



DORE HEALTHCHECK REPORT



Microsoft Office User
HEWLETT-PACKARD

SECTION 1

SECTION 1: contents

Page 2

SECTION 2: Summary

Page 3-4

SECTION 3: Introduction

Pages 5--6

SECTION 4: The report

Pages 7-16

SECTION 5: Conclusion and Recommendations

Pages 17

SECTION 2

Summary

I have been appointed by Dore Neighbourhood Forum to carry out a Healthcheck on the Dore NDP. I can summarise my findings as follows:

1. The consultation process.
Although currently only a draft, the Consultation Statement documents an extensive and robust consultation process and demonstrates how the policies within the Neighbourhood Plan have developed from the issues raised during the consultation process and how those policies were revised as a result of the comments received.
2. The evidence base
I Have not been provided with the evidence base which supports the formulation of the policies within the plan. This is not to say it doesn't exist but it needs to underpin the policies and be available to review by the Examiner. This should cover issues like the Local Green Spaces policy.
3. Basic Conditions Statement
I have been provided with a draft Basic Conditions Statement, this needs some work in terms of setting out details of the Development Plan, the time period for the Plan. I understand that the scoping for the SEA and HRA have not yet been undertaken, the conclusion of this screening opinion will need to be included.
4. The policies.
I have reviewed the plan and its policies and I consider that whilst most of the policies could meet the requirements of the Basic Conditions test some do require do require considerable modification as I have indicated.
5. The plan includes too much detail from the NPPF and Development plan- this is usually covered in the Basic Conditions Statement.
6. Neighbourhood Plan Area
The Neighbourhood Plan Area covers Dore Neighbourhood Area and was designated on the 4th of February 2014. There are no other Neighbourhood Plans covering this area.
7. At the time of the Healthcheck the relevant Development Plan was the the Peak District National Park Authority Local Development Framework adopted in October 2011, the Peak District National Park Local Plan adopted March 2001, the Sheffield City Council Core Strategy adopted March 2009 and 'saved policies' of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan adopted in March 1998. I understand that Sheffield City Council is currently preparing the Sheffield Plan. It is important that the NP is consistent in its reference to the "Development Plan" which is the currently adopted Local Plan and not the emerging local plan UNLESS the emerging local plan is to be adopted before the NP goes forward for examination. The phrase to remember is that the

policies in the NP must be “in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan”. References to the emerging local plan should not be included, however, any evidence base produced for the emerging local plan can and should be used to inform the NP policies particularly in relation to housing. It is difficult for me to say whether the NP could reach Referendum before the adoption of the new Sheffield Plan. Therefore, it seems important to ensure as far as possible that the NP is in general conformity with the strategic policies of both plans, accepting that the strategic policies of the emerging Plan could be subject to change, though at this stage references in the NP to the Development Plan should be confined to the current Development Plan – this could be revised at a later date if necessary. This is to ensure that the NP does not become out of date as soon as the new Sheffield Plan is adopted.

8. Sheffield Council in line with the requirements of the European Directive 2001/42/EC, has an obligation to determine whether the Plan is likely to have significant environmental effects, they will need to prepare a Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion, which will confirm whether or not a Strategic Environmental Assessment is required.
9. As above Sheffield Council need to carry out the Habitat Regulations Screening Opinion, which will confirm whether or not a Strategic Environmental Assessment is required.
- 10.** It is also necessary to assess whether or not the Plan contributes to the achievement of Sustainable Development. This is covered briefly in the Basic Conditions Statement however this will need to be reviewed in response to the result of the SEA and HRA screening opinion.

SECTION 3

Introduction

1. Scope of the Healthcheck

My name is Deborah McCann and I have been appointed by the Dore Neighbourhood Forum to “Healthcheck” the plan in its current form and advise whether it meets the Basic Conditions or could with modification meet the Basic Conditions. I have limited number of days to review the information provided and write my report and my response is intended to give my general opinion on that information not detailed re writing of any areas of the plan I consider do not at the current time meet the basic conditions.

I am independent of the qualifying body, I do not have any interest in the land in the plan area, and I have appropriate qualifications and experience, including experience in public, private and community sectors.

