## Appendix 3: Summary of Representations Received to the proposed Creation of a BCG Neighbourhood Area and Forum

Torbay council consulted on the proposed Area and Forum in accordance with the legal requirements under the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations. Consultation ran between 6<sup>th</sup> September and 18<sup>th</sup> October 2021.

The consultation received 31 representations. Two made general but broadly supportive comments, 25 expressed support for the creation of the BCG Forum. Brixham Town Council raised no objection. There were 4 objections.

No	Name(s)	Comment	Response
	(-)		
	General		
1	Brixham Town Council (Currently the Qualifying Body for the Brixham Peninsula Neighbourhood Area).	While the Town Council is saddened at the villages actions, it acknowledges the importance of the democratic rights of the communities, who we understand have been canvassed in this matter, prior to a formal request being submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The Town Council does not wish to present any objection to the villages request for designation. It is our duty to openly work with all stakeholders and neighbouring villages while representing the residents of Brixham to ensure a robust neighbourhood plan is maintained.  Subject to the successful designation of the Churston, Galmpton and Broadsands area and to expedite the refresh and modification of the existing plan, the Town Council requests designation of its parished area. It is understood that when a Parish or Town Council applies for designation of its area there is no requirement for the Local Planning Authority to undertake the 6 week publicity. It is also understood the existing plan remains in force until a new plan is made.	Noted.
2	Natural England	Neighbourhood plans present significant opportunities, but also potential risks, for the natural environment. Proposals should be in line with the National Planning Policy Framework. The key principles are set out in paragraph 109  The neighbourhood planning body should also consider the natural environment policies in the area's Local Plan. The neighbourhood plan should be consistent with these, and the neighbourhood planning body may decide that the emerging Neighbourhood Plan should provide more detail as to how some of these policies apply or are interpreted locally.	Noted. The Forum is likely to be supportive of the area's important natural environment.
	Support		
3	NW	Support BCG forum as it will democratically represent the BCG area.	
4	AL and JL	Support	
5	"Jtbl" email address	Support	
6	JW	Support an BCG Forum as giving greater autonomy to local residents. Feel let down by BTC over Inglewood	Significant local support noted. It is noted that some
7	MB	Support	supporters of the
8	TK	Support- will give voice and improved representation to residents of the area.	BCG area come from the

No	Name(s)	Comment	Response
9	JL	BCG Forum will have greater democratic say in the	Broadsands part of
		area's future of the villages.	the proposed
10	CP	Support	Neighbourhood Area.
11	PD	Support	
12	KM	Support- important that residents can organise to	
		support and protect the area.	
13	SP and PC	Support	
14	MC and AC	Support – BTC is not best placed to make decisions in	
		the best interests of Windy Corner.	
15	DS	Support	
16	PR	Support	
17	RR	Support a separate Forum from Brixham	
18	DP and MP		
19	SH and JH	Support a separate BCG Forum	
20	SC	Support the creation of a neighbourhood Forum	
		including Broadsands and Churston.	
21	DE and LE	Support- will give residents a strong local voice.	
22	CS	Support – will give more control to residents, which is	
		overdue.	
23	DrL	Support Given the recent decision of the Brixham	
		Neighbourhood Forum to deprive the three villages of	
		their democratic rights it is essential that there is a local	
		group to focus on local priorities and needs within the	
		framework of Torbay. As the supporting document	
		identify, the area covered by the proposed Forum is	
		distinctly different from the three urban area both in	
		terms of demography and geography. It therefore	
		requires its views to be articulated and heard.	
24	JW	Own land off century Road, Brixham. Will be pleased to	-
24	300	·	
		be associated with the new Forum in whatever capacity	
		is allowed.	
25	DrH,	Recent history clearly shows a need for the 'Villages' to	Support from
	,	separate from Brixham as they have different needs.	previous and current
		The formation of the new Neighbourhood Forum for the	TNP Chair noted.
		'Villages' will improve the general engagement between	
		Torbay Council and its constituents.	
26	LB	Support. From experience as previous TNF Chair it is	
		essential that any Forum is absolutely relevant to the	
		area for which it represents and in my opinion the	
		choice of this area is correct and reflects the guidance	
		on an appropriate Forum Area and is more relevant	
		than the current large area Forums we currently have in	
		Torbay.	

