



Brantham Regeneration Area Allocation Community & stakeholder workshop event 4 March 2014

Summary of key outputs

1. List of attendees

Darren Smith - Brantham Leisure Centre
Janet Moy - Brantham Residents Group
Roger Dann - Brantham Scout and Guides
Graham Mower - Good Neighbour Scheme
Alastair McCraw - Brantham Parish Council
Paul Revell - Brantham Parish Council
Jacqueline Heywood - Chair of Village Hall Management Committee
Sarah Keys - Brantham Parish Council
Iain Duncan - Parish Council – Industrial Estate working group
Trevor Nobbs - Brantham Parish Council
Joop Vander Toorn – St Michaels Church
Kevin Cussen – Brantham Residents Group
Liz Dunnett – Parish Council
Sue Dawes - BDC
Dave Benham - BDC
Tracey Brinkley - BDC
Kate Lowe - BDC
Stuart McAdam - BDC
Fionnuala Lennon – ATLAS / HCA
Geoff Gardner – ATLAS / HCA

2. Points raised following BDC presentation on policy position

- What is the anticipated employment generation figure for Brantham? (500 jobs)
- Village community would like to be involved in discussions on a potential application.
- Proportionality will be an important aspect of considering any planning application as per the policy – need to be very clear on regeneration benefits & link to job creation & the number of houses demonstrably needed to deliver these – also the issue of proportionality of new development in relation to the size of the existing village. Recognise that there are potentially costly issues associated with the site in areas of remediation & flood defence.
- Who will develop the site?
- What guarantees are there that St Francis Group will not sell off the greenfield site for housing development without doing any remediation or job creation on the employment area? Is it possible to secure remediation

of the employment site before ANY development occurs on the greenfield site?

- How will road access issues be dealt with given that there are bottlenecks north & south of the village (rail crossing & bridge)? Significant concern at the impact of new development on the A137 & the local B roads leading to the A12.

3. Community & stakeholder engagement

The group was asked to suggest ideas about how to engage with the local community; and also whether setting up as Place-shaping Group or other forum would be appropriate.

The group highlighted that there was a very high level of local interest in the proposed development which was likely to continue. Good ways to involve the local community included:

- Drop-in exhibitions in local venues, early stage exhibition followed by others when parameters are known particularly on Saturdays. Would be helpful if Babergh DC could provide a networked computer at these to allow residents to complete on-line questionnaires about the project.
- Provision of dongle plug in from Babergh
- Dedicated & easy to find page for proposal on Babergh DC's website that was kept up to date. Could include information about the proposal & ability to have on-line surveys about issues.
- Information in the Parish Council newsletter (The Bugle) which was widely distributed & read. Also, the Parish Council Facebook page & website were effective ways of distributing links to information.
- Community Café would be a good place to leave documents for the community to inspect. Part of the Good Neighbour initiative.
- It was noted that there would be an annual Parish Council meeting in early April which was likely to be well-attended & may be a good opportunity to do a presentation on the proposals.
- Need to consult with neighbouring communities who may also be affected by the impacts of the development (but recognised that this may be best done via the district council)
- Recognition that the community needs to be pro-active and look at opportunities which could arise from new development

With regard to setting up a Place-shaping Group or other forum to enable regular liaison on the emerging proposals, there was general consensus it was a good idea. The current group could be a nucleus of it with some additional key local representatives such as the school. It was considered important that meetings were focussed to address specific issues and had the right people at them. With regard to whether representatives of St Francis Group & their consultants should be included, it was considered that this may be satisfactory if it were carefully managed. Priorities for the group to address were:

- Viability & remediation issues
- Access & transport issues
- Prioritisation of community aspirations / needs to inform any S106 Agreement

4. Initial issues & aspirations raised by the group

The group was asked to identify some initial key issues with the potential redevelopment of the employment area and possibly part of the adjoining land; and also community aspirations that it would be useful to explore to see if they could be addressed.

The numbers below relate to the issues recorded on post-it notes that were attached to relevant parts of the site (see plan that follows). The group was aware that consideration will need to be given to priorities for the village – not all ideas will be deliverable, but need to understand the viability context first.

1. No GP or health facilities in the village or immediate area. Nearest is in East Bergholt and Manningtree although there is an outpost in in Capel St Mary. Giving ageing profile of local population some health provision is critical – perhaps another outpost of an existing surgery.
Need to think about whether some additional local shops will be needed to serve the larger village population
2. Need a teenage leisure opportunity – possibly something like the youth club or venture centre. A new multi-functional community centre would be beneficial as the current village hall is too small with no parking. Also, the scout hall needs renewal & additional space is needed for allotments & the graveyard. Some warden assisted housing is needed.
3. Road access (Factory Lane) to the employment area is very poor & has limited ability to be improved given its narrowness – additional landtake would impact on nearby houses & businesses. Concerns over increased congestion. The roundabout on the A137 is a bottleneck – how will it be improved?
4. Need a cycle path to the station & Manningtree along the A137
5. Leisure centre is run via a Community Interest Company and is a resource that would benefit from investment
6. Access onto Brooklands Road – while it is understood that a second access will be needed; there are concerns about the ability of this road to cope with extra traffic and it ultimately ends up at the same roundabout as the other traffic. Traffic particularly heavy at school drop-off & pick-up times.
7. School – a very important facility for the community. May need expansion to cope with increased houses in the village. The school hall is not big enough to cope with large events such as school concerts, etc when a large number of people would like to attend. Similarly the church does not have a large capacity space.
8. Decoy Pond – a really important facility for the community & well used (fishing, dog walking). Would like to see public access to it enhanced.

9. Job creation – Creation of 500 jobs seems to be at very optimistic. Would like to see small units developed but aware that there are similar premises in Manningtree that are lying vacant. How will the employment area compete with other sites more conveniently located to the A12 and A14. Will need something special on site to attract employers. Aware that the employment area came close to being flooded during the recent storm surges.
10. Sewage station – can it cope with additional development?
11. Peninsula - worried about contamination. It needs to be safe for children & others who might gain access to it. Aware that remediation of this area will increase the costs and impact on viability & that a balance may be required as not interested in having this as a resource to the detriment of other facilities the village may value.
12. Peninsula – Useful to explore different kinds of use it could be put to – aware that there was previously interest in a marina & solar farm. Need to address long term management issues - who will maintain this area?



5. Next steps

- Babergh DC to draft an initial community engagement proposal to test with the group & St Francis Group. This should include a timescale for when various events, etc might happen.
- Babergh DC to liaise with the Parish Council on securing a date for the first meeting of the Place-shaping Group – possibly early April. BDC also to suggest an agenda for that meeting & draft an initial terms of reference for the group.