

Appendix 3

Neighbourhood Forums and Areas, Reg 5 and 8 Renewal Applications: Summary of Representations received to public consultation between 6th October 2017 and 20th November 2017. (All received by email unless otherwise stated).

The table below sets out the results of the consultation into Forum and Area renewal. In summary the consultation received the following representations:

All Forums –Support for renewal from 6 organisations, 1 Councillor and 43 private individuals. No overarching objections.

Torquay Forum – Support from 3 organisations and 27 individuals. 1 objection to Forum and area.

Paignton Forum – Support from 3 organisations and 16 individuals. 1 objection, 1 general comment regarding the area.

Brixham Forum – Support, 43 individuals. 3 objections to areas -Waterside (2) and Brixham (1)

Neighbourhood Forums and Areas, Reg 5 and 8 Renewal Applications. Summary of Representations received to public consultation between 6 th October 2017-20 th November 2017. (All received by email unless otherwise stated).		
Name	Comments	Response
General (all Forums).		
CPRE Torbay (Carol Box for)	Support Forum re-designation. Many Torbay resident members have worked hard over the past 5 years to produce Neighbourhood Plans.	Noted.

Name	Comments	Response
<p>Galmpton Residents Association (Jeremy Partridge and Christine Batten for)</p>	<p>Support renewal of neighbourhood forums. Forums/NPs are excellent bodies to foster and enhance sense of community.</p> <p>Retention of Forums and areas is necessary for the implementation of the Neighbourhood Plan and in view of the huge amount of volunteer time .on the Plans</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>South Devon TUC and GMB (Paul Raybould for)</p>	<p>Forums should be allowed to continue the work started in 2011</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Residents for Churston CIO (Ian Russell)</p>	<p>Forums should be renewed. Many CIO members have worked hard over the last 5 years on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Noted. Agree that a great deal of volunteer time has gone into Neighbourhood Planning.</p>
<p>Torbay Green Party (Dr H Boyles for)</p>	<p>Support Forum re-designation</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Torbay Friends of the Earth (Alan Griffey for)</p>	<p>Support the three Neighbourhood Forums of Torquay, Paignton and Brixham and agree that they should be re-designated as the Qualifying Bodies and have their associated Neighbourhood Areas re-confirmed.</p>	
<p>Cllr Derek Mills</p>	<p>The Forums should be renewed. A huge amount of volunteer time has gone into them.</p>	
<p>43 individuals (recorded as they signed themselves and broad area, where known).</p> <p>Individuals have been initialised, where the representation identified a specific area this is recorded after the initials)</p>	<p>36 Representations from people writing in a private capacity in support of all three Forums being renewed. (Note that some of the responses to individual Forum/areas are also likely to be implicitly supporting all three forums. Reasons stated include:</p> <p>Forums critical to wellbeing and success of Torbay</p>	<p>Noted Agree that a great deal of volunteer time has gone into Neighbourhood Planning.</p>

<p>AB, JS (Brixham), NG(Torquay), CD (St Marychurch), HB (Galmpton), RC (Brixham), JG (Roundham and Hyde), CL,LS,KP,CE (Paignton), MT(Paignton), MP,(Secretary of PNF),JG,DP,SK,JK,HG,AG,LW, SC, AR(Galmpton), PS (Galmpton), JS (Galmpton), EV,BV, BT,DM, HL(Galmpton) ,JL (Galmpton) ,RE, RM (Torquay), LS (Torquay) RC(Galmpton), JA(Brixham), AW,JW(Galmpton), RC, YC (Galmpton), FED,CB,CB, MG (Galmpton) Received 21/11/17</p>	<p>Three-plan structure supports effectively the sense of community.</p> <p>Forums will support the enhancement of greenspaces and biodiversity and give consideration to the provision of local food (i.e. through planning policies)</p> <p>Forums have done immensely valuable work. They should continue their contribution to protect our environment and promote the sympathetic development that we residents want to see within the town centres.</p> <p>Not renewing the forums would be a waste of public money and disregard of the hundreds of hours of volunteer time.</p> <p>The Forums and their Plans are also dedicated to an <u>environmentally sustainable</u> vision of Torbay's future which <i>protects</i> and <i>enhances</i> its unique natural assets rather than sacrificing them for short term financial gain in a way which will threaten the area's longer economic viability and attractiveness as a tourist destination. It would be heartening to see Torbay Council supporting these aims in accordance with, rather than in opposition to the communities which they have been elected to represent.</p> <p>Forum status should not be delayed to gain advantage for developers.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Forums/planning is the best way of representing the communities of Brixham Peninsula, Paignton and Torbay. I am aware of the dedicated efforts of groups of residents (the Neighbourhood Forums) who have expressed our and other local people's concerns in the</p>	
--	--	--

	preservation and enhancement of the unique assets of Torbay.'	
Natural England	Set out general natural environment considerations for Neighbourhood Plans to consider.	Does not relate to Forum renewal, but the Forums have been engaged and consulted Natural England.
South West Water	No comment	

