

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

Steering Group meeting 12th December 2018

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

Apologies

1. Apologies were received from Keith Shaw (KS).

Minutes of the meeting held on 28th November 2018.

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

Matters arising on the Minutes.

3. With reference to minute 3, we had still not received a response from SCC to the notification that we had sent.
4. With regard to minute 4, DC reported that he had very recently received an email from Sarah Smith (SS). This will be considered later in the meeting.
5. Minute 11 referred to CP's proposed textual amendments concerning environmental evidence. CP had started to do this and **CP would complete it for the next meeting of the SG.**
6. With regard to minute 18, CP reported on the action being taken by the sub-committee (which included non-DVS committee members) of the DVS, with a nomination application to be sent to SCC proposing that the Hall is an asset of community value. He also noted that one of the policies in the current SCC Adopted Plan stated that such assets should be so categorised and should not normally be sold.
7. All other matters arising were covered by individual agenda items.

New Draft "February" Neighbourhood Plan.

8. Under this item, it was first noted that we now had a "frozen" record of the original DNP prepared.
9. DC reported that in the current version of the New DNP he has incorporated all necessary changes to reflect the content of the new NPPF. He had also incorporated two inserts relating to sustainable transport and varied the introduction to remove the blue coloured pages and introduce new wording.
10. It was noted that at some point the SG will need to make a decision with regard to the options presented by paragraph 66 of the new NPPF.
11. CP reported on a meeting he had attended where a researcher had concluded that references to Green elements in the adopted Sheffield Local Plan were well covered but that the enforcement wording used was weak.
12. It was agreed that **DC should re-title the new DNP** so that it was clear that the current version was V1, with further agreed changes being designated as V2, V3 etc.

Housing Issues.

13. The SG discussed CP's email of 5th December and the attachment to it. The SG agreed that what was proposed, both in the attachment and in the final part of the email, should be included, but with some of the wording being modified. **CP to produce revised wording and to suggest** how it be inserted into the V1 text.

Pre-Submission Consultation Response Schedule.

14. PR reported that he had modified the comments originally provided by CP, so as to reduce their bulk by removing what he thought was unnecessary wording. **CP will look at the revised document** and give his comments to PR.
15. It was also noted that in the email from SS to DC, she had confirmed that she would meet with the SG to give advice concerning the ADAS proposal. Following that advice, there would need to be further amendments to the P-SC.

HRA & SRA Screening Opinions

16. It was noted that we had now received the comments of the 3 statutory consultees, and it was confirmed that full assessments are not required.
17. It was noted that an SCC ecologist had prepared a report which had now been sent to the PDPNA; and it was hoped that this would now be accepted by them.
18. However, we still need to get the finalised statements from the PDNPA/SCC.

Transport Issues.

19. PR reported that he had seen an announced intention by the South Yorkshire Mayor to Commission a City Region Transport Strategy. However, from what he could judge, it would seem that this would not impact on the DNP.

High Street Permitted Development Rights.

20. There was concern at the 7th December email and attachment received from SS. The consultation from the MHCLG was worrying with its suggestion that there could be permitted rights for shops to be changed to other uses, including residential. If such changes were to be made, then it would override the proposed DN8.
21. However, it was noted this proposal conflicts with what is stated on the new NPPF on this subject.
22. It was agreed that **DC should respond to this consultation** on behalf of the DNF arguing that the introduction of such permitted rights was not appropriate for small Neighbourhood centres.

Consultation Statement.

23. PR reported that he had put all tables into appendices, which meant that the narrative of the document was now just about twenty pages.
24. PR will keep upto date with further changes that DC may make and make any necessary amendments to the Consultation Statement.

Basic Conditions Statement.

25. DC noted that he had not yet done this. **DC confirmed that he would make changes** relating to the NPPF, although it was too early to incorporate references to the screening opinions or the SCC strategic plan. This Statement would be one of the final documents to be prepared.

Workload Priorities.

26. This document from CP was noted; and it was suggested that it could be slimmed down by removing those actions which had now been completed. **CP will do this.**

Any Other Business.

27. DC reported that after emailing Rob Murfin, SS had replied on his behalf. In this response she reported that the SCC themselves had now received further advice relating to the new NPPF; and indicated that the SCC would be able to provide further advice to the SG, including on the ADAS proposal.
28. **DC will reply** suggesting that the meeting should take place early in February, to coincide with the return from holiday of CP.
29. **DC will copy** SS's email to SG members.
30. The SG discussed a proposed draft letter to Rob Murfin prepared by CP. it was agreed that **CP would send the letter.**

Date of Next Meeting.

31. As previously agreed, the date of the next meeting was confirmed for 9th January 2019.

David Bearpark
14th December 2019