**Dore Neighbourhood Forum**

**Steering Group meeting 24th October 2017**

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

**Apologies**

1. Apologies were received from Keith Shaw.

**Minutes of the meeting held on 4th October 2017.**

1. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

**Matters arising not on the agenda:**

1. With regard to the postponement of the Forum meeting, CP had affixed a notice at the school to alert anyone turning up that the meeting had been cancelled. DC reported that he had spoken to the person in charge of facilities at King Ecgbert who had provisionally reserved both the evenings of 27th and 28th February 2018 for the meeting of the Forum. It was confirmed that the date chosen was 28th February; the booking to be w.e.f. 19.00 and the meeting being for two hours, starting at 19.30. **DC will confirm this** with the facilities manager. A number of comments were made about the proposed article for Dore to Door. **CP undertook to make changes** to it to reflect those comments. It was noted that the Spring edition of Dore to Door would probably be delivered to homes about a week prior to 28th February.
2. DC had had several conversations with Deborah McCann (DM) concerning the further NPIERS health-check. Her further advice and comments would be referred to under the appropriate item later on this agenda.
3. It was confirmed that we would be able to make amendments to the draft Plan after the pre-submission stage and before the Plan was then finalised (minute 13 refers).
4. With regard to a budget for the coming year, DC had spoken to the DVS treasurer and they had agreed to request the DVS committee to approve estimates of £3000 for the first quarter of the year, and then between £5000 and £10000 for later expenditure, including the possibility of engaging a Consultant to review the final version of thePlan.

**Current draft Plan.**

1. It was noted that DRB had sent to DC a detailed critique of his latest (6/10/17) version of the Plan. This had concentrated primarily on grammatical and presentational errors, although there also were a number of policy queries raised. DC has changed the Plan to reflect these points; and **DC will now send** the amended version to **DRB, who** will then do a **further proofread of it;** after which point **DC should date it and circulate** it to all SG members.

**Checklist of further work to be done**.

1. It was agreed that it was critically important that the SG had a clear list of all matters that still needed to be addressed. **CP undertook to prepare** a first draft of this, which he would circulate to all SG members for comment and additions. It would also be necessary to attribute individual responsibilities to each outstanding issue. It was noted that we still had a very tight timetable: there was not very much time remaining for us to produce the draft Plan, which we had previously agreed needed to ready for distribution by the end of January 2018. We could not ease off the pressure!

**Housing Policy and Evidence**.

1. CP noted that Locality had produced an analysis of the Government’s white paper on fixing the broken housing market, in the context of neighbourhood plans; and this had highlighted references in the White Paper to incentivising older people to downsize, thus releasing larger properties for families. This could play well with the “aunt sally” produced by CP on possible Housing Policies, and the follow-up proposal from DRB.
2. TH queried whether the new community development officer for Dore and Totley would have useful input to this debate. **TH agreed to contact** this officer to discuss her role and possible input.
3. DC reported on his conversations with Deborah McCann. Although she states that we do not currently comply with the NPPF, it appeared that she had belatedly realised the constraints on Dore for further housing development, accepting that Dore’s housing areas were completely developed.
4. However, she strongly advised that in the early part of the narrative of our Plan, rather than challenging the SCC strategy as set out in their Options document, we should instead be stating that we (in Dore) are relying on the SCC to solve the strategic housing issues for Sheffield as a whole and should not be seen to be challenging or confronting the Council over this. In this context, it was noted that the first words within the NPPF stated that there must be significant housing growth. DC had spoken to Sarah Smith (SS) who had agreed with this advice. The sections of our Plan to which this advice referred are 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8.
5. This did not mean that we did not mention this anywhere; simply that the references should come in the later parts of our Plan, where we are advancing the logic behind our Housing Policies. It was agreed that we should develop those Policies based on the advice from DM, the housing policies outlined by CP and the further comments from DRB. Rather than attempting this at the SG, it was agreed to do this by a smaller group drafting something for the SG to consider: **DC, CP and DRB agreed to do** **this**.
6. DC reported that DM also states that we need to be more explicit about a policy on infill development; **DM had offered to draft a** revised version of DN4 to address this point.
7. DC reported that **DM will produce** her further advices on these Housing issues by the end of next week. **DC indicated that he would keep in touch** with her to try to ensure that she achieved that target.
8. It was noted that the comments and advice from DM would become part of our Evidence history; and, as such, may be helpful in supporting our final wording.
9. CP raised the issue of the importance of the landscape transition form the National Park to the developed areas of Dore. It was noted that the PDPNA’s landscape strategy document was a strong document and was something that we could use in support of an argument here. It was agreed that **DC would strengthen the text** in this respect. It was noted that the SCC had produced their own landscape assessment several years ago but that it had only been a visual one.