Torquay		
Shiphay and Willows Community Partnership (Darren Cowell for)	<p>Support re-designation of Torquay Neighbourhood Forum. A significant amount of Torquay's growth is within Edginswell (i.e. Shiphay with the Willows).</p> <p>Significant amount of volunteer time has gone into preparing the Plan, which does allocate employment and housing land and is general conformity with the Local Plan</p>	The issue of general conformity with the Local Plan will be tested through the examination.
Leon Butler, Chair of the Cockington Chelston and Livermead Community Partnership	Our Community Partnership has played an important role in developing the Torquay Neighbourhood Plan by being part of the Torquay Neighbourhood Plan Forum. The Forum has consistently engaged with all communities across Torquay to develop the current draft Plan which is close to submission and eventual referendum. We therefore fully support the renewal of the Torquay Neighbourhood Plan Forum as the best body to ensure that process is successfully completed.	
Leon Butler Chair of Torquay Neighbourhood Plan	As Chair of the Torquay Neighbourhood Plan Forum I am making a representation to continue the Forum's designation so that the process of making Torquay's Neighbourhood Plan can be completed. <u>The Torquay Neighbourhood Plan Forum has been a success story - we want to finish the job!</u> It has	

brought together communities with a shared vision that has been extensively consulted on. It has resulted in a submitted Neighbourhood Plan that is bottom up, 'by the community, for the community'.

It is not meant to slavishly duplicate the Local Plan it is a development Plan that allocates housing sites and adds detail to the Local Plan and strengthens policies where the communities have identified a need. It has been independently shown by Torbay Council that it supports sustainable development and protects European protected species.

It has not been plain sailing, Torquay is nationally the largest Forum population, the process has taken too long, it has been a parallel process with the developing Local Plan and communities wanted their voice heard. Remember this is a new process for everyone involved: a bringing together of centralised authority with grass roots enthusiasm.

We have not agreed with all the potential homes sites in the Local Plan but we have added new sites of our own to more than compensate the housing numbers. As expected in any process like this there have been differences of opinion on some of our detail; however it is reasonable to say this was amicably resolved. This is a healthy sign that the end result has been rigorously examined and is fit for purpose.

The submitted Plan provides policies that are judged to be in compliance with the strategic policies within the Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework, if not then the

	<p>independent examination will reject those policies. Overall it is an expression of our communities' aspirations for Torquay.</p> <p>We support and given detail to the Local Plan (representation goes on to summarise Neighbourhood Plan proposals and objectives.</p>	
<p>Pegasus Group on behalf of ECVF Ltd, Sladnor Park Maidencombe</p>	<p>Object to Torquay Neighbourhood Plan Area and Forum. The area is too large and does not meet criteria in PPG. Neighbourhood Plan areas should reflect a neighbourhood level, i.e. be at parish or ward boundary level, circa 5,500 people. Torquay is circa 62,000 people. The numbers are too large to be representative of the disparate areas and interests in Torquay.</p> <p>LPA's have refused to designate large Forums in other areas i.e. Wirral and Manchester.</p>	<p>Issues noted. The online Planning Practice Guidance was introduced post creation of Torbay's Neighbourhood Forums in 2012.</p> <p>The PPG is not law and is intended to be guidance (i.e. less binding than the NPPF). PPG 41-033-20140306 indicates that the considerations around area size, population, catchment area etc. "could be considerations". It does not say they must be. Nevertheless the PPG is advice to LPA's that could not have been taken into account at the time that Forums were first approved in Torbay in 2012</p> <p>The above advice will need to be weighed up against the impact of not re designating the Forum/area in the light of a submitted Neighbourhood Plan. It would also need to be assessed in the face of the legal requirements under S61(F) inserted into the T&C Planning Act, and</p>

		<p>whether the Forum has taken reasonable steps to secure membership across different places and sections of the community.</p> <p>The decision on Forum status should not be used to prejudice (in either way) the outcome of the submitted Torquay Neighbourhood Plan's policy on Sladnor Park, or a future planning application. Consideration of these should take place at the Local Plan examination and/or a planning application, when submitted.</p>
<p>29 individuals</p> <p>PR, JC, RH (Maidencombe), CB (Maidencombe),LB (Maidencombe),HW(Maidencombe),KH (Maidencombe), VA,SA, MGJ, CS, CS, HG, PY (Maidencombe), HS,MB, MR,MR,WG (Maidencombe),SG,DE (Maidencombe),ME (Maidencombe),LMcM (Maidencombe),PN,RC,FED ,SM,DM,</p>	<p>27 individuals expressing support for the renewal of Torquay Neighbourhood Forum. Note that some could reasonably be considered to be supporting all three Forums/areas.</p> <p>Support re-designation of Forum</p> <p>Not renewing the status would be disrespectful to all those in the Forum and many others who have worked diligently and given significant voluntary time over recent years if Torbay Council fails to renew the status. It would also be in conflict with the Localism Act of 2011.</p> <p>Support sections of the Plan that deal with Maidencombe. The area is enhanced by having an effective neighbourhood Forum</p> <p>The Forum is a useful interface between the community and the local authority.</p>	<p>Issues noted. As above, it is agreed that a huge amount of volunteer time has gone into neighbourhood planning.</p>

