

Brantham Regeneration Area (Main Modification 25)

Matter: Is the proposed inclusion of additional land for open space and housing ('Proviso D land') between the Regeneration Area and the existing settlement necessary and justified by the evidence base?

Specific questions:

1. The landowners have stated that, without Proviso D, the original policy CS6a is not deliverable, and that the viability evidence (March 2013) indicates that the scheme would be viable and deliverable with the inclusion of up to 600 dwellings (c.320 on the 'Proviso D land'). Although Proviso D does not give an absolute commitment to a major element of housing development the joint viability group, including BDC, was looking at the costs and other models of development. To what extent is the inclusion of the Proviso D land now supported by evidence?
2. Are there any known constraints affecting the Proviso D land, and how might these be overcome: access, water, sewage?
3. Given its potential scale should this development be specifically included in the table of housing developments in Policy CS2? (It was previously included, then removed).
4. How does the potential scale of the development affect the overall housing figures, including the amount of development allocated to Core and Hinterland Villages?
5. Would the scale of the development be proportionate to the existing settlement and its facilities?
6. Is the loss of open countryside justified by the evidence base, and have all options using brownfield land been thoroughly explored?
7. Given the scale of the proposed development, is it appropriate that Brantham remains a Hinterland Village?
8. How would the Proviso D housing development and the employment regeneration on the original allocation site be linked and phased?
9. Has sufficient public consultation and engagement been undertaken to consider the inclusion of the Proviso D land at this stage?