

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

Steering Group meeting 15th August 2018

Present: Christopher Pennell (CP), David Bearpark (DRB), David Crosby (DC) and Keith Shaw (KS).

Apologies

1. Apologies were received from Pat Ryan and Jen Donnelly.

Minutes of the meeting held on 1st August 2108.

2. DRB referred to his email asking for clarification on two aspects of the minutes. It was agreed that at the 8th bullet point of minute 13 it should record that we did agree to continue to map those community facilities that are at the centre of the village, whilst referring only in the text to community facilities located elsewhere in Dore. At bullet point 9 of minute 13, it was agreed that the minute was correct; and that wording should be added to refer to the village centre as being “the heart of the community”. **DC will add this wording.** Other than these points, the minutes were agreed as a correct record. **DRB will send out** an amended version of these minutes.

Matters arising on the Minutes.

3. At minute 3, CP noted that he had contacted SCC and that a reply had been received. Although this reply confirmed that full SEA/HRA assessments were not needed, Sarah Smith’s reply was somewhat confusing. It was agreed that Sarah needed to build the statutory consultees’ comments into formal reports from SCC and PDPNA to support our Basic Conditions Statement; and it was noted that CP had asked SS for that.
4. With regard to minute 4, the email from Rob Murfin of 2nd August and CP’s response of 8th August were noted.
5. With reference to minute 5, CP noted that it was not appropriate yet for him to make this contact. DC reported that he had met Brenda in the village and that the subject of the computer and the information stored on it was raised, with Brenda saying that she would speak to her son-in-law. It was agreed not to pursue this further for the moment.
6. Correspondence had taken place relating to minute 9.
7. With regard to the 4th bullet point of minute 13, DC tabled a list of shops with their categorisation. He proposed that logically two should be removed from the list, which would then mean that there were 11 out of 24 A1 category outlets. On this basis it was agreed that we should keep our target of no less than 50% as A1.
8. With regard to minute 14, final bullet point, it was agreed that we should adopt the wording proposed by PR. **PR to note and record as part of our evidence.**

Progress re P-SC comments.

9. The schedule attached to the email from PR dated 2nd August was welcomed, although some of the paragraph numbers to which he referred appeared to be incorrect. With regard to PR’s reference to para 54, DC stated that he had altered the references to include this suggested re-wording. CP queried whether that definition was the correct one for every one of the references. It was agreed that this would be revisited.
10. With regard to the other changes, DC reported that he had made all the changes that PR had sent to him.
11. It was noted that all DC’s records were backed up in the cloud.
12. It was agreed that now would be the right moment for an updated version of the DNP to be prepared, one which should have all the amendments discussed at recent SG meetings, with the exception of Housing related issues. It was **agreed that PR and DC**

should meet in order to produce this updated DNP, together with PR's schedule of all actions taken. KS noted that it was possible to use the computer compare function to automatically highlight all the changes made from the Pre-Submission version of the DNP and the latest one now to be produced. **KS is available to advise** on this if PR and DC would find this helpful.

13. It was noted that **DC needs to keep** an unamended electronic version of the Pre - Submission version of the DNP intact for future record.

14. **DC noted that he would be able to produce** this updated version in the last week of August (he had little time next week and in the first week of September.

Implication of further Sheffield Plan Delay.

15. All present agreed that this yet further delay was completely frustrating. This was particularly so as, for the last two years, we had been regularly given revised expectations of the likely publication of this document and, consequently, had repeatedly delayed the finalisation of our DNP. It was almost as though it was a delaying tactic by the SCC!

16. The situation was now further complicated by the introduction of the Government's new NPPF. With regard to this, it was noted that in paragraph 214 of this document, it was stated that those Neighbourhood Plans that were submitted before 24th January 2019, would be examined against the current NPPF.

