**Dore Neighbourhood Forum**

**Steering Group meeting 15th February 2017**

Present: Christopher Pennell (CP), David Bearpark (DRB), David Crosby (DC), Jen Donnelly (JD), Pat Ryan (PR), Thelma Harvey (TH).

**Apologies**

1. Apologies were received from Keith Shaw.

**Minutes of the meeting held on 20th January 2017.**

1. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

**Matters arising on the minutes.**

1. The minutes of the meeting of the Village Centre WG were noted.
2. PR proposed a change to the current wording relating to Allotments. He had spoken to current allotment holders and to those on the waiting list (8). They were not in favour of the new site: it was too far away, was water logged and had no water supply. There was also the fear that if it was developed the Council may seek to close the existing site. Furthermore, some parts of the existing Allotments site were unused and this should be managed. DC noted that the current proposed Policy reflected the need strategically for the SW of Sheffield, where there was believed to be a waiting list of 850. It was agreed that the disadvantages of the new proposed site made it unattractive, that the cost of developing it was unlikely to be met by the SCC (Sarah Smith had already indicated as much) and that our NP was a Dore NP. So it was decided that we should change the reference to Allotments to make it a Proposal that the SCC should manage the existing site properly. **DC will make** this change.
3. The current reference to Transport at the Dore and Totley Station was felt to be wrong. We had previously decided that it was not the place of the DNP to provide detailed proposals to resolve the parking issues but rather to raise the need for a resolution to be found by the appropriate bodies. Accordingly we should make the wording less precise in respect to car parking; and we should also broaden the wording to refer to all other forms of transport. DC advised that this could not be a Policy if it related to on-road parking. However, PR noted that he had found wording relating to this sort of issue in other NPs which had been approved. **PR will send** this information to DC with a view to demonstrating that it was possible for the revised wording to be a Policy. It was agreed to adopt the new wording proposed by PR **(DC to do)**. It was also noted that at the moment we did not have wording relating to sustainability. **DC will incorporate** this into a Proposal.
4. With regard to Sarah Smith's statement that there are brownfield sites in Dore, DC reported that he had not yet contacted Sarah to question where these may be. It was suggested that perhaps we should simply refer to our willingness to see appropriate brownfield sites developed, rather than seek her clarification at this stage.
5. It was noted that Adele had confirmed that the PDPNA would provide a suitable main map for the DNP.
6. With reference to minute 11, DC noted that he had not yet spoken to Sarah Smith in order to obtain details of the Green Belt methodology. **DC would pursue this as a matter of urgency.** The recent announcement about possibly more frequent reviews of Local Plans carried with it the implication that Green Belt reviews could become more frequent. This was not helpful in terms of the long term viability of Green Belts, which needed a sense of permanence.
7. Inrespect of minute 14 and the recall of the Housing WG, DC suggested that the SG should first give further consideration to what was a considerable point of conflict with the SCC. Sarah Smith is saying that our concentration on the character and density of housing areas is contrary to SCC policy; whereas the Housing WG takes a quite opposite view and sees the definition of character and density as important to restrict the further heavy development within the housing areas. DC was now investigating an alternative approach to this. The London Borough of Harrow had incorporated within its NP an anti-garden grabbing Policy, which is in line with a new requirement within the NPPF. If we approached the issue with such a Policy, this would avoid the mire of character/density. Fundamentally, we should be sympathetic to possible new housing whilst seeking to keep the features that reflect the distinct areas of Dore. So, for instance, replacement housing, which could be houses or apartments, could be roughly on the footprint of an existing property but could not extend significantly into the garden. Such a Policy would replace the current DN5 Policy. It was agreed that DC would work up a revised section based on this approach and circulate it to the SG members before calling another meeting of the Housing WG.

**Matters arising from the subgroup meeting.**

1. It was noted that CP had written to members of the WGs explaining the delay on progressing with the DNP.
2. Minute 13 of the subgroup meeting was discussed. It was felt to be ridiculous that SCC could be intending to publicise its new Local Plan without having completed its Transport assessment work and incorporating a Transport Policy. **DC is to write** to Sarah Smith querying how this can possibly make sense: how can comments be made in the absence of a complete Local Plan?

