

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

52nd Steering Group meeting, 16th September 2020

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

Minutes of the meeting held on 27th August 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 16, CP reported that he had not yet received a reply from Chris Heeley. **CP will now pursue him for a response.**
3. With reference to minute 18, DC had circulated the information immediately after the last meeting.
4. In terms of minute 22, KS had reported that the DVS committee had agreed that the DNF should have a budget at its disposal. **CP will present this to the next DVS committee meeting.** With regard to the suggestion that the DNF should be formally constituted as a sub committee of the DVS, KS recalled that the SCC had previously been keen to view the SG of the DNF as not being simply the DVS committee under a different guise. The DNF consisted of all DVS members and the SG purposely contained individuals who were not on the DVS committee. It was agreed that it would be better for matters to remain as they are, with the SG having the delegated authority to incur expenditure as it saw fit, against the total budget agreed by the DVS.
5. All other matters arising were referred to as agenda items.

Reg 16 Consultation on the DNP.

6. CP noted that the editor of D2D had advised that any information publicised in D2D should be brief and simple if it was going to gain the attention of readers.
7. KS reported that he had fulfilled all our obligations to Debbie Merrill concerning local publicity for the DNP, and she was very pleased with what we had done.
8. KS also reported that he had emailed information about the consultation to 850 DVS members. The offer had been made that a hard copy of the DNP could be provided or requested. KS was the contact for this; and he could get hard copies from CP.
9. In terms of possibly encouraging local residents to comment, DC advised against this. The Consultation was focussed precisely on commenting on the extent to which the DNP met the Basic Conditions. But these referred to a lot of jargon and many supporting documents, and local residents were extremely unlikely to have any knowledge of all this. It was agreed that we should not pursue this approach.
10. With regard to the appointment of the Examiner, nothing further had been heard from the SCC. **CP will write to SCC**, asking about progress, not least to make sure that we are going to be consulted.

SCC's Public Consultation on their Issues and Options Document.

11. After discussion it was decided that what the SCC really wanted were comments on their thoughts about Option A to C, noting that all 3 Options included 20,000 houses in the suburban areas. So, did we support/think it feasible that the other 20,000 could be provided in the central area?
12. In this context, CP noted his concern that, after years of austerity, the SCC might not have the resources and skills to manage the land assembly and master-planning necessary to produce 20,000 homes in the Central Area in the timescale required and it was important that the local authority should have substantial control of the exercise to ensure it provided the types of homes which were really required. The scale of this

'project' could not be left to developer choices. Failure to reach the Central Area target would create more pressure on the Green Belt.

13. It was agreed that the SCC had not really addressed the Green Belt aspect in any depth in this document. And the references that were there, were to Mossborough, Norton etc, and not to the South West.
14. It was suggested that our response should therefore take an encouraging and persuasive tone.
15. CP noted that many of the textual additions he had suggested had not been included by DC.
16. DC accepted this and stressed that his latest draft response document which he had circulated on 13th September, following comments from CP and DRB, was most definitely not the final version, as he had not yet really addressed the Green Belt issues.
17. In particular it was not clear to him where in response to the SCC's questions it was possible to make our extensive Green Belt comments. After discussion, it was felt that we would be able to make our comments, initially in response to question 22, and then also in the "catch all" invitation on page 70, or in response to the Landscape and Green Belt Capacity Survey mentioned by SCC.
18. It was suggested that we could combine two approaches. Firstly, our main response could be pithy and concise.
19. Secondly, we could provide a separate more "heartfelt" set of comments relating to the Green Belt and its location adjacent to the Peak Park and, in particular, to the western fringe. DC also suggested that our response should incorporate the phrases and wording used by SCC, such as the Green Belt being too sensitive to be developed.
20. In addition, it was noted, with some concern, that the Issues and Options document made no reference to the critically important issue of Biodiversity.
21. **CP agreed that he would construct** two statements, possibly to be prepared as winding up statements, addressing the key Green Belt concerns and the question of Biodiversity.
22. CP commented that one concern was that even though a parcel of Green Belt may not score high on the SCC comparisons with the 5 tests, nevertheless there may be other strong reasons why those sites were not suitable for development.
23. Equally, the SCC paper made it clear that even a high-scoring parcel of land might be suggested as a development site option if exceptional circumstances (like the inability to meet the housing target elsewhere) required it. The paper also accepted that the scoring system was not purely mechanical and involved a good deal of professional judgement, which surely made it potentially challengeable.
24. CP referred to the information that he had managed to locate which gave some more information about the Duty to Co-operate discussion with the PDNPA. There were points referred to in this summary which he could usefully incorporate in his narrative.
25. **CP reported that he had**, as indicated in one of his emails, now emailed the SCC to enquire about the absence of appendices 10 to 12 from the Green Belt Review document.
26. After discussion, it was agreed that there was no merit in the DVS committee being asked to submit a separate response to the SCC; but that the DNF response to that SCC consultation would note that the DVS committee had been consulted and was fully supportive of the response made by the DNF.
27. Nevertheless, **CP would provide** a summary for the DVS committee members in case any of them wished to respond individually.
28. In terms of the several supporting documents now published, PR pointed out that the SCC were only asking for comments on the main Issues and Options document. So were we able to comment on the supporting documents? The SCC 'Emerging Draft

Sheffield Plan' web-page confirmed that comments were also invited on 'Additional Documents' and implied that the same could be true of 'Background Documents' to the consultation paper. But although we could not respond to the supporting documents directly, we should incorporate our views within the general response, as discussed earlier in the meeting.

29. There was some uncertainty about the import of the Land Availability document. It showed as "available" area such as the proposed Long Line development and Ryecroft Farm. It was not clear why these were shown there.
30. In terms of the response to the SCC, it was noted that at the last meeting we had been satisfied that the SG had the proper authority from the DNF to respond to such matters on its behalf. It was agreed that we would share our response with the Long Line residents group.
31. With regard to the offer by Debbie Merrill for a briefing meeting, it was agreed that we should take up this offer. We will need to **see the updated narrative from CP and DC** and put together our questions (which we had been asked to do by Debbie). **CP will email Debbie** proposing either Monday 28th or Tuesday 29th September; and he will ask her if, as well as us asking questions, we will receive a general presentation on the approach adopted in the Issues and Options document.

Reactions to the August 2020 Government White Paper on the Future of Planning.

32. It was noted that several Conservative MPs were making very critical comments on this document, and it would be interesting to see how the government responded to this level of criticism.

Local Planning Applications to note.

33. It was noted that this was being raised here as it related to applications that were clearly in conflict with the approach set out in the DNP.
34. DC reported that he had sent his comments to the DVS committee in respect of a proposed development at 18 Blacka Moor Road, which he considered to be out of character as it was proposing 3 storey development, as well as 62 Dore Road, which again raised several critical points in conflict with the DNP approach.
35. CP reported that in terms of the proposed Long Line development, there had suddenly been numerous documents posted on the SCC website relating to changes in what the developers were proposing. The Long Line residents were currently looking at these.

Any Other Business.

36. There were no items of any other business, although CP thanked KS for again arranging the Zoom meeting.

Date of Next Meeting.

37. It was agreed that the next SG meeting would be at 19.30 on Wednesday 7th October 2020. This would also be via Zoom; and **KS would again make the arrangements.**

David Bearpark
18th September 2020