**Open Spaces Policy and Evidence.**

1. The expanded version of the narrative in respect of Open Spaces produced by PR was welcomed; and it was believed that this should address the previous shortcomings.
2. There was extensive discussion on whether or not Water Lane and Bushey Wood were appropriate to be suggested for designation as Local Green Spaces. There was general agreement of the importance of protecting the tree belts in both those locations; and it was noted that they both had current protections by virtue of the rights of way through those locations. However, the final agreement was that they did not meet the clear criteria for designation as Local Green Spaces. It was also felt that we would weaken our case for the other proposed designations if we were seen to be simply asking for every green area in Dore to be so classified, even if they appeared not to meet the criteria. It was agreed that **DC would build into the draft Plan** the updated text provided by PR but **would exclude** Water Lane and Bushey Wood. It was also agreed that we would **exclude** Abbeydale Sports Ground, in view of the letter from the Club withdrawing their support for the proposal, the roadside verge on Totley Brook Road and the Allotments. **CP was asked to reply** to the letter from the Abbeydale Sports Club.
3. DC confirmed that, as advised by SS a little while ago, he had written to other Council departments on this topic; and their responses were in our Evidence documentation.

**Sustainable Transport Policy and Evidence.**

1. The revised narrative and two Policies produced by PR were accepted as the amended approach to this area of the Plan. **DC will read this and amend** the draft Plan accordingly; and if has any queries, he will pursue those with PR and CP.

**Green Belt**.

1. CP noted that originally we had a Policy covering Green Belt enhancement; and he suggested that we should seek to incorporate this again.
2. DC reported that DM has advised that we could have a Green Strategy for the Green Belt, to include the green corridors, noting that these were already part of the SCC strategy. **DM was going to draft** some wording to cover this; and, again, this should be with us by the end of next week.
3. CP noted that we should be aware of, and perhaps even refer to, the fact that even under current Green Belt rules, not all development there was prohibited, although there were clear guidelines to what was allowable.
4. CP also proposed that something similar to the wording in his email of 9th June was adopted viz. “*when assessing the value and sensitivity of Green Belt surrounding Dore and reaching judgements whether any development within it might be exceptionally acceptable, fuller than normal weighting should be given to the NPPF purpose for Green Belt “to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment” in that the countryside in question is not just ordinary countryside, but rather the narrow vitally important and beautiful setting of the Peak District National Park”.* **This was agreed in principle,** but we would await the proposed wording from DM before finalising this.

**Dore Village Centre Policy**.

1. The latest wording in the draft Plan was that from the Retail Workshop. However, it was recalled that SS had made a lot of comments on this wording and DM had suggested that we should divide the Policy into two. **DC would look at this again** and change the draft to reflect these points.

**Conservation Policy**.

1. It was suggested that our policy texts do not yet adequately take account of SS’s observation that the NPPF required that demands placed on planning applicants in the conservation and archaeology realm were proportionate and that, in any case, SCC lacked the officer resource to cope with work arising from too much demanded information from applicants. Graig Broadwith had given some additional advice dated 19 October on how to draft and evidence a policy on Local Lists of buildings of architectural or historic interest, pointing to the example of Otley NP.” **DC would study this and prepare revised wording.**

**Other Matters**.

1. To begin with, it was agreed that we should keep our Aspirations annex, despite the observations from SS.
2. With regard to the CIL, DC acknowledged that he had not read the comments from SS, where she stated that the management of the CIL was incorrectly described in our draft Plan. **DC will study this and will amend** the draft accordingly.
3. CP asked SG members to consider whether there were other matters which should be included within the Glossary.
4. DC advised that he was still in touch with the PDPNA regarding the final NP Map and any subsidiary maps required.

**Any Other Business.**

1. CP reported that he had been asked by two people who had been involved with WGs whether they could have sight of the current DNP. It was considered that we should make progress in revising the key policies discussed earlier before releasing any draft of the DNP. **CP will speak** to those concerned.

**Date of Next Meetings.**

1. It was agreed that the next two meetings of the SG would take place on Wednesdays 15th November and 6th December 2017.

David Bearpark

25th October 2017

.