**Dore to Door article and questionnaire.**

1. It was reported that the questionnaire was printed and ready to be inserted in copies of Dore to Door. This was planned for tomorrow afternoon after the delivery of the magazine. **CP was going** to send a copy of his article to Sarah Smith, local councillors, the CPRE and the PDNPA. **CP was also** going to speak directly to Brian Taylor at the PDNPA. The possibility of further publicity of the article was considered; but this was dismissed as it was felt that involving the local press would be seen by the SCC as confrontational.

**March 2017 version of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan**

1. The updated version of the DNP which had been circulated by DC was welcomed. PR noted that he had identified two golden rules for a NP. The first was that it had to be in harmony with the Local Plan. Currently ours is not, although several areas where this was a problem had been covered in the latest re-draft (and a further immediate problem for us was that the new Local Plan was likely to make changes to the current Plan). Changing the tone of the document and the proposed garden grabbing Policy will help; but do we need to offer more assistance with housing needs? The problem here was that after varying the Housing Policy element, this was still very unlikely to produce significant numbers of additional dwellings: the housing areas within Dore simply did not have much capacity; and for any such development the SCC would have to identify specific sites. As a consequence, the scope for many additional houses could only be satisfied if building took place in the Green Belt. It was agreed that we should stress that we supported the appropriate development of windfall sites and brownfield sites within the housing areas in Dore. **DC will draw up a Policy** to say this.
2. The other golden rule was that the NP needed to be demonstrably based on the views and issues perceived by the local residents. On the basis of the Consultation we had undertaken it was felt that this was the case with our NP. And the draft Consultation document produced by TH was setting all this out. In addition it was agreed that we should also incorporate sections of this into the text of the DNP document itself, to emphasise the Consultation carried out and its relevance to specific parts of the DNP.
3. It was also agreed that the introductory part of the DNP, or a foreword to it, could incorporate parts of the paragraphs previously offered for consideration by CP; and the Vision and Objectives should be extended to be less "self-serving" to Dore by also emphasising the benefits to Sheffield as a whole of retaining the character and attraction of Dore and its Green Belt within the setting of the National Park.
4. It was agreed that **each SG member** would review the latest draft provided by DC and provide comments to DC within the next week, so that **DC could then update the draft** further during the following week. In this way there would be a further opportunity to review the next version in advance of the next planned SG meeting. Depending on the comments received, it may be appropriate to arrange a further dedicated meeting to discuss this.
5. The speedy timings for these points was essential, so that our basic documents were in good order in advance of the publication of the draft SCC Local Plan.
6. In the context of the awaited draft Local Plan, there was surprise expressed that SCC appeared to be approaching the need for new housing development on such a broad Green Belt front instead of concentrating on the more obvious and available potential large housing sites in the four confident bite-sized chunks of Green Belt which needed to be master-planned.

**The Evidence Base.**

1. There was limited discussion on the updated Evidence Base circulated by PR. It was agreed that this was well on the way to being the finished version. **Each SG member** to consider whether more evidence items are required.

**The Consultation Statement.**

1. The Consultation Statement had only been circulated immediately prior to the meeting due to computer problems. As a consequence there was very limited discussion on it, although it was noted that there were a number of places where much more information was needed before it could be considered to be complete.
2. As the first next step **CP and DC would** get together to provide TH with information to fill in the outstanding gaps.Following this, it was agreed that **TH and PR would then meet** to discuss and develop further this document. **Each SG member** to consider what further changes were desirable to the draft provided by TH.

**White Paper.**

1. CP spoke about a new Government White Paper that had recently been issued. It was entitled "Fixing our broken housing market"; and despite its title, it still emphasised the need to protect the Green Belt. It was thought that this was a further reference to which we could refer in justifying our attempts to stop encroachment into the Green Belt around Dore.

**Any Other Business.**

1. Notwithstanding minute 9 above, in preparing these minutes I realised that the meeting did not address one of the actions referred to in minute 8 of the SG meeting held on 11th January. This was that in the context that Sarah Smith clearly disagrees with our view that each housing area has its own specific characteristics and seems to believe that some of those housing areas have no character and that we have confused "density" with "character", **DC was to going to ask the Government appointed** advisors for a view on this.

**Date of next meeting.**

1. The next SG meeting was agreed for Wednesday 15th March 2017 at 19.30.

David Bearpark

20th February 2017.