When the Dore NDP is ready to be independently examined the examination will follow the process set out in the Town and County Planning Act 1990 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011) and the subsequent Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

2. The Role of Examiner including the examination process and legislative background.

When the plan does reach the independent examination stage, the examiner is required to make one of the following recommendations:

1. The Plan can proceed to a Referendum
2. The Plan with recommended modifications can proceed to a Referendum
3. The Plan does not meet the legal requirements and cannot proceed to a Referendum

The examiner will also recommend whether the Referendum Area should be different from the Plan Area.

In examining the Plan, the examiner is required to check, under Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, whether: - the policies in the Plan relate to the development and use of land for a designated Neighbourhood Area are in line with the requirements of Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004:

- The Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the Planning and

Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to specify the period for which it has effect - the Plan has been prepared for an area designated under the Localism Act 2011 and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.

The examiner will also determine whether the Plan complies with the Basic Conditions, which are that the proposed Neighbourhood Plan:

- Has regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- Contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
and
- Is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the Development Plan for the area.

The Plan must also not breach, and otherwise be compatible with EU obligations and Human Rights requirements.

Upon completion of the examiners report Sheffield City Council will consider the Examiner's report and decide whether it is satisfied with the Examiner's recommendations. The Council will publicise its decision on whether or not the plan will be submitted to a referendum, with or without modifications. If the Neighbourhood Plan is submitted to a referendum, then 28 days' notice will be given of the referendum procedure and Neighbourhood Plan details. If the referendum results in more than half those voting (i.e. greater than 50%), voting in favour of the plan, then the City Council must "make" the Neighbourhood Plan a part of its Development Plan as soon as possible. If approved by a referendum and then "made" by the local planning authority, the plan then forms part of the Development Plan.

SECTION 4

The Report

1. Qualifying body

I understand that Dore Neighbourhood Forum is the Qualifying Body.

2. Neighbourhood Plan Area

The designated Dore Neighbourhood Development Plan covers the Dore Neighbourhood Plan Area. The Basic Conditions Statement confirms that there are no other Neighbourhood Plans covering the Area.

3. Plan Period

I understand that it is intended that the Development Plan will cover the period 2018-2034, this needs to be made clear in all the documents relating to the Plan.

4. The Consultation Process

The requirements of the consultation process that has led to the production of the plan, is set out in regulation 14 in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The Consultation Statement must form part of the submission draft and therefore must meet the requirements of regulation 14.

I have been provided with a Draft Consultation Statement. The consultation process appears to be thorough and well documented. It is important that modifications you have made to the plan and its policies as a result of comments received during the development of the plan are clearly recorded within the Consultation Statement including comments from both councils.

5. Compliance with the Basic Conditions

The Examiner has to determine whether the Dore NDP:

1. Has regard to national policies and advice
2. Contributes to sustainable development
3. Is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the appropriate Development Plan
4. Is not in breach and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations and Human Rights requirements.

The documents brought to my attention by the group for my Healthcheck include:

- Dore Draft Neighbourhood Plan
- Draft Consultation Statement
- Draft Basic Conditions Statement

7.Planning Policy

7.1. National Planning Policy

National Policy guidance is in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012.

To meet the Basic Conditions, the Plan must have “regard to national policy and advice”.

In addition, the NPPF requires that a Neighbourhood Plan "must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the local plan". Paragraph 16 states that neighbourhoods should “develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development; plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan”.

The Plan does not need to repeat these national policies, but to demonstrate it has taken them into account.

I have reviewed the plan and its policies and I consider that whilst most of the policies could meet the requirements of the Basic Conditions test some do require do require considerable modification as I have indicated.