No	Name(s)	Comment	Response
27	ST on behalf of Abacus Projects and Deeley Freed Estates. (Owners of the Inglewood development).	Abacus Projects Limited and Deeley Freed Estates Limited wish to express support for the formation of the new Neighbourhood Forum and Area. The proposed Area as identified on the map submitted as part of the application is considered to be appropriate.  Suggested amendment to paragraph 3.1.1 of the Constitution. The word 'monitor' should be replaced with 'prepare' so that the paragraph reads as follows, 'To prepare the Neighbourhood Plan for the Broadsands, Churston and Galmpton Neighbourhood area and to decide how it will be monitored and reviewed, including frequency of review.'  Would like to remain fully engaged in the neighbourhood planning process with the new Neighbourhood Forum assuming a designation is	Support noted.  Minor amendment to constitution is sensible as the Forum clearly intend to prepare a new Neighbourhood Plan
	Objections	made.	
28	DW	Please advise what safeguarding and oversight and scrutiny instruments will be in place to effectively monitor the actions of this new forum. There was considerable local dismay at the actions of some of the elected officers of the BPNP. When concerns were raised the message clearly received from BPNP was that even if allegations were proven there was no mechanism to sanction any member of the forum.  As it is likely that some of the former members of BPNP will migrate to the proposed new forum the issue of their accountability is a matter of public concern.	Noted. The issues appear to relate to a specific site, which did not make it into the former BPNP. Officers have suggested that Forum post holders should sign up to Torbay Councillors' code of conduct. The two elected Ward Members are currently heavily involved with the Forum.
29	AJ and BC	Having previously attended various meetings leading up to the latest neighbourhood plan that was produced, we found that any comments we made were ignored. The committees appeared to be made up of unelected persons with self interest who just turned up at the meeting without a selection process. [removal of comments relating to an individual relating to a historic dispute which is not relevant to the consideration of these applications]  We object to this Forum process as the majority of residents will not be aware of its existence and assume that Torbay Council are the ultimate decision makers and any input on future planning should be made to them. Also the residents in the proposed area will believe they live in Paignton, which is their postal address.  We strongly object to these forums as these important matters on future planning should be left to the experienced Officers and elected members of Torbay Borough Council.	See above. This appears to relate to a historic dispute, and interests were declared at the time.  The neighbourhood Plan will be subject to public examination and referendum and must be made (i.e. adopted by Torbay Council).  Different boundaries have been considered to include parts of Broadsands in the Paignton Neighbourhood Area, but this would also result in

No	Name(s)	Comment	Response
30	MD	Not everyone in the Community has either the time and/or inclination to be a member of the Forum. However, the actions of a small select group will affect the Community as a whole.	anomalies, and the majority of responses have supported the proposed boundary.
		Having read the new proposed Constitution it is not clear to members of the Community as to what Codes of Practice the Forum will operate under and the complaints procedure available to residents if they believe there are issues. This is fundamental for transparency.	Officers have suggested some minor amendments to the Constitution. However, this is not intended as
		I have great concern that the phrase 'The Forum will determine' is much used, and if so, there should be scrutiny.	questioning the bona fides of those promoting the BCG Forum.
		Please advise me therefore what safeguarding and oversight and scrutiny instruments will be in place to effectively monitor the actions of this new Forum.	
		In relation to Finance there appears to be no easily published access for members of the Community to view and monitor or publicly be aware as to what is taking place and which funds are available and for what. Again, this seems to be down to the Forum to decide under the Constitution.	
31	JB	Lack of confidence in transparency. Proposed are contains most of the green areas Lack of public knowledge about Inglewood. Alleged issues relating to Waterside.	See above., BTC will still be able to comment on matters that affect both areas. It is
		Residents of Brixham should be involved with this planning due to any decisions in that area having a knock on effect for residents of Brixham. E.g. Inglewood development which will affect residents of Brixham, who should always be kept informed as well. I think this separation will cause even more divide within the community, caused by independent ward councillors causing even more distrust from Brixham residents.	common for cross boundary planning issues arise in planning.