

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

51st Steering Group meeting, 27th August 2020

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

Minutes of the meeting held on 4th March 2020.

1. The minutes were agreed as a correct record. **CP will arrange** for them to be posted on the DVS website.

Matters arising on the Minutes.

2. With regard to minute 9, CP reported that the DNP had been updated to the new version. It had not been printed; but electronic copies had been sent to the SCC and the PDNPA.
3. With reference to minute 13 (consultation stage for the DNP), **CP will send a full set** of the documents to John Eastwood, copied to KS, so that if requested by SCC they can be displayed on the DVS website. SCC should not insist on hard copies being available for consultation, bearing in mind that they are handling planning applications entirely electronically; but if they do, KS can make them available for appointment in the DVS office. **CP will write to Debbie**, simply checking that their timescales remain the same.
4. In terms of the Examination, the specification for an Examiner has been agreed with SCC and the PDNPA.
5. With regard to minute 26, the SCC take the view that planning applications should not routinely be sent to the DVS. We can comment on this in response to the government's white paper.

SCC Issues and Options Paper.

6. The first matter raised was to address the initial 3 matters highlighted in CP's email dated 25th August.
 - It was agreed that we should delay any response to the SCC's document until we had seen all the other supporting documents promised by the SCC.
 - With regard to speaking on behalf of Dore residents, it was noted that the SG had previously obtained the explicit agreement of the members of the DNF to act on their behalf and to represent their views; and the DNF members had agreed the draft DNP. Therefore the SG could respond to this SCC document in the context of its implications for the recommendations within the DNP.
 - On this topic, it was also agreed that **CP would in due course prepare** some guidance notes for DVS committee members so that they could encourage other members of the community to write in support of the DNP.
 - In terms of possible limitations on our ability to comment on the SCC document due to the particular questions that SCC had posed, CP noted that DRB had identified from within the SCC document a number of opportunities where we could extend our responses to make additional points as we wished, including a "catch all" on page 72.
7. Moving on to an initial consideration of the SCC document, it was noted that we had until 14th October in which to respond, and so there was no need to act in haste (as already agreed).
8. PR noted that the additional comments made by both CP and DRB did not contradict anything that DC had written in his first draft. It was therefore suggested, and agreed, that **CP would make additions to DC's draft** as he thought important, and would then **forward this to DRB, who would then make what amendments** he thought important, following which he would **forward it all to DC**, ready for his return from

holiday on 6th September, for him to consider further. Following the completion of this process, DC **would circulate the final version** to all members, ready for discussion when we next meet.

9. Several members had noted the apparent absence of any reference to the travel corridor from Dore to Sheffield. Obviously we will wait until the GB Review was published; but for the time being it was thought that we should not draw attention to this point, because the absence of planned improvements to public transport made it more difficult for the SCC to propose significant new development in Dore and still meet their published Policy of having development close to strong transport systems.

The August 2020 Government White Paper.

10. DC noted that he believed that the Dore area would fall within the category of a “Renewal” Area — gentle infilling (DN5 and DN6); although there would be protected areas [the conservation area and the Green Belt]. He also noted that he did not see that this would have any impact on our DNP.
11. It was also noted that whereas usually a Government would publish a Green Paper for full consultation, this was immediately a White Paper, which just indicated the intention to push ahead with this very quickly.
12. DC pointed out that there may be proposals for a NF to contribute to design codes for development in their area. It was also thought that the need to make sure that the SCC Local Plan was in accord with the government proposals should still enable the SCC to meet their planned deadline for the acceptance of their new Local Plan.
13. It was agreed that it was probably futile for us to spend too much time discussing and commenting on this White Paper. There would be many major contributors, whereas we, as a small NP, would be very minor noise in the system.

Consultation on the DNP.

14. It was noted that this had been discussed under minute 3 above.

Other Matters.

15. The problems being experienced by Peter Marsh at Broomhill NF were noted with concern. It appeared that a major proposed planning development in Broomhill had simply been handled by Council Officers, no account being taken of the Broomhill NP.
16. CP reported that he had not yet received a reply from Chris Heeley. It was agreed that **CP should chase him for a reply** (copied to his superior and local councillors) otherwise the danger was that it would just be ignored.
17. With regard to Locality’s campaigning, it was agreed that we had enough to do and so would not get involved in contributing to this.
18. In terms of the weight that should be given to a NP, DC believes that the NP Regulations do suggest that weight should be given to a *submitted* NP. **DC will look out the document and circulate it.**
19. CP reported that he believed that at last a permanent Chief Executive has been appointed by SCC. It is Katie Hopkins, whom he believes is a significant appointment and who has a serious background, having held a senior position in the Civil Service.
20. KS raised the case of the proposed development at 62 Dore Road, where the style appeared to be appropriate but the scale quite out of proportion to the site and the location. The resident leading the objection was intending to engage an expert for advice; and KS was asking for contact with that person in due course. DC has sent an email commenting on that proposed development. **He would send a copy to KS, and Colin Ross.** The possibility of the DVS obtaining a legal opinion was raised; but it was agreed to wait for the outcome of the approach to the expert.
21. KS also referred to further planning applications for 17 Kerwin Road, 45 Townhead Road (a minor development) and 18 Blacka Moor Road, which was to demolish one house and build two.

22. KS raised the future status of the SG and suggested that it could be formed as a formal sub-committee of the DVS, with its own budget and delegated powers – in the same way as the Dore Show. **KS will propose this to the DVS committee.**
23. CP noted that in due course consideration needed to be given to what happens after the (hoped for) acceptance of the DNP. The Plan included several proposals which would require action, such as management plans for each Open Space. Decisions would also need to be taken about the responsibility for taking these actions forward – would this be the DVS committee?
24. In conclusion, CP thanked KS for his work in overcoming the problems in making the arrangements for this Zoom meeting, which had been very successful.

Date of next Meeting.

25. It was agreed that the next SG meeting would be at 19.30 on 16th September 2020. This would also be via Zoom; and KS would again make the arrangements for this.

David Bearpark
28/08/20