

Dear Mrs. Feeney.

Thank you for your e-mail dated 07 August referring to the Inspector's Questions for the Brantham Regeneration Scheme.

Before I list my responses to the questions I would like to issue an opening statement thus:

"Everyone refers to this project as the Brantham Regeneration Area! It is my understanding that to regenerate an area you must have a viable area to begin with?

In this case the old industrial site - Is this correct? In which case the Greenfield areas do not form part of the regeneration area and therefore should NOT be included in this Planning Policy.

St. Francis Group are trying to include the greenfield areas to increase their Profit margins because they did not carry out a full evaluation study of the existing site before they purchased it! Therefore they are now committed to trying to increase their profit share wherever they can.

The Communities Secretary Mr. Eric Pickles has openly stated in the National Press that greenfield sites should only be used in "Exceptional Circumstances" in the general view held within Brantham - this is NOT one of those exceptional circumstances and should be rejected.

Responses to Specific Questions.

1. The Landowners are only intent on recovering their initial costs and making a profit. They are not the least bit concerned for the parishioners of Brantham who will have to live with this overcrowding of our village, we can if BDC go ahead with the Industrial site redevelopment accept and live with this decision. BDC is also working closely with SFG in the hope of fulfilling some of the responsibilities placed on Council's by Central Government to the detriment of the village of Brantham.

2. The constraints affecting the Proviso D site are access to the site from Factory Lane would be totally inadequate which would require further road access to be provided, this further access would increase traffic volumes on already congested roads in the village and place innumerable constraints on the access points to the A137. Providing water to the site will once again put an enormous strain on villagers with disrupted supplies and groundworks during the various building processes.

The existing sewage plant at Brantham is just about able to cope with Brantham's needs at present to add a further 600 homes to this plant is not a viable option as it will not be able to cope with this increase.

3. Given the potential scale this development and the increase in housing this development will cause to the village it SHOULD NOT be included.

4. In order for Brantham to remain as a Hinterland village the potential scale of this development will totally destroy this village and does not comply with the level of development allocated to Hinterland villages.

5. No! the scale of development will be totally disproportionate to the existing village. The proposed 600 new dwellings for Brantham will totally destroy the village outlook which is currently admired by Brantham villagers today.

6. No! the loss of open countryside is not justified by the evidence base and more is required by SFG and BDC to explore all options for the redevelopment of the old industrial site. The easier option has been taken by both SFG and BDC so far in the hope of making a bigger profit - sooner!

7. Given the scale of the proposed development Brantham will not remain an Hinterland Village and this should remain as the top most priority!

8. The link to the Proviso D housing development and hoped for employment regeneration of the original site cannot be linked, as very few local Brantham residents will benefit from being employed at the industrial site. Very few residents worked at the site previously as most travelled from outside the area to work here. SFG and BDC have both used this ruse to boost employment in the area to push this proposal through but there is very little likelihood of this coming to fruition it should therefore be discounted.

9. No! very little public consultation and/or engagement has been undertaken from SFG and BDC to consider the inclusion of the Proviso D land at this stage. BDC certainly has the impression that planning permission by them will be granted and therefore Brantham will be kept in the dark and not allowed to have a say in the planning process. This attitude by BDC is totally unacceptable, the attitude of SFG is to be accepted as they are a large company only interested in making a vast profit for themselves and feels it can ride roughshod over a few villagers in Brantham.

Regards
Keith Austin