7.2. Local Planning Policy- The Development Plan

At the time of the Healthcheck the relevant Development Plan was the Peak District National Park Authority Local Development Framework adopted in October 2011, the Peak District National Park Local Plan adopted March 2001, the Sheffield City Council Core Strategy adopted March 2009 and ‘saved policies’ of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan adopted in March 1998.I understand that Sheffield City Council is currently preparing the Sheffield Plan. It is important that the NP is consistent in its reference to the “Development Plan” which is the currently adopted Local Plan and not the emerging local plan UNLESS the emerging local plan is to be adopted before the NP goes forward for examination. The phrase to remember is that the policies in the NP must be “in general conformity with the strategic policies

contained in the development plan”. References to the emerging local plan should not be included, however, any evidence base produced for the emerging local plan can and should be used to inform the NP policies particularly in relation to housing. It is difficult for me to say whether the NP could reach Referendum before the adoption of the new Sheffield Plan. Therefore, it seems important to ensure as far as possible that the NP is in general conformity with the strategic policies of both plans, accepting that the strategic policies of the emerging Plan could be subject to change, though at this stage references in the NP to the Development Plan should be confined to the current Development Plan – this could be revised at a later date if necessary. This is to ensure that the NP does not become out of date as soon as the new Sheffield Plan is adopted.

I have considered the Dore NDP policies against the strategic policies of the the relevant Development Plan, referring to the documents from Sheffield Council. I have also considered the Basic Conditions Statement. As detailed in other sections I think that a number of the policies need modification to meet the Basic Conditions in this respect.

8. Other Relevant Policy Considerations

8.1 European Convention on Human Rights (ECMR) and other European Union Obligations.

As a ‘local plan’, the Neighbourhood Development Plan is required to take cognisance of the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive 2001/42/EC Office.

A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and HRA screening has not yet been carried.

8.2 Sustainable development

The principles of Sustainable Development required in the NPPF should be taken into account in the development of the plan and its policies.

It is also necessary to assess whether or not the Plan contributes to the achievement of Sustainable Development. This is covered briefly in the Basic Conditions Statement however this will need to be reviewed in response to the result of the SEA and HRA screening opinion.

The Neighbourhood Development Plan is required to take cognisance of the European Convention of Human Rights and to comply with the Human Rights Act 1998.

8.3 Excluded development

The plan must not cover County matters (mineral extraction and waste development), nationally significant infrastructure such as highways and railways or other matters set out in Section 61K of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

The current plan does not cover excluded development.

8.4 Development and use of land

The Dore NDP, subject to modification covers development and land use matters.

8.5 The Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Aims and Policies

vision

Dore Neighbourhood Area benefits from the natural beauty of and public access to the Eastern Moorland Fringe of the Peak District National Park.

- **Dore Village has a unique character, largely enclosed by the Sheffield Green Belt which protects the setting of the Peak District National Park and the environmentally sensitive countryside between Sheffield's south-western suburbs.**
- **Village housing areas provide a variety of diverse, quiet, safe, attractive, distinctive and desirable low-density residential environments with mature gardens.**
- **A number of local open spaces are demonstrably special and valued by the community.**
- **The Village Centre is a valuable economic and community facility.**
- **Buildings and areas of architectural or historic importance and archaeological assets are valued.**
- **The community demands good public transport provision and appropriate traffic and car parking management necessary for a sustainable community.**

This appears as more of a statement than Vision and should be modified to say what the community wants to see in the future and this should inform how the plan's aims/ objectives are set out.

Objectives

- **protection and enhancement of the natural beauty of and access to the Eastern Moorland Fringe of the Peak District National Park,**

- protection and enhancement of the Sheffield Green Belt which constitutes the setting of the National Park and the environmentally sensitive countryside around Sheffield's South-Western suburbs,
- safeguard the character of Village Housing Areas by controlling the development and design of housing infill, protecting mature gardens and benefit the proximity of the National Park
- protection and enhancement of local open spaces,
- support the viability and vitality of the retail, business and community facilities and enhancement of the environment of the Dore Village Centre.
- preservation and enhancement of buildings and areas of architectural or historic interest and archaeological assets,
- Improve public transport provision and appropriate traffic and car parking management necessary for a sustainable community.

These are aims not objectives

Suggested Rewording of the Vision/aims/objectives:

Vision

In 2034 Dore Neighbourhood Area will continue to benefit from the natural beauty of and public access to the Eastern Moorland Fringe of the Peak District National Park.

