

Framlingham Community Centre Public Meeting held on Wednesday 11th October 2017 at 7pm in the Headmaster Porter Hall, Framlingham College

Total Attendees: 227

Post Code areas:

Brook Lane – 78
Saxtead Road -43
Town centre- 26
Badingham Road –25
Vyces Road- 18
Station Road -9
Fairfield Road -9
Out of IP13 -9
(10 not legible)

Panel: Cllr Gary Kitching, Cllr Simon Garrett and Cllr John Jones
(The majority of Councillors were present to listen to the comments expressed)
Town Clerk/RFO and Office staff

PH= Police House site
BL/VR = Brook Lane/Vyces Road
NP= Neighbourhood Plan
TC= Town Council
SCDC = Suffolk Coastal District Council

Comments made by attendees

Fourteen people commented that they were in favour of providing Framlingham with a community hall.

One person commented that Framlingham does not have a local venue suitable for a wedding reception venue.

One person commented that the number of the houses adjacent to the site was 62 compared with other community centre sites that were 30 or less.

Six people suggested investigating other sites.

Two people suggested PH site

One person commented that access to the PH site would be more difficult than BL/VR site

One person commented that there would be additional complications and expense if this site was considered because access would need to be acquired as well as building plot/car parking

Four people suggested Sports Club land

One person commented that land under discussion with TC for car parking would not be large enough for hall and parking

Two people suggested land near Thomas Mills High School

One person questioned if Mills Trust could offer similar peppercorn rent on the PH site instead of BL/VR site.

One person commented that there have been discussions between TC and Sports Club regarding land for town car parking but not a Community Centre.

Four people expressed specific concerns that large events could cause noise disturbance to nearby residents.

One person informed the meeting that they were involved in a wedding venue which had a minimum distance of two football pitches and there were still noise complaints.

Five people expressed concerns regarding potential for overspill parking on access roads.

One person commented that roadside parking in this area would block access for emergency vehicles.

One person commented that Fairfield road is significantly narrower than BL but there was no planning requirement to widen the road once land is developed for housing.

Five people commented that parking provision is inadequate for the size of the building.

Four people expressed concern that an increase in traffic would result in the likelihood of road traffic accidents.

Two people commented that car drivers would/do travel at excess speed along the BL/VR.

Two people commented that the roof was too high.

One qualifying reason given was that the building could block light to adjacent houses.

Four people commented that they thought the proposed building was too large.

One person suggested that the proposed scale of the building was a means to generate a larger income stream for TC.

One person suggested building a smaller hall with a view to building a second small hall if required in future.

Three people commented that the building is too small.

Two people commented that the hall is the right size.

One person commented that the building is ugly.

One person asked if the building could be positioned more centrally on the BL/VR site to reduce disturbance to neighbours.

One person commented that a building of this nature would de-value the houses close to the proposed building.

One person commented that other local Community Halls in residential areas have good relations with their local neighbours and who have been active in promoting the rebuilding process of the said hall.

One person asked whether investigating other sites rather than the BL/VR site that is included in NP would jeopardise the validity of whole NP.

One person asked whether the TC had approached local developers to provide a community hall as part of Section 106 agreement.

Two people commented that the availability of CIL funding provided a unique opportunity to fund a large scale project of this nature.

One person commented that the availability of CIL funding is not a good enough reason to go ahead with Community Centre on the wrong site.

If a hall was not funded by the CIL would the Town Council lose the funding.

Next Steps:

All of these comments will be reported to the Infrastructure Plan Committee and then discussed by the Town Council.

The majority of councillors were present at the meeting and had an opportunity to hear the views expressed. In addition, all of the councillors have been able to read the correspondence sent in from local people in relation to the proposal and in many cases discuss the issues with them.'