

## Dore Neighbourhood Forum

### Steering Group meeting 1st August 2018

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

#### Apologies

1. It was noted with great regret and sadness that Thelma Harvey had passed away in early July. The SG expressed its sincere sorrow that a valued colleague was no longer with us and observed a minute's silence. It was noted that her burial service (no ceremony) was to be held on 8th September.

#### Minutes of the meeting held on 3rd July 2108.

2. The minutes, as circulated with CP's email of 30th July, were agreed as a correct record.

#### Matters arising on the Minutes.

3. CP noted that, although we had been told by SCC that there should be no need for SEA/HRA full assessment, we had still not received final confirmation of this from SCC following their consultation with the statutory bodies. [it was noted that at the SG meeting on 20th June we believed that the 3 week consultation period for this was about to expire]. **CP to contact SCC** about this (noting that Sarah was on holiday).
4. In the light of the continuing delay in the publication of the SCC draft Local Plan, it was unclear whether or not the two meetings with SCC arranged for 8th and 17th August would still take place. **CP is to telephone SCC** on Friday to enquire about this.
5. PR referred to the screenshot that had been circulated in advance of the meeting. This demonstrated that he had electronic copies of everything that we had prepared and all comments that we had received. In discussion about the location of the hard copies of some documentation, DC reported that he had the post-it notes from the workshop event. It is believed that TH had other hard copies; and, recognising the sensitive situation, **CP undertook to speak to Thelma's friend** (Brenda) in due course, about those hard copies and also access to Thelma's computer where information is stored.
6. CP noted that he had completed and circulated his article for D2D.
7. With regard to the possible enlarging of the SG, CP had spoken to Geoff Wilson, who felt that he wished only to continue his involvement with Long Line matters.
8. With regard to the question of the DNP obtaining legal advice, DC reported that he had spoken to Adele at PDNPA. She had informed him that no other Neighbourhood Forum in the Peak District had sought legal advice and she was puzzled as to why Sarah has suggested this. It was also recalled that at the meeting with SCC, Sarah had struggled to explain why she had recommended it. It was agreed not to seek legal advice.

#### The Sheffield Draft Local Plan.

9. Given the absence of any information, **CP undertook to contact** the SCC on Friday if the Plan was not published by then.
10. It was noted that when the SCC Plan is published, it is likely to be a very substantial document and to have impacts on Dore which are outside the context of the DNP. It was agreed that it would no doubt fall on the SG to consider all aspects of these documents in relation to Dore. It is also expected that at the same time the SCC would be publishing their response to the Citywide Options for Growth document and the Green Belt Review.

#### Schedule of Comments received.

11. PR referred to his document circulated on 29th July, which categorised all the comments received during our Pre-Submission stage. He suggested that the SG

should consider each category now, agree on how to treat each comment, so that changes could be made to the Draft DNP now. Clearly the difficult Housing and Long Line issues could not be addressed until we had had the proposed meetings with the SCC to discuss these further.

12. Accordingly the comments were addressed as follows:

- Those comments coded green: the SG confirmed that these had already been agreed and should now be shown in the Draft DNP.
- Those comments coded blue: these had previously been discussed and the SG now formally agreed that they should also be incorporated within the Draft DNP.
- With regard to comment numbered 33, it was agreed that wherever the word “downsizing” appeared, it should be replaced with the words “smaller homes”.
- Comments 45 to 49 related to Long Line. It was agreed that we could not do anything further on this until we had met and discussed this with the SCC.
- With regard to comment 55, it was agreed, as requested by the SCC, to ensure that in any references to the SCC, its title should be used in full, rather than, for example “the City”.
- Comment 62 referred to the Green Infrastructure Policy and SCC ‘s suggestion that we reworded it. DC noted that the detailed wording we used was as recommended by Deborah McCann. Also, Natural England were in agreement with this and the PDNPA suggested that we strengthened that section. It was agreed to use the approach and wording used by DC. It was further agreed that the Green Belt chapter should be retitled to embrace “landscapes” and “Green Infrastructure” as well as “Green Belt”, in particular acknowledging that the DNP did not have a Green Belt Policy as such, but a Landscape (setting of the National Park) Policy and a Green Infrastructure Policy.
- Comments 74 to 77 and 79 to 83 related to Housing matters. It was agreed that we needed to wait for the SCC Draft Plan and the subsequent meeting with the SCC before we could sensibly amend these. However, CP noted that, contrary to what SCC stated, our DN5 was not a total ban on development in residential gardens. It would also be interesting to see if the SCC current Policy H14 was strengthened in their new Plan.
- With regard to comment 92, DC reported that he had checked the wording that the SCC had criticised and he was able to confirm that in fact that wording was exactly as quoted in the Act.
- Referring to comment 98, it was agreed that DC should incorporate the “put into practice” narrative alongside DN16 as well as DN15.
- With regard to comment 112, it was agreed to remove from paragraph 11.25 the reference to “particularly for the elderly”.

