

Dore Neighbourhood Forum

Steering Group meeting 29th April 2019

Present: Christopher Pennell (CP), David Bearpark (DRB), David Crosby (DC), Jen Donnelly and Keith Shaw (KS).

Apologies

1. Apologies were received from Pat Ryan (PR).

Minutes of the meeting held on 3rd April 2019.

2. The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

Matters arising on the Minutes.

3. With reference to minute 4, DRB had checked the latest version and had found a limited number of corrections that still needed to be incorporated. **DC was to do this.** However, DC noted that amending some of the layout issues were beyond his competences. **JD agreed to review** these issues with DC.
4. With regard to minutes 5 and 17 it was noted that the minutes of the meeting with SCC held on 14th March had now been received. These minutes appeared to be broadly acceptable; but **CP and DC would meet** to review them properly. Also, the report from GW on Long Line had now been received. This was considered to be very thorough.
5. With respect to the planned Forum meeting, the confirmed date was noted: Wednesday 19th June in the Church Hall Townhead Road. **CP will put this on the agenda** for the next SG on 15th May so that the format for the meeting is decided; although it was agreed that visual displays should be used, and it was noted that projectors were available either from the Garden Club or JD.
6. With reference to the application for re-designation, DRB referred to his email in which he confirmed that he had informed Sarah Smith (SS) that he was withdrawing the suggestion for amendments to the DVS Constitution.
7. In terms of timing, DRB referred to his further email in which he noted the timing requirements laid down in the NP Regulations. **He would now be getting this underway**, speaking to SS as appropriate.
8. All other matters arising were covered by other agenda items.

Content of the DNP.

9. Before moving to a detailed discussion of the Housing Chapter, DC raised the issue on which advice had been received from SCC, AECOM and our own advisor, namely that it was inappropriate to include such extensive quotations from the Local Planning Authority's Policies and the NPPF Regulations within the Plan document; and that such references should more properly be included within the Basic Conditions Statement (BCS).
10. Other SG members shared the same concern. And it was also thought that few in the community would be tempted fully to read a document that contained such extensive "dry" quotations from LPA and Government documents, whereas a slimmed down document would help focus on the key aspects and issues. Therefore, **it was agreed** that in principle this approach should be adopted.
11. However, there was concern that this might obscure some of our reasoning and justifications. So it was also agreed that
 - We would continue to make brief references in the text to critical points, as we do already with regard to CS31 etc.
 - We would also make a specific reference in the introduction, stating that we had taken account of all the relevant documentation (and specifying what this is), making clear the purpose of the NPPF and noting that this was covered in the BCS.

12. It was noted that this was going to require extensive cross-checking of paragraph numbers quoted throughout all the documentation accompanying the DNP.
13. It was also agreed that acting on this advice did not need further referencing to Consultation from the SCC, as this was simply as a result of working with the SCC and following their duty to support the development of Neighbourhood Plans.
14. **DC undertook to recast the DNP to reflect this decision.** He would now proceed with this task.

Housing Chapter.

