

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

Steering Group meeting 9th January 2019

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

Apologies

1. Apologies were received from Pat Ryan (PR).

Minutes of the meeting held on 12th December 2018.

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

Matters arising on the Minutes.

3. With reference to minute 12, DC reported that he had done this.
4. All other matters arising were covered by individual agenda items.

Proposed amendments to the DNP text.

5. CP noted that he had circulated the latest version of the DNP received from DC, with a series of suggested changes to the narrative shown in "yellow bubbles". In addition, DRB had circulated an email in which he agreed with the suggested changes and identified a number of corrections to the text, particularly in relation to the quotations from the new NPPF.
6. All present indicated that they agreed with the proposed changes; and so **DC was asked to update the DNP** to reflect the narrative suggestions and the corrections to the text. **DC would label** the resultant version as new DNP version 2.
7. DRB noted that in his comments there were a few questions of fact; and **DC undertook to check** those.
8. CP added that amongst his bubble comments were some suggestions as to areas which would require further action as IWUN evidence became clearer and as we studied the SCC Reg18 Draft Sheffield Plan.

Pre-submission Consultation Response Schedule.

9. With regard to this item, CP noted that he had not yet been able to do what was noted at minute 14 of the last meeting. He would endeavour to do this before the next SG meeting.

Relations with SCC Planning Department.

10. The meeting noted the December 2018 email exchanges between CP and Rob Murfin (RM) and that RM seemed to be suggesting that we carried out a complex housing assessment. It was agreed that we did not see the need for the DNF to do this; which, apart from anything else, would mean that we would need a full SEA assessment if housing sites were identified.
11. With regard to housing, the DNF is not going to produce a full housing plan, not least because we have no un-utilised housing sites and no brownfield sites. And there is evidence to support this in the SHMA document which states that there is limited scope for housing development in the SW of Sheffield.
12. The SG also noted the comments prepared by DC in which he confirmed that there was no requirement for the DNF to prepare a full housing needs assessment.
13. It was believed that RM would be leaving his post at the end of February and moving to Northumberland.
14. There was still no information as to when the SCC Reg18 document would be published, although it was conjectured that they may wait until after the local elections.
15. DC was waiting to hear from Sarah Smith (SS) about a date for the promised early February meeting. Topics for the meeting could include the SCC comments in their SEA response, the issue of housing, ADAS and permitted development rights.

High Street Issues.

16. There was uncertainty as to whether the Government proposals concerning permitted development rights on the High Street would be pursued in the short term or whether the concentration on Brexit would mean that it was delayed.
17. DC noted that, in line with minute 22 of the last meeting, he had responded to the proposals, objecting to the ideas that in small local areas shops should be allowed to be converted into residential use, and that the temporary increase in the scale of residential extensions allowed without Planning Permission should be permanent. **DC to locate a copy of his objection and circulate** it to SG members.
18. **KS will speak to our Local Councillors** to seek their support in objecting to these proposals.
19. **Church Hall.** With regard to the Church Hall, it was noted that the PCC was now publicising a public meeting to present and discuss its proposal to demolish the Church Hall. This was welcomed; and the DVS was publicising this event as widely as possible to ensure that all those within the community were aware of it.
20. It was thought that because it was in a Conservation Area, permission would need to be sought from the Planning Authority for its demolition. It was believed that when there was a similar situation in Norton, the Authority required proof that all the community uses of the Hall could be catered for elsewhere. **DC will investigate what** the current SCC regulations and current Local Plans say about such situations.
21. **Post Office.** Concern was also expressed about the situation with regard to the Post Office. CP noted that he had written to the Post Office headquarters stating how important it was to the local community for there to be a post office in Dore.
22. However, there was concern that the appeal submitted by the owner had been a bit haphazard and hurried. With proper notice, the DVS could have publicised the petition widely throughout the community.

Basic Conditions Statement.

23. DC reported that he had changed this to reflect the new NPPF.
24. Although it was noted that more work would be needed in due course to keep this upto date, for the time being nothing further could be done.

SEA/HRA screening opinions.

25. Members discussed the email response from SS dated 21st December 2018. It was noted that although technically it was the responsibility of the DNF to complete this, the SCC has offered to carry it out and we had accepted. And the SCC had subsequently felt the need for further investigation, hence the delay.
26. However, the SCC (and the PDNPA) had now confirmed that the DNP did not require a full SEA/HRA assessment, which was what we fully expected and was welcomed. A final comment was still awaited from Rhodri Thomas regarding the SCC ecological report on points raised by Natural England in their P-SC response. **CP will contact him** at the end of January if no progress is evident.
27. Although the SCC conclusion was welcomed there was concern that within the report the SCC had made a number of negative comments about the housing elements of the DNP. The SG did not believe that these comments were appropriate to be included within a document relating to an environmental assessment. **CP will challenge** the inclusion of these comments, most probably when the meeting with SS takes place.
28. There was also concern at the references to the possible need for the screening opinions to be reviewed if there are significant or material changes to the draft DNP. It was agreed to accept the SCC offer to review the screening opinions in advance of the formal submission of the final DNP, noting that the Government regulations stated that an environmental assessment need not be carried out for a minor modification to a plan. **CP will communicate this decision** to SS.

29. It was also agreed in principle to accept the revised wording proposed by SS in respect of DN14. However, before confirming this it was agreed that we should see the SCC Local Heritage List. **CP will request this from SS.**

Workload Priorities.

30. The updated schedule presented by CP was noted.

Any Other Business.

31. It was agreed that the next article in Dore to Door should focus on explaining why there had been such a long delay in progressing the DNP, setting out the ongoing delays from the SCC. Although there was concern that this made the City vulnerable, it was agreed that this would not be emphasised in the article. **CP will be writing the article** before he departs on holiday.

32. There was discussion about the security and completeness of our archive and record of decisions. It was thought that PR had assessed this several months ago, not least with regard to the records held by TH. **PR to advise on this** when he sees these minutes.

33. **CP agreed that he would seek assistance** from his Son to ensure that his computer records were properly backed up.

34. There had been recent publicity from the local Liberal Democrats to the effect that the SCC had decided to keep almost all of any CIL for their decision in the City generally, rather than the advised proportion being for the area affected by a development. SG members were unsure whether or not this was yet the final decision of the SCC. **KS will enquire about this** at a meeting he is attending shortly; and **will advise SG** members of what he discovers.

Date of Next Meeting.

35. It was decided that the next meeting of the SG would be on Wednesday 20th February at 19.30

David Bearpark
11th January 2019