

Summary of consultation responses to the applications for Crofton Park and Honor Oak Park Neighbourhood Area and Forum

Rep ID	Categorisation	Summary
1	Support	I support a forum for this area.
2	Support	I support the forum. There are too many small houses in area. I have a query regarding a specific development.
3	Support	I agree with purpose and objectives. The neighbourhood plan will benefit local community. It will increase community cohesion.
4	Qualified Support	I was delighted to see proposal, until I realised my street (Elsiemaud Road) will not be included. I use Crofton Park post office and shops, and Crofton Park station, and live next door to Crofton Park Baptist Church. Elsiemaud Road should be included in the area.
5	Support	Excellent idea. I hope to be involved. I am concerned about currently proposed block of flats in area.
6	Comment	How will the proposal differ from the current assembly?
7	Object	The proposal does not include all of Honor Oak Park. I would not support proposal if it will not cover entire area.
8	Support	We are in favour. It will be positive for the area.
9	Comment	I am not within the proposed area, so why have I received this mailshot? It is a waste of time and money.
10	Comment	I do not object to the area, but the boundary does seem arbitrary. The constitution seems fine, but I'd expect those outside the area to be able to engage with the plan.
11	Support	I am writing in support of the proposed forum.
12	Object	The forum is dominated by Crofton Park residents. I live in area, at Whatman Road, and I feel geographically closer to Forest Hill. I use facilities in Forest Hill, not Crofton Park. Honor Oak will not be the focus of the forum, so will not benefit. I suspect few residents of SE23 would wish to join forum. I am concerned that a group of people elected by a small number will have power. I don't know anything about their expertise, motives or plans.
13	Qualified Support	I live at Chudleigh Road, west of Bexhill Road, and consider this to be part of Crofton Park. The boundary should include this area. I would like to become involved. I cannot find the forum's constitution so cannot comment on this aspect. I would very much like to become involved in planning in Crofton Park.

Rep ID	Categorisation	Summary
14	Support	It is an excellent idea, and we strongly support it. The forum should include "Honor Oak Park" in the title. Crofton Park is not accurately named. Crofton Park station has a lousy train service.
15	Support	I am very supportive of the idea. I agree with the proposed area and constitution.
16	Qualified Support	The naming of the borough, wards and forum is confusing. The label on the map saying "Honor Oak Park" is in the wrong place. Will the college receive one vote, or will every teacher and pupil receive a vote? I thought there was already a similar group for Crofton Park - will this proposal replace the existing group? Would the objectives of the forum include improving the appalling train service from Honor Oak Park and Brockley? If so, then I am all for it.
17	Support	I am very interested. The area boundary accords with my understanding of the neighbourhood. I agree with the purpose and objectives. A recent development was of a poor quality.
18	Comment	The proposal sounds Crofton Park-centric. Honor Oak Park already has a community group. Crofton Park (between Beecroft Road and Eddystone / Sevenoaks Road) seem to be neglected. No theoretical issue with combining two areas, but wouldn't want to see things move away from Honor Oak Park.
19	Object	The boundary of Crofton Park along with an incomplete area of Honor Oak Park is not well thought out. Arbitrary line has been used as area boundary. Shows a lack of understanding of areas to west of railway line (One Tree Hill and residents in wedge shaped area between Honor Oak Park (road) and Devonshire Road. Honor Oak Park fosters village atmosphere centred on parade. People within short walking distance of the parade have an interest in the centre of Honor Oak Park. However I have no special interest in Crofton Park. There should be a sharper targeting of neighbourhood boundaries. Honor Oak Park should go it alone.
20	Support	I fully support the proposal to create a forum. A minor point is that the boundary should extend to the west boundary of St Dunstan's College, to include all of Ravensbourne Road, Winterstoke Road, all Blythe Hill and Stanstead Grove.
21	Support	We approve of the forum and wish to join.
22	Support	The proposed area is a suitable neighbourhood. It would be hard to find a boundary between Crofton Park and Honor Oak Park. The railway forms a prominent boundary. The purposes and objectives of the constitution are in line with the ambition of giving local people the opportunity to enhance their community in line with their views.
23	Object	Please don't waste your money on another community forum. Money should be spent on services, not on a talking shop. Council officers and elected politicians already know what needs to be done.

