

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

Steering Group meeting 20th June 2018

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

Apologies

1. Thelma Harvey's continuing absence due to ill health was regretted. With regret, we needed to plan on the expectation that she would be unable to contribute further to the DNP process.

Minutes of the meeting held on 16th May 2018.

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

Matters arising on the Minutes.

3. CP referred to the note he had circulated relating to the Act of Parliament. **DC now needs to make** the appropriate change to the text.
4. Some of the actions agreed under Minutes 7 to 9 still need to be incorporated into the text of the Plan. **DC will make these changes** at the same time as he makes changes to reflect the "easier" P-SC comments received.
5. It was noted that Sarah Smith had written to the statutory consultees regarding the SEA and HRA screenings. It was thought that the three week timescale for replies was probably imminent.
6. With regard to minute 16, DC noted that he had amended the Basic Conditions statement to take account of the comments from CP; however, it was agreed that this should not be circulated yet; the updated document should await further anticipated changes.
7. In response to a question about replying to John Mason's comments, it was reported that his response had been acknowledged, as had those received from others. The SG had previously agreed that this was the sufficient and correct approach for all respondees; and that it would be wrong to treat one response differently.
8. The other matters arising mentioned on the agenda would be addressed as part of following substantive agenda items.

Focus of this evening's meeting.

9. Picking up on the points made in the email from DRB on 18th June and subsequent emails from CP, it was agreed that:
 - It would be premature to discuss in any detail the more critical comments received from SCC. These would best be addressed following our consideration of the imminent publication of the SCC Local Plan and Green Belt Review.
 - As for the village centre issues, a meeting has been arranged with SCC. We should be agreed tonight on the approach to this.
 - We can discuss the question of legal advice and what this should cover.
 - We need to decide how we programme and control future changes to the text of the Plan.
 - We could work on the "easier to address" comments received.
 - Issues relating to alleged shortcomings in evidence and rationale could also be considered.
 - We need to decide on exactly how we are required to incorporate comments received in our Consultation Statement.
 - We should consider an outline timeline for SG actions in the coming months.
 - Although not critical just yet, we also need to consider the position regarding the raw information held by Thelma.

Village Centre meeting with SCC.

10. It was noted that the date for the meeting was Friday 6th July at 2.00pm. **CP, DC and PR would be attending.**
11. The meeting hopefully would resolve the criticisms received from SCC, as it had been thought that we had taken account of their earlier comments on finalising the text. It was agreed that the meeting must not stray into Housing issues.

Legal Advice.

12. The repeated comments made by the SCC, advising us that the DNF should get its own legal advice was thought to be confusing. Our presumption was that it would be the SCC that would have to take a legal position on planning matters.
13. It was agreed that **CP would write to Sarah** asking her to explain clearly and exactly in what respects the DNF should be expected to get its own legal advice.
14. Also, **DC will speak to Adele** to see if she can provide any thoughts on this; and he would also ask Adele whether this suggestion has been made to any of the Forums with which the PDPNA have been involved.
15. The question of seeking advice on other aspects of the SCC's response to our P-SC Plan, for instance regarding the question of sustainability, was discussed. It was agreed that this was important but would be deferred for the time being. Also deferred for now was the suggestion that we could seek advice from Deborah McCann about the quasi-legal rules regarding Neighbourhood Planning.

Control of changes to the text of the Plan.

16. Concern was expressed about simply making ad hoc changes to the text of the Plan without a robust procedure to identify and record all such changes.
17. It was agreed that the approach to doing this was not to keep making changes to the draft Plan itself, but to have a separate document which would record the original element of the text, the comment made and then the agreed response by the SG to it, with the final revised text agreed by the full SG.
18. Each change should have a separate file name, with the date of the change. **PR would send to DC** a template for this approach. **KS/PR would meet with DC** to explain the computer techniques which could be used for this approach.
19. As part of this approach, it would be **necessary for DC to go back to the version** of the Plan used for the P-SC. Thus, in addition to the point made in minute 4 above, any other changes that DC has already made to the text of the Plan should form part of the new approach to the recording, dating and agreeing of changes.

Schedule of P-SC Responses Received.

20. It was agreed that of the P-SC comments received, the only ones which incorporated critical issues were the ones from SCC and ADAS; and SCC had offered a meeting to discuss the ADAS comments. It was agreed that our initial focus should be on the SCC apparently "non-critical" comments.
21. It was agreed that, with regard to the SCC comments, the document to address was the one circulated by PR on 15th June, which listed all the SCC comments and showed alongside them the initial observations made by CP.
22. Discussion took place on the extent of the reporting of comments received that needed to be shown in the Consultation Statement: should we précis such comments so as to reduce the volume? It was agreed that any such action would run the risk of us being accused of not properly showing the concerns made. It was agreed the information should be shown in full, using the tabular approach referred to in paragraph 17 above.
23. It was noted that in its response, SCC had in some instances quoted incorrect paragraph numbers from the DNP. It was agreed that our record should show the SCC response as it was originally received (i.e. with the incorrect para numbers), with the correct numbers then being shown alongside. Again, so as to avoid any accusations of incorrectly reporting comments received.

24. **CP agreed to produce** a schedule itemising instances of errors in the SCC response.
25. **DC will produce** a schedule of all the “easier” comments in the format agreed above in paragraph 17. This would cover all comments, both positive and negative.

The more serious comments received.

