2018.
2. DM’s observations about evidence needs for Long Line and Sustainable Transport policies had been overtaken by events.
3. DC noted that, with reference to minute 8, he had now added different colours to the different elements of the text. He would now add additional narrative in the introduction setting out that we had incorporated this information both as a way of helping the community to understand the document, and to inform the Examiner of why we had done this, thus hopefully forestalling him/her criticising the Plan as a consequence.
4. With regard to minute 10, CP noted that he would be adding to the text to make further reference to the SCC Housing Market Profile document.
5. All other matters arising would be covered in later agenda items.

**Healthcheck Report.**

1. The final Healthcheck Report, with its inclusions of suggested wording for certain policies, was welcomed. PR queried DM’s reference to not seeing the evidence base. This was a bit confusing as it does exist in full, although she had not asked for it!
2. It was agreed that the **SG should look at the** Evidence Documentation in detail at the next SG meeting.
3. It was reported that Sarah Smith had asked if we would let her have a copy of this Healthcheck (which we had paid for). It was noted that it would be available ultimately as part of our Consultation Statement; and therefore it was agreed that she could have a copy. **CP will arrange this.**
4. There remained some confusion as to in which section of the Plan we should incorporate the Green Infrastructure element, with DM appearing to include it within Open Spaces. It was agreed that it should remain within the Green Belt section, with references also to Open Spaces in that section.
5. In answer to an earlier query, it was noted that there was no open access land on the Dore side of the PDNPA boundary.
6. DC referred to the query from TH concerning the phrase about the reclamation of the pavilion on the land adjacent to Hathersage Road. He confirmed that the Proposal to reclaim this was limited just to that pavilion and not to the rest of the land around it.

**The Revised Chapters of Draft Plan.**

1. **Introductory Section.** DC confirmed that he had changed the terminology to Vision and Aims, instead of Vision and Objectives. The terminology was used in a number of places and he had changed them all.
2. DC was also making changes to the Contents page, accepting that the page numbering could not be finalised until the final version of the Plan.
3. TH had questioned whether we should extend the Consultation Diagram to incorporate post-submission consultation. It was agreed that this was not our remit. However, it was agreed that it would be helpful if the diagram clearly distinguished between the Village Design Statement, the first stage “unofficial” Neighbourhood Plan stage and the “official” post autumn 2015 Neighbourhood Plan stage.
4. **Eastern Moorland Fringe**. There were no comments on the latest version of this section.
5. **Green Belt**. There was extensive discussion about whether we should use either option X or option Y from CP’s email; or whether we should not use either. The agreed preference was for option Y.
6. One possible problem raised was whether option Y was solely on the western boundary and thus whether this could properly be represented on the Map. After consulting the latest version of the Map, it was agreed that in fact it was correct to refer to option Y as relating to exactly the same complete area as the Green Infrastructure area and the map’s index could make this clear.
7. DC believed that he had addressed the point raised by DM concerning the clear definitions on Long Line.
8. The conclusions to this section were that we had four Policies: DN1 access under Eastern Moorland Fringe; DN2 option Y; DN3 Green Infrastructure; DN4 Long Line.
9. **Housing**. There was agreement with the approach adopted by CP in his rewrite of the Housing section. As mentioned earlier, **CP will add further wording** in respect of the SCC Housing Market Profile. It was also noted that the housing character appraisal was still important as a link to the urban grain concept.
10. It was confirmed that this next set of Policies were: DN5 New Infill Housing and DN6 Downsizing.
11. **Open Spaces.** PR raised the question of the levels of Formal and Informal Recreation Space. It was noted that in published SCC documents, it would appear that the amount of Open Space in Dore, related to the population (c.7000) pointed to the amount of such space being exactly on target. However, it was agreed that it was an impossible task to seek to make the distinction between Formal and Informal in respect of each of the Open Spaces in Dore.
12. It was agreed that the narrative should be expanded to stress that many of the Open Spaces in Dore were used by other people resident in Sheffield outside of Dore. **PR will add** wording to this effect.
13. So the next Policy would be DN7 Local Green Space.
14. **Village Centre and Conservation sections.** There were no further comments to make with regard to these other sections of the Plan.
15. Accordingly, the remaining Policy Numbers were: DN8 Retail, DN9 Community, DN10 Environmental Improvements, DN11 Sites of …., DN12 Demolition, DN13 Protection of Heritage, DN14 Local List.
16. **Sustainable Transport.** Agin, there were no further comments to be made on this. These Policies therefore became DN15 Park and Ride, DN16 Sustainable Transport.
17. **Proposals.** These were generally thought to be correct. With regard to Proposal 5, it was suggested that a management plan should be prepared for each site. It was also pointed out that the numbering needed amending after Proposal 5.
18. **CIL**. The SG was reminded that Sarah Smith had stated that we had incorrectly set out the procedure for the allocation of CIL. DC stated that he had in fact varied the wording to reflect this: so, the CIL did in fact go to the Forum, although it reached the Forum via the Council, who were the formal recipient of the CIL, but the funds made available had to be spent in accordance with the Forum’s priorities.
19. **Glossary**. A couple of other definitions needed to be added to the Glossary, relating to Green Infrastructure and Land Character Assessment. **CP will prepare wording** for these and send it to DC.
20. **The Digest of the Plan.** It was agreed that it was important for there to be a succinct Digest of the DNP in order to make sure that residents could read a short summary of the key points of the Plan without necessarily feeling the need to read the whole 70+ pages of the full final version. **PR will prepare an updated Digest.** This will have a brief introduction and then outline each Policy within the Plan. PR indicated that he would seek to prepare this Digest within the next week.