Rep ID	Categorisation	Summary
24	Comment	I'd like to propose that Polsted Rd be included within the boundary - our neighbourhood is definitely part of the Blythe Hill Fields area rather than the general Catford area.
25	Support	We agree with the purpose and objectives of the forum.
26	Comment	A boundary is difficult to define, and the proposed boundary is as good as any. I agree with the purpose and objectives. The information provided is too long and full of jargon.
27	Support	I welcome the creation of the neighbourhood area. I wish to build an extension in the near future. I wish to be kept informed.
28	Support	We are interested in the forum. There is a growing community here. We socialise together, so it makes sense to come together on local issues.
29	Comment	The boundary does not align with my understanding of the area. The boundary should start at Whitbread Road. I agree with the purpose and objectives. Is there a neighbourhood forum for Brockley?
30	Object	I oppose the current proposal. It seems to be driven by residents of Crofton Park, with Honor Oak Park as an afterthought. The proposed boundary doesn't match up with the boundary of Honor Oak Park on a map. The boundary of Honor Oak Park is Forest Hill Road. Honor Oak Park has a stronger link with Forest Hill, and should link up with that area. Crofton Park is better linked to Brockley. I hope the proposals can be revised.
31	Qualified Support	Devonshire Road (at least the northern portion from Tyson Road to Honor Oak Park) should be included in the area. It is less than half a mile from the centre of Honor Oak. I urge you to amend the area. Residents of Devonshire Road are part of the Honor Oak Park community, and I would like to be part of the forum.
32	Qualified Support	I am interested in the forum. I agree with objectives. But Polsted Road should be included.
33	Object	I disagree with the boundary. It shouldn't end at the railway line (near Honor Oak Park station). It should continue west and include One Tree Hill as it provides important amenity space and contributes to the character of the area. It should include Hengrave Road and Boveney Road because this is the catchment of the station. Honor Oak Park has as much in association with Forest Hill as it does with Crofton Park.
34	Comment	The area should include Braxfield Road.

Rep ID	Categorisation	Summary
35	Support	We are enthusiastic about the proposal. The community can assist and deal with planning issues. People are coming together more, and would like to have a say, both in Crofton Park and Honor Oak Park.
36	Object	Why have the forum members not been listed? Decisions will be taken in line with the design statement in the neighbourhood plan, however the plan hasn't been produced yet. We only know the aims of the forum, we don't know what it will do. I can't support the forum due to the uncertainties.
37	Support	I support the forum. The area is sensible. I hope design and planning issues can be considered in conjunction with neighbouring wards. The first objective of the forum should refer to "residents and businesses". "Inhabitants" is vague, and businesses should be included.
38	Object	My notion of my neighbourhood extends into Southwark - Brockley Way, Brenchley Gardens and the vicinity. Some of the other areas are of little interest to me. Southwark has previously consulted Lewisham residents regarding the expansion of the burial space
39	Qualified Support	I support the idea of a forum in principle, I do not agree with the area. I live at Bovill Road, and I do not see Crofton Park as being part of the same neighbourhood. I do see One Tree Hill and the allotments as being my neighbourhood. The boundary should not stick rigidly to the ward boundary.
40	Support	I support the formation of the forum.
41	Comment	The objectives should be further justified - there are limited development opportunities in the area. Proposal may result in duplication in planning system with no benefits. Application lead should not be elected councillor, as it should be lead from community.
42	Support	We like the idea of the neighbourhood area.
43	Comment	We live at Polsted Road, just outside the proposed boundary. We want to be included in the forum. We consider ourselves in Blythe Hill (which is in the area), not Crofton Park or Honor Oak Park. We would be unhappy at the creation of a plan that includes Blythe Hill which excludes from it the people who live close to it and regularly use it. The boundary is wrong.
44	Object	We don't agree with the boundary. It needs to include more of Honor Oak Park rather than splitting it in two.
45	Support	I support the proposed forum. I attend assembly meetings, residents and businesses are passionate when it comes to their local area. I am chair of EPSP at the Ackroyd - a project for elderly people - these people would welcome the opportunity to voice an opinion on local matters.