26. It was noted that SCC had offered a number of meetings to the DNF. These were:
- To discuss the “technical” matters relating to the village centre (see minute 10 above).
 - A combined meeting for all current Forums in Sheffield, with Rob Murfin there.
 - A meeting specifically for the DNF, relating to the Housing issues raised by SCC, again with Rob Murfin present.
 - A DNF meeting to offer advice relating to other representations received. This was expected to be after the SCC legal section had provided its comments.
27. CP noted that although we had decided not to spend time on the more serious issues until we had seen the imminent SCC Plan, nevertheless there were a few issues raised within that category which we believed had arisen because our proposed Policies had been misunderstood. It was agreed that these should be looked at. **CP will produce a list** of these instances for initial discussion at a future SG meeting.

Rough Timeline for future actions.

28. The meeting reviewed the very rough document from CP which sought to summarise the various actions which we would have to address. It was agreed that many of them had been covered in the discussion so far this evening.
29. It was agreed that several of the matters itemised could only sensibly be addressed following the publication of the SCC draft Local Plan. Only then would be able properly to understand the implications for our DNF and what actions we therefore needed to consider.
30. Until then it was also not really possible to attribute proposed dates to those actions.
31. In the context of future actions needed, there was concern that the number of members of the SG, which had started out as 9, was now only 6; and this at a time when significant further work could be envisaged.
32. It was also noted that with JD now having become a member of the DVS committee, such members now formed a preponderance of SG members. It was noted that the DVS committee itself simply received an update report each meeting on the DNF and that it did not enter into any debate on the topic. Although it was the DVS which was the designated Forum, activities related to the DNP were clearly delighted to the DNF body, to which the SG reported. Having said that, for perception purposes, it would be preferable if any further assistance could be provided by non-DVS committee members.
33. Despite the workload envisaged, there was concern that it could be difficult for new members of the SG to get up to speed with all the background. With this in mind, it was suggested that further assistance could be targeted at topics which did not need all that background, for instance in preparing a comparison document of our draft DNP and the imminent SCC draft Local Plan, in preparation for our work on a Dore consultative response to the new SCC Plan and Green Belt Review.
34. It was possible that some members of the WGs may be willing to get involved in more detailed work. **SG members should consider** whom they may think might fit that category. Geoff Wilson was suggested, although it appears that he may be having an operation shortly. **Further discussion at the next SG meeting.**
35. **KS will also look at** the list of attendees at the Forum meetings, on the basis that by attending they had shown clear interest in the process, and see which names he might suggest for an approach.

Basic Conditions Statement.

36. It was agreed that there was not much further to say about this document at this stage.

Consultation Statement.

37. Further to the extent of the reporting of comments received, as agreed in minute 22, it was also noted that we did not need to be concerned about the volume, as the information would be available electronically within the Consultation Statement.
38. There was also discussion about the schedule of “raw information” that TH had taken responsibility for compiling. It was important that this was available as a complete and comprehensive support to the main Consultation Statement. CP was concerned that it may be insensitive at this time to make such an approach. However, it was accepted that this information would be critical in due course; and it may feel more insensitive in the weeks to come. It was also thought certain that TH herself would not be offended by any request. **It was agreed that CP would approach** Thelma’s friend to request information about the location of the information and Thelma’s password to access it.
39. CP did note that he had never deleted anything associated with the DNP and so, if the above approach were to fail, we would still have the information. The difference, obviously, was that Thelma had scheduled and categorised the information.
40. The discussion then moved on to the extent to which our data had been properly backed up. **PR offered to visit CP with an external** hard drive so as to ensure that all CP’s records were backed up. This was agreed.
41. Other than this, it was agreed that there was no further action needed at this stage.

Evidence.

42. CP had circulated a first draft of the areas where SCC had suggested that our evidence was insufficient. **It was suggested that a further discussion of this could** take place at the next meeting of the SG.
43. Other than this, at this stage there was no further action needed on Evidence.

Any Other Business.

44. It was noted that ADAS had circulated widely the fact that they were having an open meeting on Friday to present their proposals for development at Long Line and to seek residents’ views. **Members of the SG would attend the open session.**
45. It was reported that Geoff Wilson had stated that he wished to circulate all Long Line residents with something that set out the response of the SG to the ADAS proposal. DC noted that he had produced a letter of response to ADAS in April, following the meeting held with them. (KS forwarded it again to PR as the meeting progressed). **PR will send this to Geoff Wilson** so that Geoff can circulate it to the residents.
46. It was noted that JD was keeping a schedule of holiday commitments of members of the SG over the coming months. **Members were asked** to keep her informed of new commitments or changes to dates already notified to JD.

Dates of next SG meetings.

47. The next meeting was agreed to be on Tuesday 3rd July at 7.30pm. It was agreed that this meeting would be to focus on agreeing the schedules of comments in the “easier” category received on the P-SC, confirming our responses to those comments and agreeing the changed wording. **As agreed in minute 25 above, DC will produce the proposed schedule and circulate it in advance to SG members** to form the basis of the discussion at this meeting. [DRB gave his apologies for this meeting].
48. In addition, if there was time, this meeting could also try and agree actions relating to alleged Evidence deficiencies, as indicated in minute 41 above.
49. A further meeting was pencilled in for Tuesday 10th July. This would be to share initial thoughts on the draft SCC Local Plan: SCC may not offer it for a lengthy consultation period. If the document had not been published before that date, then this meeting would not take place: unless an SG member suggests a clear purpose in holding it.
50. Following this, another SG meeting was agreed for Wednesday 1st August.