Dore Village's unique character will be retained and enhanced. Buildings and areas of architectural or historic importance and archaeological assets will continue to be valued.

Village housing areas will provide a variety of diverse, quiet, safe, attractive, distinctive and desirable low-density residential environments with mature gardens.

There will be a number of local open spaces which are demonstrably special and valued by the community.

The Village Centre will continue to be a valuable economic and community facility.

The community will have good public transport provision and appropriate traffic and car parking management necessary for a sustainable community.

Our Vision will be achieved by:

Aims

- **protection and enhancement of the natural beauty of and access to the Eastern Moorland Fringe of the Peak District National Park,**
- **protection and enhancement of the Sheffield Green Belt which constitutes the setting of the National Park and the environmentally sensitive countryside around Sheffield's South-Western suburbs,**

- safeguard the character of Village Housing Areas by controlling the development and design of housing infill, protecting mature gardens and benefit the proximity of the National Park
- protection and enhancement of local open spaces,
- support the viability and vitality of the retail, business and community facilities and enhancement of the environment of the Dore Village Centre.
- preservation and enhancement of buildings and areas of architectural or historic interest and archaeological assets,
- Improve public transport provision and appropriate traffic and car parking management necessary for a sustainable community.

In order to achieve these aims identified through the Neighbourhood Plan Consultation process the following policy objectives have been identified:

- Housing
- Done Village
- Green Infrastructure/Green Belt/Open Space
- Heritage
- Traffic

8.6 Comments on individual policies.

N POLICY 1: Open Access Land

Development will not be permitted on Open Access Land that prevents or restricts the rights of walkers.

COMMENT

I have no comment on this policy.

DN POLICY 2: Long Line Development.

New single dwellings are not permitted on Long Line except in the following locations; Properties Numbered 1-19, 57-63 and 139-175 Long Line.

Care must be taken to ensure all development respects and enhances the high quality of the landscape in the Green Belt and the setting of the National Park

COMMENT

This policy needs to be supported by evidence clearly setting out the

reasoning and justification for this policy otherwise it could be considered overly restrictive. I suggest including some of the justification in the initial paragraph of the policy.

DN POLICY 3: Green Belt Enhancement

A scheme of enhancement will be planned to increase the value of the Green Belt adjoining the National Park and between Dore Village and Ecclesall Woods; to take opportunities to provide for access, open spaces, outdoor sport and recreation, retain and enhance landscapes, biodiversity and visual amenity and to improve damaged and derelict land.

COMMENT

This is a proposal and not a policy, it should be moved to the project/proposals section of the plan

DN POLICY 4: New Housing Development in Housing Areas;

New dwellings will only be approved on the footprint of existing dwellings subject to the development being in character with the existing form of development.

COMMENT

In order to meet the Basic Conditions policies must have regard to the NPPF and be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Development Plan- this policy is very restrictive and would, in my opinion need significant modification to meet the Basic Conditions.

One approach would be to include allowing infill development defined as “The infilling of an undeveloped plot in an otherwise built-up frontage by no more than two dwellings.”

It is important to refer clearly to the strategic growth policies of Sheffield Council within the context/justification for the policy and state that you support them.

Suggested modification:

Due to development constraints within the settlement of Dore new dwellings will only be supported where they comprise:

- 1. the redevelopment of an existing dwelling on the existing footprint**
- 2. infill development or**
- 3. the redevelopment of an existing dwelling to provide one or more dwellings for downsizing**

subject to the development being in character with the existing form of development.

DN POLICY 5: Local Green Spaces

Valued open spaces will be designated Local Green Spaces with scope for enhancement.

- a) Abbeydale Sports Ground
- b) Ash House Lane Playing field
- c) Beauchief Gardens
- d) Bushey Wood
- e) Dore Recreation Ground
- f) Dore Road Allotment Site
- g) Dore Village Green
- h) Kings Coppice Amenity Space- 'The Orchard'.
- i) Kings Croft Open Space
- j) Limb Lane Picnic Site
- k) Old School Sports Ground
- l) Topley Brook Green Space
- m) Topley Brook Road Verge
- n) Water Lane
- o) Whirlow Brook Park
- p) Whirlow Playing Field

COMMENT

The inclusion of Local Green Spaces in a Neighbourhood Plan must be supported by evidence that meets the tests set out in paragraph 77 of the NPPF – I have not had sight of that evidence and so am unable to comment on whether these areas meet the tests.