Rep ID	Categorisation	Summary
46	Support	This is a good idea. We need a forum to discuss how to make our neighbourhood a good place to live and work. The anti Domino Pizza campaign showed how strongly people feel about the quality of local businesses. The Council have not kept us informed about the fight to prevent Tesco's opening opposite Budgens. I live in Sevenoaks Road and have had to put up with this ugly building site which is now attracting fly tipping. No one knows what is happening.
47	Support	I am writing on behalf of the Ackroyd Community Association to express support for the creation of a Neighbourhood Forum for Crofton Park Ward.
48	Object	The area is misnamed. It only covers part of Honor Oak Park, which in the view of most residents stretches over the railway line up to the hill. The road called Honor Oak Park should be included. Honor Oak Park doesn't follow the ward boundary. Creating an area with a name which doesn't match the boundary is likely to result in a lack of cooperation and commitment. A distinction could be drawn between Honor Oak Park and Honor Oak, with the former being smaller than the latter. But to say Honor Oak Park road is not in Honor Oak Park is indefensible. It is not clear what advantage it will bring. We already have societies with better boundaries. I am opposed to the application.
49	Object	I am not sure we need another level of committees and politicians given that we already have a very good and helpful planning department. It is government policy to help development of housing and schools etc, and this will only hold up development. We recently contacted the local councillors regarding an application at Prendergast Ladywell Fields College, but both Labour councillors refused to help as they supported the development. I was banned from attending meetings. Once they realised level of concern they made feeble effort to help out. Their job is to represent constituents, but they didn't. This forum is not needed. Instead we could have Facebook page for every street in the borough. We do not need another level of bureaucracy at the mercy of politicians.
50	Object	I am opposed to the proposed area. The boundary cuts the area in half. It should extend west at least as far as St Augustine's but ideally as far as Honor Oak Road and Brenchley Gardens. It should include the north part of Devonshire Road. The local shops for these places is Honor Oak Park. The boundary should not follow the ward boundary. If the area is not extended west, then I am opposed to the whole proposal.
51	Object	The proposed area does not align with my understanding of the neighbourhood I live in. My neighbourhood includes Honor Oak Recreation Ground and One Tree Hill. I am aware that Honor Oak Park is split by the railway line and crosses two boroughs, and I am against boundary lines that do not take this into consideration.
52	Object	I am opposed. I do not see the benefits. It adds an unnecessary level of bureaucracy. It will be unrepresentative. We already have an elected council. It will have no power over neighbouring developments such as Catford dog track, which was not properly consulted on. The Neighbourhood Plan will just be a hotch potch of control that will still need to accord with planning regulations, and will be subject to bullying by developers and will penalise individual residents.

Rep ID	Categorisation	Summary
53	Object	I do not agree with "Honor Oak Park" being in the title. The boundary replicates Crofton Park Ward. The boundary does not include Honor Oak Road and only includes part of Honor Oak Park road. Honor Oak Park station is the nub of Honor Oak and includes One Tree Hill from which the area gets its name. One Tree Hill is a central feature of Honor Oak's landscape.
54	Qualified Support	The general principle is very appropriate as Honor Oak does not engage easily with either Forest Hill or Peckham Rye. The high streets of Honor Oak and Crofton Park are closer. However, I live in Honor Oak Rise, and find it extraordinary that my road (and others bearing the Honor Oak name) and the principle church (St Augustine's) are not included in the area. It is stated that the railway line provides an obvious delineation, but there is a bridge over the line by the station, Such a delineation is therefore archaic. Many people outside area use the station - the area only covers half of the catchment area. The station is a focus for local people and their identity. Maybe a small area of Southwark could be re-designated as Lewisham.
55	Support	I support the proposal. It sounds like an excellent initiative.
56	Support	I support the proposal, and hope we are successful.
57	Support	We think this is a fantastic idea. It will foster a greater sense of community engagement. The area is often lumped in with Forest Hill, which is a different neighbourhood with different needs and interests.