	<p>The neighbourhood plan offers much needed protection from avaricious and inconsiderate development of the beautiful area in which we live.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Forums/planning is the best way of representing the communities of Brixham Peninsula, Paignton and Torbay. I am aware of the dedicated efforts of groups of residents (the Neighbourhood Forums) who have expressed our and other local people's concerns in the preservation and enhancement of the unique assets of Torbay.'</p>	

Paignton		
Save Victoria Park(Dr Sam Moss for)	Support Forum re designation	
Paignton Heritage Society (Eileen Donovan for)	Paignton Heritage Society unanimously support Forum renewal.	Noted.
Yalberton Valley Community Forum (Stephen Reed)	Support re-designation of Forum. The Forum has been a useful conduit between the Council and community and has a useful role to play in ensuring implementation of the Plan.	Noted
Jane Barnby (Cllr)	Object: The forum is entirely unrepresentative of the area It is dominated by people who want no change to Paignton whatsoever and has alienated other people. Please change the constitution to allow more voices to be heard.	Noted
ML(Paignton),DW,IC (Blatchcombe) AMC (Blatchcombe),RB, PB,RLL, ED,LG,PH,AGP, JM, HR, FED,VW, SM	16 individuals expressing support for the renewal of Paignton Neighbourhood Forum. Note that some could reasonably be considered to be supporting all three Forums/areas.	

Support re-designation of the Forum

The Forum has complied with all requirements for creation and existence of a neighbourhood Forum in a non-parished area. Forum designation is needed until at least the referendum stage.

Urge the Council to grant the Applications to continue the existence of the designated Area and Forum until such time as the Plan has been approved by Referendum or has been otherwise disposed of.

This Forum is an effective way for the public to make their views known.

The forum members have put in a great deal of work in order for the Paignton Neighbourhood Plan to reach its current state and it would be not only a great pity but more a travesty of justice if it were not allowed to carry on for another 5 year period in order to complete the plan and enable residents of the area to have a say in what is built, where and when. These rights were given as part of the Localism act of 2011 and are still current. There is no logical or rightful reason for not renewing the application.

Paignton Neighbourhood Forum is a community-led welcoming open-minded transparently democratic group of local people planning for Paignton Neighbourhood Area, preserving the historic heritage of its past, enhancing its environment and economy in the present, and preparing and ensuring inter-generational equity and sustainability for its future.

	<p>A substantial and meticulous effort has gone into ensuring the necessary balances of a stance that will be viable for the future of Paignton within the legal planning framework available. A stance which is essential to maintaining the health and beauty of the area, as one that values its historical green spaces and biodiversity by ensuring its protection and ensuring scope for further future enhancement, for the benefit of locals, employment, nature & tourism and to meet some of our responsibilities here in Torbay for tackling the scourge of AGW (Anthropogenic global warming).</p> <p>The Paignton Neighbourhood Plan been delivered on time and way below any comparable council budget adds great weight to the continuity of The Paignton Neighbourhood Forum and the geographical area it represents.</p>	
Paignton Heritage Society (Eileen Donovan for)	Paignton Heritage Society unanimously support Forum renewal.	Noted.
MN	Expand the plan area to include Preston School and Livermead across to Churston and Lupton House including the waters of Tor Bay and inland to South Devon College and University plus protection of wood land and farmland including Old Way Gardens and Mansions	Noted. This is not an objection per se. Some of these areas are not within Paignton and would blurr boundary lines. Consideration of protection policies for woodland and Oldway are matters for consideration as part of the Neighbourhood Plan (Reg 16) consultation.