DN POLICY 6: Additional Open Space

An additional area of open space will be added to the Topley Brook Green Space for recreation purposes.

COMMENT

This is a proposal not a policy and should be moved to the project/proposals section of the plan. This policy could be replaced by a

Green Infrastructure policy. Green Infrastructure (GI) is defined as: “A strategically planned and managed network of accessible greenspaces and access routes, landscapes, biodiversity and heritage which will meet the needs of existing and new communities.”

1 Your plan should clearly state why green infrastructure is important locally, include your thoughts about green infrastructure in your neighbourhood plan vision statement.

2 Green infrastructure encompasses the neighbourhood's open spaces, woods, wetlands, meadows, watercourses, ponds, parklands, gardens, public footpaths and bridleways, and could be extended to include night skies. Try to link green spaces as part of the green infrastructure - this is important to form a living network.

3 You could include a specific policy on local green spaces within your plan in which you can specify particular named green spaces that are valued by the community and which it wishes to protect from building development. Some areas might already be protected by other legislation (e.g. registered village green, registered common, SSSI). Unprotected areas to include as Local Green Spaces in your Neighbourhood Plan might be unregistered greens, village ponds, recreation/sports fields and unregistered commons or woodland or river meadows. Draw up details of these specific green spaces that are particularly valued by the local community and by visitors; state why they are valued, and point out the potential conflict of interests between e.g. wildlife and landscape vs tourism and leisure pursuits.

4 Illustrate your plan with plenty of maps and photos. These are usually more impactful than verbal descriptions, especially in relationship to landscapes, green infrastructure features and traditional local building styles.

5 Be aware of what a neighbourhood plan cannot cover - remember it is a neighbourhood development plan i.e. it is essentially about development planning. But policies can be supported by aspirations and projects. There is no harm in creating a set of ‘wishful thinking’ aims even if they cannot be officially regarded as part of the plan. Draw up an appendix of simple projects and make sure that your council is reminded of those projects at regular intervals in coming years. This is especially relevant in terms of green infrastructure. Projects are often

ideal for the whole local community to get involved in on a voluntary basis, helping to develop the vital community spirit that is the bedrock of any good neighbourhood.

6 Consultation with the whole community is essential. It forms a crucial part of the evidence base that is needed to support the Plan. Use every opportunity to put your group's views forward for open discussion in the community, with open meetings, exhibitions, house-to-house visits, articles in local newsletters and so on, explaining clearly why you have reached the conclusions that you have but listening to what the community is saying.

Below is a suggestion of how to include this within your plan. It can encompass Local Green Spaces at the heart of the GI policy however as per my comments on the Local Green Space Policy it is necessary to have robust evidence to support any sites to be included.

Green infrastructure is a planned network of green spaces and inter-connecting links designed, developed and managed to meet the environmental, social and economic needs of the surrounding area.

It includes:

- **Green Places – including: parks, woodlands, informal open spaces, allotments, street trees, multi-use trails;**
- **Blue places – rivers waterways and lakes**

Green infrastructure provides many benefits for local people including areas for exercise, relaxation and play, wildlife areas, flood alleviation, food and fuel production and sustainable transport links. Improving and protecting these assets is a key aspect of planning in Dore

Green infrastructure policy potential wording:

The existing green infrastructure network in Dore, which is important to recreation, leisure, community use, townscape and landscape quality and visual amenity will be protected and enhanced. Development proposals should contribute to an enhanced connected and functional network of habitat, open spaces and waterscapes by:

- 1. Retaining and enhancing the most important environmental infrastructure assets and connections that contribute to the functionality of networks of ecosystems and our Strategic Environmental Infrastructure Network in their existing location; and**
- 2. Demonstrating that all the functional environmental infrastructure and connections have been taken into account in the design of the scheme**

or site layout, including impacts on ecosystem services; biodiversity; coastal processes and recreation within and near to the application site and show how this understanding has positively contributed to place making and influenced the proposal; and

