**Dore Neighbourhood Forum**

**Steering Group meeting 15th November 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 Thelma Harvey and Keith Shaw.

**Minutes of the meeting held on 24th October 2017.**

1. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

**Matters arising not on the agenda:**

1. It was noted that DC had previously reported that the person in charge of facilities at King Ecgbert had provisionally reserved both the evenings of 27th and 28th February 2018 for the meeting of the Forum. DC has not yet confirmed to the school that the date chosen is 28th February. **DC will confirm this** **with the facilities manager asap.**
2. It was reported that the invoice from Deborah McCann for the Healthcheck work would be submitted for approval to the DVS committee at the end of November.
3. TH had contacted the community development officer for Dore and Totley but there was no useful outcome from this.
4. All other matters arising would be covered in later agenda items.

**Healthcheck Report.**

1. A number of comments were discussed concerning the Report received from DM, mainly based on the list of possible questions circulated by CP. in this context, it was noted that the dictionary definitions did indeed suggest that we should use the word “Aims” and not “Objectives”. It was agreed that **DC would contact DM** with these comments and seek her response, which we need to have before the next meeting of the SG on 6th December.
2. The point was raised that one of the comments by DM was that we did not need to incorporate such extensive extracts from the various Governmental/SCC documents. PR agreed with this and felt that it made the document less easily readable. It was noted that the inclusion of this information was not to assist the Examiner, who would have all such documents to hand, but to help the lay readers in the community better to understand the reasoning behind the proposed Policies. This was felt to be important, although the size of the whole document could indeed be less than helpful. It was then proposed and agreed that a system of colour-coding was introduced, so that all background text would be in one colour, with another colour being used to highlight those paragraphs where the relevance and use of such background information was being put into a Dore context, leading up to the individual Policies, which were themselves already colour highlighted. **DC agreed to amend the document to implement this decision**.
3. Referring to a previous query, DC noted that it was not possible to have a second Healthcheck. We could, if we wished to, employ consultants to give us further advice. However, it was felt that this would not be necessary and, in any event, there was insufficient time to go through such a process.

**Revised text of Draft Plan** **Checklist of further work to be done**.

1. **Housing.** The document circulated by CP earlier in the day, headed Housing Thoughts, was discussed in the context of the current wording in the Housing section of the draft Plan. The suggestion that we had a second Housing Policy, emphasising the need for downsizing properties was agreed. Also agreed was the need to incorporate in our background supporting text, references to and extracts from (i) the SCC Housing Market Profile (part of the Options for Growth documentation) - perhaps add to paragraph 6.24; and (ii) the Government white paper on Fixing the Broken Housing Market - as an expansion of what is said in paragraph 6.1, which should then be moved to follow on from paragraph 6.24.
2. It was also felt that the first part of CP’s document could usefully be incorporated, as it read as a good introduction to the housing situation in Dore.
3. It was also agreed that some re-ordering of the paragraphs would be preferable.
4. It was agreed that **DC would amend the Housing Section** to reflect the discussion; and **DC, CP and DRB would then meet** againto review the wording in this section.
5. It was noted that DM refers to the need for more evidence in respect of the Long Line Policy. **DC will speak to DM about this**, as he has already added further evidence.
6. **Green Infrastructure**. DC observed that he had incorporated the wording suggested by DM into the latest version of the Plan.
7. It was noted that following each element of the proposed Policy the word “and” implied that every one of the elements needed to be met before the terms of the Policy were met. DC felt that one of the uses of the word could be changed; and **he would review it** in full.
8. CP noted that he wished to look at the wording in respect of Green Infrastructure and the Green Belt, along the lines of the wording referred to in the minutes of the last SG meeting. **CP undertook to do this** in advance of the next SG meeting.
9. **Open Spaces**. It was noted that DC had amended the previous version to incorporate the revised text provided by PR. However, not all of the new text was yet incorporated. **PR will amend the text in the** document as necessary — see minute 25 below.
10. DC noted that he was meeting Clare Wilkins from the PDNPA to give her the updated information so that the related map for this section could be updated.
11. **Sustainable Transport**. It was noted that paragraph 10.4 needed to be moved so that it was under the correct heading. **DC will do this**.
12. There was some confusion in the text of the document from DM on this section. Her comment on DN13 states that it is problematic whether it would meet the Basic Conditions. However, the wording in the second paragraph of this Policy, which she quotes in her document, is the wording that she proposed should be included so that it was an acceptable Policy. **DC will raise this with DM.**