Brixham		
Cllr Jackie Stockman	Support Forum an area designation.	
<p>42 representations in support from individuals</p> <p>CB, BE,MS,AC (Galmpton resident),RR,PR,ES(Churston), PD (Galmpton),IY (Galmpton),JR (Galmpton),JR (Galmpton), JC (Galmpton), RB (Galmpton) , DH,BH,JB,RWM,ST,JT (Galmpton), GT (Galmpton),JF, BJ (Brixham),HR (Galmpton), RS,JS (Brixham), SM (Brixham), BB (Galmpton),SB (Galmpton), BT(Galmpton), MT Galmpton), FS(Brixham),DA (Galmpton),JS,WB,NA, PR,DE(Galmpton), PS (Galmpton),WS (Galmpton),HG,AG,MB</p>	<p>41 individuals expressing support for the renewal of Brixham Peninsula Neighbourhood Forum. Note that some could reasonably be considered to be supporting all three Forums/areas.</p> <p>It is extremely important to protect our green spaces and natural environment, wildlife habitat etc. and the Forum is the best resource we have to ensure that the right development takes place in the right place.</p> <p>The Forum best represents the people of Brixham, Paignton and Torbay. The Plan is the result of considerable work by the residents who have concerns regarding the healthy and balanced development of our beautiful home territory.</p> <p>It is the result of years of dedicated effort by a group of residents anxious to ensure that the natural assets of the area are enhanced and protected from insensitive or inappropriate development.</p> <p>Sent from my iPad with best wishes.</p> <p>Brixham Town Council is the appropriate qualifying body to seek designation.</p> <p>The council has apparently delayed ratification of the Brixham Peninsula Neighbourhood Plan. A cynic might say that the delay had been deliberate in order to rush through major housing development plans before the said Plan (and others in Torbay) became legally enforceable. I</p>	Noted

still TOTALLY support the plan for a multitude of reasons - the same ones that I agreed with in the first instance. In my view adoption of the Plan it is the best way of representing the views of the local communities in matters relating to the preservation and enhancement of our local environment.

In the Reg 14 consultation, a very clear majority of residents who responded to the question as to whether or not they supported the plan were in favour.

The Forum has saved Torbay Council a considerable amount of work in providing the housing and employment allocations for the Brixham Peninsula

It seems scandalous that these local plans are being deliberately delayed in being accepted by the council just so that other large scale planning applications can be approved before these Neighbourhood Plans are adopted

We support the Neighbourhood Plan as the best way of representing the communities of Brixham Peninsula, Paignton and Torbay. We hope that the views of the local community are listened to as these additional developments will negatively affect all who live and/or work here.

We totally object to any further house building in this area as there is already over development here. The local infrastructure cannot support this. The roads, GPs, hospitals, education and job opportunities are already full to capacity and any further housing will only ruin the special environment in which Torbay stands.

<p>Gillian Baker (Widow of the late William Baker, who was a key author on the emerging Neighbourhood Plan: Name not redacted with Mrs Baker's permission).</p>	<p>As the widow of William Baker (an active and key member of the above Forum), I vehemently support and value the gruelling work that this group of volunteers have committed themselves to on behalf of the Brixham Peninsula. Their dedication has resulted in the production of a high quality detailed plan. Through consultation great care has been taken to represent the views of the population in the Brixham Peninsula. I am angry that the process has not yet been completed. There have been many hurdles to surmount resulting in so many hours of deliberation and redrafting, Will found this so frustrating I am certain the stress contributed to his heart condition and early death.</p> <p>FIVE YEARS WORK BY LOCAL RESIDENTS must NOT be wasted!</p> <p>I strongly support the renewal of the Brixham Peninsula Neighbourhood Forum and its area designations.</p>	<p>Noted with sympathy.</p>
<p>DH (Brixham)</p>	<p>Brixham should not be renewed. The Town Council is the elected body and should be the qualifying body- not some self-appointed well-meaning volunteers. Churston and Galmpton may need their own forum.</p>	<p>Since Brixham Town Council is the qualifying body for Brixham (as required by law), this appears to be a comment that Churston and Galmpton should be a separate forum and not an objection to the Forum per se.</p> <p>See comments above about size of Neighbourhood areas.</p>
<p>JD,MD (Waterside), AJ (Waterside)</p>	<p>Waterside area is on the edge of the Brixham Peninsula designation and relates more closely to Paignton. It should be part of Paignton Neighbourhood Forum.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. Whilst Waterside is on the boundary with Paignton, it is</p>

	<p>Contend that the inclusion of the areas of Waterside and Broadsands are totally inappropriate as the majority of the person living in of these areas assume they are resident in Paignton and so totally unaware that this is now to be part of Brixham. Churston, Galampton and Broadsands Community Partnership is not active, so it would be more appropriate to locate these areas in Paignton.</p> <p>33 objections were made to Waterside Quarry (out of 381 total responses). These were rejected by the Forum. The Neighbourhood Forum does not seem to be taking into account the wishes of the People of Waterside, and the areas should consequently be part of Paignton.</p>	<p>allocated within the Brixham Peninsula Plan.</p> <p>However the substantive point appears to be an objection to the allocation of Waterside. This would not be removed from the submitted Plan if the area was amended.</p>
--	---	--