3. Providing appropriate buffers to natural spaces that have community, biodiversity and heritage significance; and

4. Restoring or enhancing connectivity for nature and people through the site and linking to adjacent sites or green routes, helping to provide better links between urban and rural landscapes creating accessible and attractive places for communities to make regular contact with the natural environment; and

5. Providing accessible and good quality open space; and

6. Providing clear arrangements for the long-term maintenance and management and/or enhancement of the green infrastructure assets.

In exceptional circumstances where retention of the most important green infrastructure assets and connections is outweighed by the benefits arising from the development proposals and they cannot be retained on site, the loss resulting from the proposed development should be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality of ecological or open space value in a suitable location.

DN POLICY 7: The vitality and viability of Dore Village Centre

The vitality and viability of Dore Village Centre will be supported by retaining and encouraging development of important shopping or community roles.

Development should not result in the proportion of shops (Class A) at street level frontage to fall below 50% unless it meets the following conditions:

- a) it has been shown that the unit would not be viable for use as a shop or community facility.
- b) the change of use would significantly increase the daytime vitality and viability of the centre.

Community facilities which provide a community's day to day needs or which further the community's well-being or social, recreational, cultural and sporting interests will be protected from development.

Development which would result in the loss of a valued community facility will be permitted only if;

- a) it can be demonstrated that continued use as that community facility would be unviable; or

b) equivalent alternative facilities would be available within easy walking distance; or

c) a commuted sum is paid to enable the facility to be provided elsewhere within easy walking distance.

COMMENT

This policy seems to be dealing with two separate issues and would probably be better if split into retail and community facilities.

In terms of the retail element:

- **To include an element in a policy with a threshold there needs to be adequate evidence to support the choice of that threshold. I haven't had sight of any evidence so am unable to comment on whether or not this threshold is appropriate.**
- **It is usual to include a measure to establish whether or not the continued use for retail is viable or not. This can be requiring marketing for a certain period of time at a reasonable price/rent, for example.**
- **How would b) be measured?**

DN POLICY 8: Village Centre Environmental Improvements

A comprehensive environmental improvement scheme will be developed to support the vitality and viability of the Village Centre as the heart of the community.

COMMENT

This is a proposal and not a policy and should be moved to the proposals/project section of the plan.

DN POLICY 9: Sites of Archaeological Heritage Significance

The sites and settings of archaeological significance at Copperas House, Whirlow Wheel and Rycroft Mills will be protected from development that may harm their significance.

COMMENT

The current wording of this policy does not reflect the control set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant policy guidance and would therefore not meet the Basic Condition in this respect. As policy control already exists at a national level it is unnecessary to include a policy of this kind within a Neighbourhood Plan. However, if you wish to include one it must reflect the higher tier policy and not seek a greater level of control than already exists.

Suggested rewording:

DN POLICY 9: Sites of Archaeological Heritage Significance

Copperas House, Whirlow Wheel and Rycroft Mills are sites of archaeological significance. Any proposal affecting or having the potential to affect these sites must be accompanied by an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, will be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

DN POLICY 10: Demolition in Dore Conservation Area

The Council will resist proposals for the demolition of, or alteration to boundary walls, gate piers, fences and gates that make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

COMMENT

The policy control for Conservation Areas are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant guidance and would therefore not meet the Basic Condition in this respect. As policy control already exists at a national level it is unnecessary to include a policy of this kind within a Neighbourhood Plan. However, if you wish to include one it must reflect the higher tier policy and not seek a greater level of control than already exists. In addition, you will need to have adequate evidence to support how these elements do contribute to the character of the conservation area- through a Conservation Area Character Appraisal, for example.

Suggested rewording:

In Dore Conservation Area planning permission is required to:

- demolish a building with a volume of more than 115 cubic metres. (There are a few exceptions - you can get further information from the LPA).**
- To demolish a gate, fence, wall or railing more than one metre high next to a highway (including a public footpath or bridleway) or public open space; or more than two metres high elsewhere**

Proposals for the demolition of boundary walls, gate piers, fences and gates that make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area will not be supported.