Rep ID	Categorisation	Summary
		<p>I write on behalf of the Forest Hill Society. The proposed boundary does not represent the neighbourhood as it actually functions. It excludes many residents who rely on and use key parts of the area. The constitution states that the plan is for the benefit of inhabitants of the area, therefore many people who associate with Crofton Park and more particularly Honor Oak Park will be excluded from membership and from voting for in the referendum.</p> <p>The boundary reflects the ward boundary. There is no reason for this to be the case. The boundary should reflect the functional neighbourhood. The proposed boundary does not reflect the functional neighbourhood of Honor Oak Park as it excludes half the community to the west of the railway line. This is a significant problem as a key area of benefit could be improvements to Honor Oak Park and the local shopping centre, however many relevant residents would be excluded.</p> <p>Honor Oak Recreation Ground is a key open space which is included. One Tree Hill is excluded but we can see that it may have a wider significance.</p> <p>There is also a concern that the southern part of the boundary is functionally Forest Hill.</p> <p>At a recent Crofton Pak Ward Assembly meeting we understand residents who were from outside the boundary area who had gone along to take part in the discussion were excluded from the discussion. The boundary may create more problems than it solves.</p> <p>This is in contrast to the Grove Park proposal which appears to have covered issues relating to the proposed area in greater detail.</p> <p>Lewisham could consider separating the approval of the boundary from that of the forum. The boundary can be considered first, and then the forum and constitution can be considered in light of the boundary.</p> <p>We have spoken to a number of Forest Hill Society residents, who share the concern regarding the boundary.</p> <p>The constitution only includes those who live and work in the area. It is not clear how the views of people living nearby will be taken into account.</p> <p>We are aware there is a duty to consult neighbouring groups as part of regulation 14 set out in the Neighbourhood Planning regulations, however at that stage it will be too late to have a meaningful impact.</p> <p>In parished areas outside of urban areas it may be appropriate to exclude non-residents, but not in dense urban areas.</p> <p>The draft constitution says positive things about working with local groups and being inclusive, but this may not reflect the intention when it comes to dealing with groups such as the FHS who operate partially in the area. In an urban area it is important to address this type of overlap.</p> <p>We would like assurances, if this application is approved, that the Forest Hill Society as key civic group and local stakeholder with members in a large part of the proposed area would be able to contribute and collaborate.</p> <p>We would welcome the opportunity to engage, and have made attempts to do so. We want to work with any</p>

Rep ID	Categorisation	Summary
59	Object	<p>The proposed area does not align with our understanding of the local neighbourhood.</p> <p>The area splits Honor Oak Park in two.</p> <p>It divides the community around Honor Oak Park and station.</p> <p>It fails to take advantage of the possibility to cross boundaries. Instead it reinforces the division of the borough line which separates residents from their amenity space (Honor Oak Park Recreation Ground, One Tree Hill, and allotments).</p> <p>It would exclude part of Honor Oak Park community from having influence over the neighbourhood's future.</p> <p>There are streets to the north and east of the boundary that are closer to Crofton Park than alternative centres. These residents are precluded from involvement.</p> <p>The proposed boundary runs along the middle of residential streets in places. The idea that two sides of the same street are in separate neighbourhoods is absurd.</p> <p>We have been contacted by constituents regarding this matter.</p>
60	Object	<p>A neighbourhood forum is a good idea in principle, but I disagree with the proposed boundary as it divides the Honor Oak Park community in two. It excludes key assets (including Honor Oak Recreation Ground, One Tree Hill and St Augustine's), and alienates a large number of residents who live outside the boundary who identify as being part of the Honor Oak Park community.</p> <p>The constitution excludes anyone living outside the boundary. This will entrench the issue of Honor Oak Park being split between different wards and boroughs.</p> <p>A key stage of the Localism Act - identifying the area - has not been properly presented to the local community. The applicants have merely chosen to define Crofton Park as a neighbourhood, which is not acceptable.</p>