13. The meeting then discussed the issues raised in CP’s email dated 1st August, relating to wording in DN Policies 8 and 9. Referring to that email, the following was decided:

- Agree the change in title to DN8 and use the term “Dore Village Local Shopping Centre”.
- In the first sentence of the Policy change the wording to read “retaining and enhancing its core retail function”.
- To welcome the notion of protecting a prominent (anchor) shop — the Co-op — by separating it out in the second sentence of the policy.
- With regard to the 50% class A1 quoted, we need to research further what the current percentage is and therefore what percentage threshold should be set before making a final decision. **DC to lead on this.**
- To accept the improved “unviability” test as described by the SCC at footnote 2.
- Agree the SCC footnote 3 relating to “active frontages”.

- Agreed that the key in our policies map should exactly reflect the wording adopted in the revised policy.
  - With regard to our approach to identifying community facilities, it was agreed that those in the village centre should continue to be shown on a map, whereas those elsewhere in Dore should simply be referred to in the text of the Plan.
  - We should add supporting text relating to the distinct cross-roads and concentration of retail and community facilities at “the heart of the village”.
  - Agree that all pubs in our Area should be identified as community facilities.
  - Accept the list of typical community facilities shown in SCC footnote 4.
  - Accept the “unviability” test as set out in SCC footnote 5.
  - Continue with the ringed area on the maps as defining where DN10 applies.
14. Discussion next centred on comment 110 relating to Open Spaces.
- In particular the comments from the SCC were stressed, namely that we had listed every Open Space in Dore as being special, that we had not shown any priorities and that we had been especially conservative in our approach.
  - One suggestion was that we should remove from the listing certain areas that were on the fringe of our Area and which were clearly extremely unlikely ever to be proposed for development: such as Whirlow Brook Park, Beauchief Gardens and Kings Croft Green. However, it was pointed out that Whirlow Brook Gardens was immediately adjacent to the proposal for a major development many years ago and, as such, could very well be at risk.
  - With regard to Kings Croft Green, there were conflicting views given as to the current status of this area. Some thought that a Trust had been set up to own this land, with the primary school being proposed as an Academy; whereas PR reported that he had been told clearly by the Education Department that the school is not on the list for conversion to an Academy and that the land is on their schedule for future educational expansion.
  - It was noted that Open Spaces classification had a greater strength than Green Belt designation, and so pursuing Open Spaces designation was preferable.
  - It was agreed that we should remove from the list the Kings Croft Field but that that any further action should await the SCC Draft Plan. **PR will draft a reasoning for the removal of Kings Croft.**
15. It was noted that a number of the matters discussed and agreed this evening had implications for the several maps shown in the DNP. It was agreed that no amendments should be made to these maps until we had finalised our DNP. The maps are prepared for us by the PDNPA and we should not keep requesting interim changes.
16. **DC undertook to ensure that** all the changes to the draft DNP agreed at this evening’s meeting would be incorporated in the next version of the DNP.
17. PR proposed that the best way to ensure that all changes had been actioned was to use the “find and replace” application. It was agreed **that DC would send his completed document to PR as a Word document and that PR would then use this application to verify the amendments.**

### **Rough Timetable for SG activities.**

18. CP had circulated an updated version of the document first prepared on 1st July 2018. It was noted that this was just a reminder of what other actions lay ahead, rather than a proposed working document.
19. PR queried the penultimate bullet point under item 5, questioning whether this was an SG function. It was noted that the DVS saw the SG as the Group most able to advise on this, not least as the two key planning persons on the DVS (DC and CP) were members of the SG.

### **Dates of next SG meetings.**

20. It was agreed that the meeting already planned for 8th August would only proceed if the SCC Draft Plan had been published before this weekend. [JD gave her apologies for any meeting that did take place on 8th August].
21. The next SG meeting was agreed for Wednesday 15th August.

David Bearpark  
5th August 2018