

Summary of responses received on the application for designation of a Neighbourhood Forum and Area in Sneinton

Respondee number	Name of individual/organisation	Nature of representation	Summary of Response
1	Natural England	No specific comments to make at this stage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England is a statutory consultee. Protected Landscapes, Protected Species, Local Wildlife Sites, Best Most Versatile Agricultural Land and opportunities for enhancing the natural environment should all be considered in preparing the Neighbourhood Plan.
2	Ward Councillor	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boundaries of the Area are too wide Has not heard of Sneinton Neighbourhood Forum and says that the signee does not live in the area.
3	The Coal Authority	No specific comments to make at this stage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sneinton lies within the current defined coalfield. However as the consultation relates to the proposed designation of the Neighbourhood Plan Area, the Coal Authority wishes to make no specific comments at this stage.
4	Homes and Communities Agency	No specific comments to make at this stage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The HCA have no land holdings within the proposed Neighbourhood Plan Area and therefore do not wish to comment on the designation proposals.
5	Highways Agency	No specific comments to make at this stage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments with regard to the proposed Neighbourhood Area or Forum. Would like to remain engaged with the process due to the proximity of the Neighbourhood Area to the Strategic Road Network (i.e. the A52 Trunk Road).
6	Forum Member	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the boundary proposals. Even though the proposed area crosses ward boundaries it represents what local people regard as their neighbourhood. Sneinton Residents regard Sneinton Market as being in their area despite it being in the St. Ann's and Mapperley ward. Support for the Forum being representative of people who live and work in the area.
7	Resident of Sneinton	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the boundaries of the proposed Neighbourhood Area. Support for the Forum being representative of people who live and work in the area.
8	Representative of the Neighbourhood Centre, St. Ann's	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the boundaries of the proposed Neighbourhood Area. Feels that it reflects the natural boundary of the area. Support for the Forum being representative of people who live and work in the area. It will support the community that already has established a strong unity among its diverse residents.
9	Chair, Friends of Colwick Woods	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the boundaries of the proposed Neighbourhood Area. It makes sense to include

			<p>all of Colwick Woods Local Nature Reserve as it is one unit and used throughout by the people of Sneinton.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the Forum being representative of people who live and work in the area. It seems to include people from all sectors of the community.
10	Resident of Bakersfield	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear of proposals but does not want to see any development on Colwick Woods. • Half of the park is in Bakersfield and not in Sneinton.
11	Chair Sneinton Tenants and Residents Association	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to the boundaries of the Neighbourhood Plan Area. Inclusion of Sneinton Market is inappropriate as it has more in common with the City Centre in terms of its location, commercial activity, transport and integration. • Objects to the Forum and does not believe that it is representative of the area. Concerned that the membership of the group could easily disproportionately be made up of business owners or their employees who could then have an undemocratic impact in the imposition of their wishes over those of the actual residents. The numbers of such people should be strictly limited in terms of any influence over decision and management of the group if it should go ahead. • The Membership document seems to have made factually incorrect assertions. The Prettier Whittier and STOP Group representatives made it clear, in public meetings, that their organisations have not given agreement to be recorded as Forum members. • Concern expressed that there seems to be no evidence, in the form of minutes, that any support has been endorsed by groups listed as Forum members. • Difficult to see what actual advantage the proposals will bring to the people of Sneinton. • Concern expressed over the resources or expertise available to the Forum (or any other such constituted group) to make well informed objections or proposals for the area. • STARA has experienced good working relationships with the City Council and feels that the instigation of the proposed Forum could result in an unnecessary layer of bureaucracy with little benefit. • Little to indicate how any actions can be taken forward to achieve anything beyond discussion of a range of issues.
12	Forum Member	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the boundaries of the proposed Neighbourhood Area. Seems to be a good coverage of Sneinton • Support for the Forum being representative of people who live and work in the area. Believes that the Forum has a wide variety of people as members from different ethnic backgrounds, ages, gender, economic status and groups in the area.
13	Representative of SEND Project (Local Youth Arts Organisation)/	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the proposals. Believe them to be a fantastic opportunity for local people to be empowered to work together and see collective goals and plans come to fruition. Testament to the love and care that local people have for the community that they have been proactive enough to mobilise people to work together to build a better Sneinton.

	local resident/Forum Member		
14	Forum Member	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the boundaries of the proposed Neighbourhood Area. Clearly defined by geographical boundaries which were arrived at and refined through consultation with local people. • Support for the Forum being representative of people who live and work in the area. The Forum is dominated by local residents from across the Plan area, from a variety of backgrounds.
15	Planning Committee	Object	<p>Response split into four headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status of the Forum: is unclear with regard to how far it is representative of the proposed area as a whole. There is no clarity about the purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan or the issues it is seeking to address. • Governance of the group: some individuals listed as members have said that they are not actually members. Not clear that adequate safeguards exist to prevent conflict of interest between Forum members and the proposed Neighbourhood Plan. • Boundary of the Area and Strategic Sites: boundary of the area appears to be arbitrary and includes some areas that are not well related to Sneinton such as Colwick Woods which relates to other neighbourhoods such as Bakersfield. Also includes strategic sites which have city-wide implications and it is important that their development is not fettered by local interests. Where the actual boundary sits (i.e. whether back/front of pavement or middle of road) has implications for matters such as highway/transport improvements. • Quality of consultation undertaken by the Forum: Several key local residents groups were unaware of the proposals and had no previous contact with the Forum. It is not clear how local businesses have been engaged. Potential for conflict of interest between the Creative Quarter and the Neighbourhood Plan. Although Forum say that 2,000 leaflets have been distributed, area contains considerably more addresses than this.
16	Area Committee East	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Neighbourhood Area covers parts of St Ann's in addition to Sneinton. Councillor David Mellen expressed concern that the composition of the proposed Forum did not include a wide ranging group of people but could include individuals who did not reside in the area. Concerns were also raised that the proposals presented the possibility of businesses taking over the Forum for their own needs so this would need to be adequately safeguarded.
17	Resident of Bakersfield	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unfair that the Bakersfield area has been left out of the boundary. Would prefer if the boundary included Greenwood Road, Langdale Road, Oakdale Road, Parkdale Road and Carlton Road (at the junction of Dale View Road) as shown on the submitted plan.