Rep ID	Categorisation	Summary
61	Object	<p>A neighbourhood forum is a good idea in principle, but I disagree with the proposed boundary as it divides the Honor Oak Park community in two. It excludes key assets (including Honor Oak Recreation Ground, One Tree Hill and St Augustine's), and alienates a large number of residents who live outside the boundary who identify as being part of the Honor Oak Park community.</p> <p>The constitution excludes anyone living outside the boundary. This will entrench the issue of Honor Oak Park being split between different wards and boroughs.</p> <p>A key stage of the Localism Act - identifying the area - has not been properly presented to the local community. The applicants have merely chosen to define Crofton Park as a neighbourhood, which is not acceptable.</p> <p>The Grove Park application is much better thought out and more inclusive, and has undergone community engagement.</p> <p>I hope the application is turned down. An neighbourhood forum needs to be representative of the whole neighbourhood.</p>
62	Object	<p>A neighbourhood forum is a good idea in principle, but I disagree with the proposed boundary as it divides the Honor Oak Park community in two. It excludes key assets (including Honor Oak Recreation Ground, One Tree Hill and St Augustine's), and alienates a large number of residents who live outside the boundary who identify as being part of the Honor Oak Park community.</p> <p>The constitution excludes anyone living outside the boundary. This will entrench the issue of Honor Oak Park being split between different wards and boroughs.</p> <p>A key stage of the Localism Act - identifying the area - has not been properly presented to the local community. The applicants have merely chosen to define Crofton Park as a neighbourhood, which is not acceptable.</p>

Rep ID	Categorisation	Summary
63	Object	<p>A neighbourhood forum is a good idea in principle, but I disagree with the proposed boundary as it divides the Honor Oak Park community in two. It excludes key assets (including Honor Oak Recreation Ground, One Tree Hill and St Augustine's), and alienates a large number of residents who live outside the boundary who identify as being part of the Honor Oak Park community.</p> <p>The constitution excludes anyone living outside the boundary. This will entrench the issue of Honor Oak Park being split between different wards and boroughs.</p> <p>A key stage of the Localism Act - identifying the area - has not been properly presented to the local community. The applicants have merely chosen to define Crofton Park as a neighbourhood, which is not acceptable.</p>
64	Object	<p>A neighbourhood forum is a good idea in principle, but I disagree with the proposed boundary as it divides the Honor Oak Park community in two. It excludes key assets (including Honor Oak Recreation Ground, One Tree Hill and St Augustine's), and alienates a large number of residents who live outside the boundary who identify as being part of the Honor Oak Park community.</p> <p>The constitution excludes anyone living outside the boundary. This will entrench the issue of Honor Oak Park being split between different wards and boroughs.</p> <p>A key stage of the Localism Act - identifying the area - has not been properly presented to the local community. The applicants have merely chosen to define Crofton Park as a neighbourhood, which is not acceptable.</p>
65	Object	<p>The proposed boundary does not reflect my understanding of the local neighbourhood. The boundary divides Honor Oak Park in two. If I lived on Devonshire Road within 200m of Honor Oak Park station I would consider my local neighbourhood to be my nearest shops and services. Roads around One Tree Hill are similarly affected. The boundary should be reconsidered.</p>
66	Object	<p>A neighbourhood forum is a good idea in principle, but I disagree with the proposed boundary. The catchment area of Honor Oak Park station would make much more sense, taking in the roads between the Southwark border and railway line to the west, and Blythe Hill Park to the east. The station, the shops and the two nearby parks are the focal point of the community, and should be geographic centre. The ward boundary is not a neighbourhood.</p>

Rep ID	Categorisation	Summary
67	Object	<p>A neighbourhood forum is a good idea in principle, but I disagree with the proposed boundary as it divides the Honor Oak Park community in two. It excludes key assets (including Honor Oak Recreation Ground, One Tree Hill and St Augustine's), and alienates a large number of residents who live outside the boundary who identify as being part of the Honor Oak Park community.</p> <p>The constitution excludes anyone living outside the boundary. This will entrench the issue of Honor Oak Park being split between different wards and boroughs.</p> <p>A key stage of the Localism Act - identifying the area - has not been properly presented to the local community. The applicants have merely chosen to define Crofton Park as a neighbourhood, which is not acceptable.</p>
68	Object	<p>A neighbourhood forum is a good idea in principle, but I disagree with the proposed boundary as it divides the Honor Oak Park community in two. It excludes key assets (including Honor Oak Recreation Ground, One Tree Hill and St Augustine's), and alienates a large number of residents who live outside the boundary who identify as being part of the Honor Oak Park community.</p> <p>The constitution excludes anyone living outside the boundary. This will entrench the issue of Honor Oak Park being split between different wards and boroughs.</p> <p>A key stage of the Localism Act - identifying the area - has not been properly presented to the local community. The applicants have merely chosen to define Crofton Park as a neighbourhood, which is not acceptable.</p>
69	Object	<p>A neighbourhood forum is a good idea in principle, but I disagree with the proposed boundary as it divides the Honor Oak Park community in two. It excludes key assets (including Honor Oak Recreation Ground, One Tree Hill and St Augustine's), and alienates a large number of residents who live outside the boundary who identify as being part of the Honor Oak Park community.</p> <p>The constitution excludes anyone living outside the boundary. This will entrench the issue of Honor Oak Park being split between different wards and boroughs.</p> <p>A key stage of the Localism Act - identifying the area - has not been properly presented to the local community. The applicants have merely chosen to define Crofton Park as a neighbourhood, which is not acceptable.</p>