17. A lengthy discussion followed, which was not helped by the complete absence of any guidance as to when the awaited SCC revised draft Plan may finally be published. As a consequence we had no idea whether if we waited for just another few months the Plan would then be published; or whether it could be, perhaps, the Spring of next year, which would mean that the two year delay would have stretched to almost three years. We are in danger of losing any momentum that we have sought to maintain with the Dore community.

18. It was recognised that if our DNP was clearly not in adequate alignment with SCC's existing Local Plan, then it would not succeed at Examination.

19. However, if we did achieve adequate alignment, then would our DNP still be at risk at Examination on the basis that the SCC current Plan was so far out of date and bearing in mind the new NPPF? But paragraph 214 (see above) suggested that there was a window of opportunity with regard to the new NPPF, so would there be similar allowance with respect to SCC's current Plan, especially bearing in mind the unconscionably long delays in its updating?

20. Eventually it was agreed that we should seek legal advice on this last point; also asking what would the survival prospects be of a DNP Plan that we submitted this year but with Policies that were subsequently shown to be at odds with the Policies of a *new* SCC Local Plan which may be produced next year, after the approval of our DNP. In addition, confirmation should be sought that paragraph 214 would mean that early submission of our DNP could not then be challenged once the new NPPF was in force.

21. **CP undertook to draft possible** questions for submission and will circulate these to SG members. It was agreed that we needed to identify a legal firm that has clear and respected expertise in such current planning matters. CP noted that in the past he had used the firm of Wilbrahams in Leeds for a successful planning matter. This was a possible firm to use; **but CP was tasked with the responsibility** for identifying a suitable legal firm.

22. **CP will also speak to** Mark Ridler on the DVS committee to see if he can offer any guidance.

23. **DC will endeavour to speak to** Rob Murfin to see if he is able to give us any help or guidance at all.

Current Key Issues: Housing Matters, Transport Strategy, NPPF changes.

24. CP suggested an approach for considering the three key issues with currently facing us, namely that one member of the SG took responsibility for studying one of the topics, producing a summary of what appeared to be the main issues facing us from that topic, which could then form the basis of a more informed discussion by the SG.
25. **CP agreed to address the Housing topic**, including the SHLAA. It was noted that in terms of seeking adequate alignment with the SCC current Plan, this was the most difficult in the context of the criticisms already received from the SCC, albeit that some of those criticisms seems to be pedantic rather than fundamental. It was also noted that under the terms of the Neighbourhood Planning regulations, it was the SCC that would have the final say on whether our DNP was compliant — it receives the report of the External Examiner but does not have to abide by it! [*perhaps this is another question for legal advice*].
26. It was suggested that the best person to look at the new NPPF, both to draw out the key differences compared with the current NPPF and to itemise the most important elements within it, was DC. **DC agreed to address the NPPF topic**.
27. It was suggested that **PR could address the Transport Strategy** topic. In his absence from the meeting, DRB will contact PR with this request.
28. Although no definitive deadline was set for these analyses, it was hoped that it may be possible to address at least two of them at the next meeting of the SG.

Any Other Business.

29. DC noted that he had received a consultation document from SCC relating to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), and asked whether this should be responded to by the DVS or by the DNF. It was agreed that it should be the DNF; and **DC undertook to prepare** a draft response for discussion.
30. CP reported that following his article in the Sheffield Telegraph, he had been contacted by an individual to discuss this, which he had done. It appeared likely that the person in question was interested in possible development of land that he owned.

Date of Next Meeting.

31. It was agreed that the next meeting of the SG should take place on Wednesday 12th September.
32. However, upon checking his engagements that evening, DRB realised that he has a prior commitment that evening. Having checked with most other SG members, possible alternative dates of Monday 10th or Tuesday 11th are suitable for all — **except** that it has not been possible to make contact with DC. So could members please keep all three of those dates free for the time being until it has been possible to make contact with DC! I will confirm the agreed date as soon as I speak to DC.

David Bearpark
17th August 2018