**Working Groups.**

1. The SG discussed the draft letters that CP had prepared for sending to members of the various WGs and it was agreed that they presented the situation very well. The only suggestion made was that a phrase should be added specifically to state that, in the final analysis the same outcomes were being proposed as originally concluded by the WGs.
2. **CP will now finalise the letters** and send them to each member of the WGs.

**Consultation and Pre-Submission**

1. It was agreed that we would need to carry out a final consultation with each of the groups that we have previously consulted, so that they could see and comment on the proposed final version of the DNP.
2. After discussion, it was agreed that for this step in the process we would need to send them the whole (70+ pages) Plan. This would be done at the pre-submission stage; and it was agreed that we would send electronic copies of the Plan to them. We would also need to display some hard copies, for instance at the library.
3. CP noted that he had asked Sarah Smith for the list of external organisations that we needed to consult at pre-submission and this was expected shortly and could be fused by TH with the preliminary list she had prepared.
4. In terms of the costs of this stage, it was confirmed that it was the Forum who bore these costs, whereas at the Referendum stage it was the local authority who funded that. We had incorporated in our budget for the possibility that we may wish to be professionally represented at the Examination itself.
5. In terms of making available the DNP and all its supporting documentation to Dore residents, it was agreed that we could not sensibly print out the requisite numbers of such a large document, and therefore it was agreed that the primary method of making it available would be by placing it on the DVS website.
6. In this context, the question was raised as to whether the DVS website would be able to handle the size of documents contained within the DNP. In particular it was noted that the Evidence and Consultation information compiled by TH was extremely large. **DRB offered to email KS** (copy to TH) to seek his confirmation that there would be no problem with this.

**Progress against the Checklists**.

1. All concerned said that they had satisfactorily covered the points identified in CP’s Checklists when undertaking the updating of their sections of the Plan.

**Next Steps**.

1. The importance of maintaining momentum was agreed, as the first of the SG meetings in January would be the last sensible opportunity for any significant changes to be made to the Plan, with the SG meeting on 24th January essentially being the “sign-off” of the Plan and supporting information before its circulation by the end of that month in anticipation of the DNF meeting on 28th February.
2. It was agreed that **each person responsible** for particular sections would incorporate any comments made at this meeting and would then produce an updated version by the end of the coming weekend; and CP would consult the WGs on them. It has to be accepted that there was an outside chance that a WG member or two might have valid comments to make.
3. **DC would then combine** all the updated sections back into one document, for transmission to DRB. This would be in Word format so that DRB could carry out a proof read and, importantly, be able to make the appropriate textual and layout alterations directly into the text of the Plan.
4. There was some concern expressed as to whether it would be too large a document to be sent as one attachment. If this is a problem, DRB will obtain the data from DC on a memory stick! Provided that he received the combined document early next week, DRB will complete the proof reading by the following weekend.
5. The next step in the whole process will be for DC to approach John Eastwood to get him to use his professional expertise to produce a high quality document. It would also be important for other members of the SG then to read through it to spot any corrections that may have been missed.

**Any Other Business.**

1. CP noted that he had written to Sarah Smith agreeing to the minutes of the meeting held on 12th September. Sarah had not wished to amend those minutes to reflect all the comments made by CP but he felt that the minutes did still reasonably reflect the meeting.
2. As previously mentioned, **CP will now send** a copy of the final Healthcheck to Sarah.
3. We should send our complete DNP to Sarah Smith for the SEA/HRA screening process at the latest at the point we are ready to put it on our website.
4. The question was raised as to whether we expected Sarah to respond to the question asked of her about whether the SCC would be amending their housing total needs as a result of the Government’s latest, reduced, numbers of houses needed. It was thought to be unlikely.

**Next Meetings.**

1. As previously agreed, the next Meetings of the SG would be on 10th and 24th January 2018, both commencing at 19.30.

David Bearpark

9th December 2017