Rep ID	Categorisation	Summary
70	Object	<p>A neighbourhood forum is a good idea in principle, but I disagree with the proposed boundary as it divides the Honor Oak Park community in two. It excludes key assets (including Honor Oak Recreation Ground, One Tree Hill and St Augustine's), and alienates a large number of residents who live outside the boundary who identify as being part of the Honor Oak Park community.</p> <p>The constitution excludes anyone living outside the boundary. This will entrench the issue of Honor Oak Park being split between different wards and boroughs.</p> <p>A key stage of the Localism Act - identifying the area - has not been properly presented to the local community. The applicants have merely chosen to define Crofton Park as a neighbourhood, which is not acceptable.</p>
71	Object	<p>A neighbourhood forum is a good idea in principle, but I disagree with the proposed boundary as it divides the Honor Oak Park community in two. It excludes key assets (including Honor Oak Recreation Ground, One Tree Hill and St Augustine's), and alienates a large number of residents who live outside the boundary who identify as being part of the Honor Oak Park community.</p> <p>The constitution excludes anyone living outside the boundary. This will entrench the issue of Honor Oak Park being split between different wards and boroughs.</p> <p>A key stage of the Localism Act - identifying the area - has not been properly presented to the local community. The applicants have merely chosen to define Crofton Park as a neighbourhood, which is not acceptable.</p>
72	Object	<p>A neighbourhood forum is a good idea in principle, but I disagree with the proposed boundary as it divides the Honor Oak Park community in two. It excludes key assets (including Honor Oak Recreation Ground, One Tree Hill and St Augustine's), and alienates a large number of residents who live outside the boundary who identify as being part of the Honor Oak Park community.</p> <p>The constitution excludes anyone living outside the boundary. This will entrench the issue of Honor Oak Park being split between different wards and boroughs.</p> <p>A key stage of the Localism Act - identifying the area - has not been properly presented to the local community. The applicants have merely chosen to define Crofton Park as a neighbourhood, which is not acceptable.</p>

Rep ID	Categorisation	Summary
73	Qualified Support	<p>The Honor Oak Park Residents Association (HOPRA) fully supports the principle of a neighbourhood forum and neighbourhood area. We believe the concept of a forum drawing up a plan for a neighbourhood will strengthen cohesion and protect from poor quality planning.</p> <p>However we would be remiss to not report local resident's concerns about the western boundary of the proposed area. Residents point out the boundary cuts Honor Oak Park in two, perpetuating the current boundary split, which they hoped could have been overcome through the proposed forum and area.</p> <p>It is understandable that the area has been drawn on ward lines, as it will be easier to administer. There are valid concerns that a cross-border forum might in practice result in little being achieved because of continual disagreements between too great a number of partners.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it is likely that Honor Oak Park residents will be disgruntled if the current boundary is agreed as people will not be able to influence decisions west of the boundary. This includes St Augustine's Church, the Recreation Ground and the immediate roads west of the road Honor Oak Park beyond the proposed boundary. Nor can those west of the boundary influence what happens at the local parade, which they see as their high street. They will not be able to stand for office in the forum.</p> <p>HOPRA's committee feels the forum and area should go ahead, but that the Council needs to take the concerns of excluded citizens into consideration.</p>