DN POLICY 11: Protection of Heritage Assets of Archaeological Significance in Dore Conservation Area

Any proposed substantial development within Dore Conservation Area will require a desk appraisal of the potential heritage assets of archaeological

significance.

Applicants will be required to provide an assessment of the need for a field evaluation and conditions requiring protection, excavation or recording of archaeological remains prior to development taking place.

COMMENT

The current wording of this policy does not reflect the control set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant policy guidance and would therefore not meet the Basic Condition in this respect. As policy control already exists at a national level it is unnecessary to include a policy of this kind within a Neighbourhood Plan. However, if you wish to include one it must reflect the higher tier policy and not seek a greater level of control than already exists.

Suggested rewording:

DN POLICY 11: Protection of Heritage Assets of Archaeological Significance in Dore Conservation Area

Any proposal affecting or having the potential to affect Heritage Assets of Archaeological Significance in Dore Conservation Area must be accompanied by an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, will be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

DN POLICY 12: Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest.

Development proposals affecting a building on the Local List of buildings of architectural or historic or interest will only be approved if the proposal is appropriate to the character of the building.

Demolition of buildings on the Local List will be resisted and would only be approved if no other use for the building was viable.

Proposals affecting the setting of a building on the Local List will only be approved if it does not unduly impact of the setting of the building.

COMMENT

The current wording of this policy does not reflect the control set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant policy guidance and would therefore not meet the Basic Condition in this respect. As policy control already exists at a national level it is unnecessary to include a policy of this kind within a Neighbourhood Plan. However, if you wish to include one it must reflect the higher tier policy and not seek a greater level of control than already exists.

Suggested re wording:

DN POLICY 12: Non designated Heritage Assets including the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest.

Development proposals affecting a non designated heritage asset including any building on the Local List of buildings of architectural or historic or interest must be accompanied by information which describes the significance of the heritage asset including any contribution made by its setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.

DN POLICY 13: Dore and Totley Station Park and Ride Facilities

Dore and Totley Station Park and Ride Facilities should be safeguarded as a rail and bus interchange.

Further development should only be approved which encourages usage whilst preventing excessive car movements. detrimental impacts on local housing areas, highway congestion, air pollution and overdevelopment of the park and ride facilities site.

COMMENT

The wording of this policy is problematic, it is imprecise and potentially overly restrictive. In its current form it would not meet the Basic Conditions. The purpose of the policy and its scope should be reconsidered.

SECTION 5

Conclusion and Recommendations

1. It is not necessary to include the sections from the NPPF and the Development Plan within the body of the plan and recommend that these are removed. Detailed reference to the NPPF needs only to be referenced in the Basic Conditions Statement.
2. I have reviewed the plan and its policies and I consider that whilst most of the policies could meet the requirements of the Basic Conditions test some do require do require considerable modification as I have indicated.
11. I have considered the Draft Basic Conditions Statement this needs some work in terms of setting out details of the Development Plan, the time period for the Plan etc.
3. I consider that the plan does not deal with County matters (mineral extraction and waste development), nationally significant infrastructure such as highways and railways or other matters set out in Section 61K of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and therefore meets the basic conditions in this respect.
4. Plan period 2018- 2034
5. The relevant Development Plan has been identified as the Peak District National Park Authority Local Development Framework adopted in October 2011, the Peak District National Park Local Plan adopted March 2001, the Sheffield City Council Core Strategy adopted March 2009 and 'saved policies' of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan adopted in March 1998. I understand that Sheffield City Council is currently preparing the Sheffield Plan.
6. Sheffield City Council, in line with the requirements of the European Directive 2001/42/EC, has an obligation to determine whether the Plan is likely to have significant environmental effects. The SEA and HRA screenings have not yet been carried out.

Deborah McCann BSc MRICS MRTPI Dip Arch Con Dip LD

Planning Consultant

CEDR accredited mediator

27th November 2017