**Maintaining the involvement of WG members.**

1. It was agreed that this was important, although DC observed that although a lot of the narrative was changing, the underlying principles previously debated and agreed by the WGs was not being changed.
2. In the light of that, it was agreed that there was no need for further WG meetings to be convened. What we should do is to write to each set of WG members setting out what was being changed and why. **CP agreed to prepare such letters** for agreement on 6th December. **PR undertook to** put together the position relating to the Transport sections and send this to CP.

**Consultation Statement**.

1. The comments received from Sarah Smith, in which she advised that only the consultations relating to the pre-submission stage need to be included, were felt to be wrong. It was agreed that we should continue with our comprehensive consultation document. However it was stressed how careful we needed to be — particularly after the pre-submission comments — to set out how we had responded in our Plan text to comments made.

**Checklist of Work to be done.**

1. The group discussed the extensive document previously circulated by CP, together with a précis document circulated by him at the meeting. After discussion, the items in the first section of this précis were grouped with designated responsibilities and certain of the responsibilities in the second section were amended. **CP will circulate** an updated version of this précis; but in the interim **the following summarises** **the responsibilities.** In the first section, DC is responsible for the first 4 bulletin points; CP for the next 4; PR for the next bullet point (Open Spaces); DC for the next 2; PR for the next one (Sustainable Transport); DC for the next 2; and TH for the final bullet point (Glossary). The responsibilities in the second action of CP’s document that were varied were as follows: TH/PR for the first bullet point; PR for the second; and DC for the fourth (basic conditions). **PR undertook to circulate** a revised version of the Consultation Statement by the end of next week.
2. Discussion then ensued as to how amendments should be made to the text by those responsible for their sections. It was agreed that **DC would divide the latest version** of the Plan into 4 or 5 segments, which would allow him to circulate these segments to each SG member as Word documents. This would allow those with the lead responsibility (as indicated in the revised CP précis) to make changes to that part of the Plan, thus relieving DC from the task of doing all of this. **Only the lead person must make such changes**; and if other members of the SG have suggestions to make for changes in an area for which they do not have lead responsibility, they must contact the person with the lead responsibility for that person to make the changes.
3. **Each lead person will circulate** their updated version of their sections to SG members in advance of the next SG meeting on 6th December. After approval by that SG meeting, the full text of each of the segments of the Plan will be emailed to DRB, who will then proof read the document, making grammatical and presentational amendments as necessary. When this had been completed, the segments of the Plan will be emailed to JD who will ensure that an aggregated document is prepared.
4. Given the limited time available before the need to have the Draft DNP reviewed and fully assessed in preparation for the meeting of the Forum (which process must be completed before the end of January 2018) it was agreed that all the above actions would be completed prior to Christmas.
5. In this context, it was reiterated that the published deadline for articles for the Spring edition of Dore to Door would be about 19th January (although the editor would be able to allow us some latitude for a further DNF article), with the publication date being c.16th February 2018.

**Date of Next Meetings.**

1. It was agreed that the next arranged meeting on 6th December would commence at 19.00, so as to ensure that there was sufficient time to complete the work scheduled for that meeting.
2. Two further SG meetings were agreed, to take place at 19.30 on Wednesdays 10th and 24th January 2018.

David Bearpark

17th November 2017