Rep ID	Categorisation	Summary
74	Object	<p>Neighbourhood planning is intended to be people based. However, a local ward assembly to which we do not belong intends to define an area which would include our neighbourhood (Honor Oak Park).</p> <p>The proposed boundary divides Honor Oak Park in two. Half of Honor Oak Park would be excluded, including One Tree Hill, St Augustine's, Honor Oak Rec and Allotments. The constitution ensures that those outside of the ward boundary cannot contribute.</p> <p>The local assembly has not sought local views on this, and those in Forest Hill ward were excluded from giving their views at the local assembly, against the stated social cohesion objectives.</p> <p>A neighbourhood forum would be good for Honor Oak Park, however the boundary should be based on the neighbourhood not the ward.</p> <p>Additionally, a survey has been conducted by the consultee - this found that the majority of respondents both within and outside of the proposed boundary identify themselves as part of 'Honor Oak' / 'Honor Oak Park', and that 50% of respondents identify One Tree Hill as the most prominent landmark in their area.</p>
75	Object	<p>A neighbourhood forum is a good idea in principle, but I disagree with the proposed boundary as it divides the Honor Oak Park community in two. It excludes key assets (including Honor Oak Recreation Ground, One Tree Hill and St Augustine's), and alienates a large number of residents who live outside the boundary who identify as being part of the Honor Oak Park community.</p> <p>The constitution excludes anyone living outside the boundary. This will entrench the issue of Honor Oak Park being split between different wards and boroughs.</p> <p>A key stage of the Localism Act - identifying the area - has not been properly presented to the local community. The applicants have merely chosen to define Crofton Park as a neighbourhood, which is not acceptable.</p>
76	Object	<p>I object to the boundary as it does not cover the Honor Oak Park neighbourhood. It excludes a large proportion of residents and businesses in the neighbourhood.</p>

Rep ID	Categorisation	Summary
77	Object	<p>A neighbourhood forum is a good idea in principle, but I disagree with the proposed boundary as it divides the Honor Oak Park community in two. It excludes key assets (including Honor Oak Recreation Ground, One Tree Hill and St Augustine's), and alienates a large number of residents who live outside the boundary who identify as being part of the Honor Oak Park community.</p> <p>The constitution excludes anyone living outside the boundary. This will entrench the issue of Honor Oak Park being split between different wards and boroughs.</p> <p>A key stage of the Localism Act - identifying the area - has not been properly presented to the local community. The applicants have merely chosen to define Crofton Park as a neighbourhood, which is not acceptable.</p>
78	Object	<p>I object to the proposal because it does not geographically represent the residents of Honor Oak Park, specifically those on Devonshire Road and One Tree Hill that are served by the amenities at the parade. These residents will be excluded from the forum and from having an influence. The aims of the constitution can therefore not be achieved.</p> <p>Also, if granted, it prohibits the excluded people referred to above from establishing their own forum to promote their amenities.</p> <p>I also object because a forum covering two neighbourhoods (Crofton Park and Honor Oak Park) with competing needs may result in confused policy.</p> <p>The application boundary could be reduced to only include Crofton Park.</p>
79	Support	The neighbourhood forum is a good idea. I agree with the constitution and boundary.
80	Comment	If we are to have a neighbourhood forum, wouldn't it be democratic to include all those who live within the area?

Rep ID	Categorisation	Summary
81	Object	<p>A neighbourhood forum is a good idea in principle, but I disagree with the proposed boundary as it divides the Honor Oak Park community in two. It excludes key assets (including Honor Oak Recreation Ground, One Tree Hill and St Augustine's), and alienates a large number of residents who live outside the boundary who identify as being part of the Honor Oak Park community.</p> <p>The constitution excludes anyone living outside the boundary. This will entrench the issue of Honor Oak Park being split between different wards and boroughs.</p> <p>A key stage of the Localism Act - identifying the area - has not been properly presented to the local community. The applicants have merely chosen to define Crofton Park as a neighbourhood, which is not acceptable.</p>
82	Comment	I am supportive of the plans except for the boundary. I live in Boveney Road, which is outside the boundary, but I am definitely in Honor Oak Park. Those in our street associate with Honor Oak Park, not Forest Hill. I'm not sure how this decision was made.
83	Comment	Is my property included in the boundary?
84	Support	I support the formation of the forum.