

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

Steering Group meeting 17th October 2018

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

Apologies

1. No apologies.

Minutes of the meeting held on 12th September 2108.

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

Matters arising on the Minutes.

3. With regard to minute 3, CP referred to the emails that he had circulated, which indicated a holdup on the PDPNA side in respect of SEA/HRA screening opinions.
4. Referring to minute 6, it was reported that the Labour Party on the SCC still seems to be intending to keep virtually all the CIL for the centre, leaving only c.1.5% for the local community affected by the development. This was in clear contradiction to the national guidelines which state that 15% should be retained locally; and it was expected that if this becomes SCC policy, this will be challenged.
5. With reference to minute 16(xi), DC noted that the Reg18 draft Plan would not incorporate this amount of local detail as to housing mix.
6. All other matters arising were covered by individual agenda items.

Timing for submitting our Neighbourhood Plan.

7. DRB reported on the legal advice he had obtained and which had been circulated that morning. This advice was welcomed as being thorough, clear and concise, and with a clear conclusion. It was agreed to accept the advice and **it was decided that we would not submit the DNP before 24th January 2019**. There were a number of interesting points made in the advice, including in paras 2.13 and 2.14. Also, the emphasis placed on the requirement for the local planning authority to work collaboratively with a qualifying body particularly sharing evidence etc was noted; and in this context the absence of information from SCC about the Green Belt Review and any further detailed information since the Citywide Options for Growth published in 2015 did not seem to meet this requirement.
8. The discussion of DC's meeting with Rob Murfin on 21st September is recorded in an annex to these minutes.
9. The decision not to submit before 24th January did mean that there would be significant further work to be addressed in revising our DNP. It was also agreed that, because of this, it was too early now to consider a revised target submission date.

Completing the Pre-Submission Consultation Response.

10. Discussion took place on whether the decision not to submit by 24th January would mean that we would need to go through another Pre-Submission Consultation. However it was felt that this should not be required. Even though we would be changing the wording in the DNP, the principles underlying the Policies and the basic elements of the Policies themselves would not change. **This would need to be kept under review, as would the need for a further Forum meeting.**
11. PR noted that he had circulated a document which incorporated all the responses to the P-SC and that these were now all in the latest version of the DNP.
12. DC had also incorporated a response to the ADAS comments.

13. DC also reported that he had incorporated revisions to DN5 and DN6 in line with previous discussions. As a consequence, PR suggested that all that was now needed for us to end up with a completed Draft Plan was to agree the wording that DC had incorporated for DN5 and DN6 and to make decisions on Open Spaces.
14. PR raised a question regarding the content of the full P-SC responses document that he had prepared. After discussion it was agreed that all the columns should be shown as part of this final document, including the middle “rationale” column; but with regard to this column, **PR would edit this column** so that it shows the rationale but without any unnecessary comments or asides.
15. With regard to DN5, CP queried whether we should use the amended words he had suggested in his email of 24th September. After discussion, and with DC reporting that Rob Murfin had seemed content with our proposals to limit infill to the frontage of a site, **it was agreed** that we should stay with the wording in the current version of the Plan.
16. It was **also agreed** that we should stay with the current wording of DN6. PR noted that he had removed all references in the Plan to “downsizing”. As a consequence of these two decisions, it was felt that we now had a more simplified version. We now needed to wait to see the response from SCC.
17. Discussion then took place about the section on Local Green Spaces, for which PR had circulated a document which set out our initial approach, the response from SCC and a suggested revision to our approach. After discussion it was agreed that Whirlow Brook Park, Ash House Lane Playing Fields and the Old School Trust Sports Ground should be removed from the list of proposed designated Local Green Spaces. With regard to the last of these three, **JD will speak to Ruth Darrall to explain** that this was because the SG felt that its inclusion would inhibit the Trust’s options on the site in the future and may result in a challenge to the DNP from the Charity Commission as being restrictive to a recognised charity (the Old School Trust).
18. All the other sites would remain as proposed Local Green Spaces.
19. **PR will now revise the Consultation Statement and circulate it. DC will update the Plan and circulate it.** So then we will have a completed draft DNP as far as the current situation is concerned.

Draft article for Dore to Door.

20. CP noted that he had made a couple of minor changes to the draft article circulated to SG members and was now forwarding the final version to the editor.
21. In this context it was agreed that we should formally notify Rob Murfin that we had decided to delay submission of our DNP until after 24th January 2019. It was also agreed that this email would be a good opportunity to remind Rob Murfin of the promised meetings and to make reference to the expectation of collaborative work and the sharing of information (as mentioned in the legal advice). **CP will prepare a draft email** to go to him and will circulate it to SG members.

Future Workload Planning

22. The issue on which we can immediately commence work is amending the current draft DNP to reflect the new NPPF. **DC undertook to start work on this;** and he would keep the current DNP untouched and create a newly tagged version.
23. The next step will be when the SCC produces its Reg18 draft Plan. There will be two elements to our work then, which probably have to move in tandem. We will want to respond to this Reg18, not least as an attempt to try and influence how the SCC move to the next stage. However, we will also want to work quickly to amend our DNP to reflect what this document says and to do so before the next iteration of the SCC Plan is produced.

24. Beyond this, it is not currently possible to create a sensible workload plan. This can only be done when SCC makes its timescale clear.
25. It was also noted that because of our decision to delay submission and with the imminence of the Reg18 draft, there was no need for us to investigate further the SCC's underlying evidence base with regard to housing needs in Sheffield. This will all become clear with the publication of their draft.

Future Meetings.

26. **Future meetings were agreed** for Wednesdays: 7th November, 28th November, 12th December and 9th January.
27. It was agreed that the 7th November meeting would concentrate on studying the updated DNP from DC incorporating the terms of the new NPPF. **DC will circulate his updated version sufficiently in advance** of the meeting to allow SG members to study the changes.
28. **CP will study** the current version of the DNP in the context of other new national documents of which he had become aware.

Any Other Business.

29. KS commented on the apparent intention of the PCC to sell the Church Hall. He noted that it may be possible for the DNP to incorporate this building as a community asset, which may restrict the possibility of its sale; although the timing of these two matters may not be advantageous.

David Bearpark
21st October 2018