15. CP introduced this item by referring to the document he had circulated on 22nd April providing an analysis of the SCC advice on the DNP Housing Chapter, together with his further note on 28th April headed "Recasting the DNP Housing Chapter".
16. Discussion then focused on the "Recasting" note; and working through the items raised, it was agreed:
 - that in order to emphasise that we were not attempting to write a housing strategy for Dore, we would change the chapter title to "Character of Dore Housing Area".
 - in principle that the proposed additional text on the first page of the note should be accepted, albeit with some fine tuning e.g. remove "as we write". **CP and DC will discuss** the final wording to be used.
 - that we should definitely aim to submit the DNP before the publication of the Reg18.
 - that we should incorporate some key stats, those as previously identified by CP and the SCC.
 - that the suggested re-wording of para 6.10 should be accepted, although reference to the absence of brownfield sites in Dore (as stated by the SCC) should also be incorporated.
 - that the final para of this section of the note should also be included, but with the final part of the first sentence being omitted.
 - to accept the next section of minor amendments, relating to paras 6.12 to 6.14.
 - with regard to the next two main paragraphs regarding paras 6.15 and 6.16, to accept the proposed wording but also to incorporate in the first of those paras, reference to the fact that CS31 is currently an SCC strategic policy and we are obliged to take it into account; and to add in specific reference to SHMA2013. As to the second of these two proposed paras, **CP to review the second** of them to see if, in effect, it is simply a repetition of the first.
 - with regard to the question of character appraisal of housing areas, DC believes that this could be addressed by reviewing the text. **DC will produce** wording for this.
 - further thought was needed to address the SCC criticism relating to our use and definition of "mature gardens". **DC will look at incorporating** larger google maps of the housing areas, showing the urban grain and the profusion of mature gardens and tree cover. **Members will consider** other terms that may better address the point that we are seeking to stress.
 - that the wording proposed for para 6.17 be adopted.
 - as for the next sections of the note, dealing with DN5 and the need to show some willingness for development in gardens but with sensible constraints, it was agreed that we should not change the basic DN5 Policy but that we should amend the wording to make it a more criteria based Policy; and the wording in the proposed version from CP was thought to be appropriate because it admitted of the possibility of some rear garden development in suitable circumstances, although **CP and DC will discuss** this wording further.
 - the remaining suggestions in the CP note were all agreed.
17. **DC and CP undertook now** to build the changes agreed into the revised wording of the DNP.

18. The meeting then discussed the presentation format of the DNP. It was noted that the recently seen Dronfield NP was a more user friendly and easier reading document than our current draft. It was noted that this was a professionally produced document. DC noted that he would need the Professional version of Adobe Acrobat. KS noted that the DVS already had this for use by John Eastwood. It was agreed that John Eastwood would be asked if, with his experience as the editor of Dore to Door, he could produce a more user friendly version. **KS will do this** at the DVS committee meeting tomorrow.

Schedule of SG activities.

19. It was noted that items 1 to 17 of the 24th April version had now been completed. Most of the items 18 to 33 for tonight's meeting had been done, but item 26 on housing had been delayed because of the late receipt of the SCC advice, and work on the updating of the P-SC schedule had been set back. Items 35 and above were in hand; but **CP would clarify** in an early re-issue of the schedule which of them had to be done for the 15th May meeting to achieve our Submission timetable.

20. With regard to item 27, it was agreed **that DC should ask the PDPNA now** to produce the DNP Area Map. This was something that was not going to change, unless there was some necessary adjustment in the village centre.

21. With reference to item 30, the P-SC schedule, **CP and PR would discuss** this further.

Vision and Aims.

22. CP referred to the action placed on him to review the Vision and Aims section of the DNP; and he referred to his email and attachment of 11th April.

23. The proposed text was discussed and it was agreed to adopt the wording proposed. **DC will incorporate this into** the next draft of the DNP.

Any Other Business.

24. **JD agreed to provide** an update of the Absence Schedule of SG members. **Each member** to provide JD with updated information.

25. CP drew attention to his email of 12th April to PR, copied to SG members, and suggested that his proposal for amending para 5.25 in the DNP on Long Line should be amended as he had written it. This was agreed.

26. CP noted the proposal by the Mayor of London to create National City Park status for London in July. CP suggested it would be inspirational if Sheffield City Council could investigate and replicate this step so that, as they were the joint first with London in introducing Green Belts, they could work alongside our Neighbouring National Park to co-operate in the introduction of the Sheffield National City Park celebrating the greening of both.

Date of next meetings.

27. The next meeting will be, as already arranged, on Wednesday 15th May.

28. Following that, it was agreed that the subsequent meeting would be on Monday 10th June. This would be a week prior to the Forum meeting and so would provide an opportunity to prepare for that meeting.

David Bearpark
30th April 2019