

Minutes of the meeting of the **Brundall Parish Council Recreation and Wellbeing Committee** held on Friday 7th August 2026 at 6.00pm in the Lounge at Brundall Memorial Hall.



In attendance: Cllr M Savory (Chair), Cllr L Britt, G Buckley (Cremer's Meadow), J Lovatt (Guides)
Clerk: Mrs. C Dickson
Members of the public: 0

Housekeeping – everyone was thanked for attending on a Friday night.

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Cllr G Abbott, Cllr P Gabillia, C Norburn (Scouts), Rev D Hanson (Yare Valley Churches), J Barrington (Brundall Memorial Hall), S Harper (Brundall parkrun)

2. Declarations of interest

None received.

3. Public Participation

None received.

4. Brundall Village Park

The S106 Deed of Variation has finally been signed by all parties.

The working group have had a couple of meetings with Groundwork East. They have been working on the design already even though the Council had not formally signed a contract with them. The second meeting therefore included a preview of the draft initial designs.

Each piece of land is being worked on by a different designer and this shows in how the whole design is a bit disjointed. The working group felt they needed to go away and consider the designs before making any comment. Cllr Savory raised concerns that all the formal structures on the Village Green is on the eastern side where the Neighbourhood Plan important view is.

Country Park

Cllr Savory read through the BVPG feedback to Groundwork East (see below).

The winter conditions of the land by the river are unknown therefore would mown paths be suitable. An Environment Agency permit will be needed for anything within 5m of the river.

The Country Park area must be completed by the 85th open market dwelling, roughly April 2028.

The working group would like an ambition for an accessible route to the river at at least one point to begin with.

The car park is in the right location but needs to be visible from the road. It will be used for visitors to Cremer's Meadow, Marty's Marsh and Braydeston Hills but could be a location for anti-social behaviour in the evening if it is not open to view from passing vehicles.

Apart from the odd bit of play equipment it feels like a lot of the design makes sense and has followed the brief.

Village Green

Cllr Savory read through the BVPG feedback to Groundwork East (see below).

The working group felt the draft design for the Village Park had a few more issues.

GE would like a meeting with Hopkins Homes with the hope of being able to talk about HH doing some of the leveling work the draft design proposes. The working group do not believe HH would be

accommodating. HH will be moving earth to level the ground up to the top of the sewer bulkheads. The ground down to the Country Park area will therefore be steeper.

The current design includes too much play equipment, in the wrong place. The sensory river and small rocks for climbing were liked by the working group. Climbing frames and zip wires were not considered appropriate. Play equipment is very expensive. A small amount of more natural equipment would be welcome. With the current location parents are more likely to park in the parking bays on the new estate than at the Memorial Hall.

Both BPC and BMH trustees would like to see some softening of boundary between the VG and BMH land but something to mark where boundary is. It feels like the design has completely ignored how it fits in with the Memorial Hall. The map does not even include all the land for the VG.

The design does not take into account the important view included in the Neighbourhood Plan (both adopted and emerging).

A formal amphitheater was not really supported by the working group but more informally stepping the slope down to a flat area was preferred.

A slide using the slope of the land and logs to climb back up were considered suitable, using what is there already.

Cllr Savory suggested swapping the play activities to the western side of the VG leaving the eastern side open for the NP important views. This would link in better to the Memorial Hall.

The most recent planning details of conditions submitted by HH did not detail the type of soil that would be used for levelling the VG. BDC are aware. They must hand over the land in a useable state for the purpose of creating a VG.

The provisional date, subject to building and sale rates, for the Country Park land to be given to the Parish Council is July 2027 and Village Green December 2027. We need the design completed and approved and a contractor/contractors appointed ready to go as soon as we receive the land. The S106 timescales indicate 9 months for delivery of the Country Park and 7 months for the Village Green, again dependent on the building and sale rates. If these timeframes are not met then HH may claw back any underspent funds.

If installation falls in winter there may be additional challenges to meeting the S106 timescales.

The meeting agreed with the comments submitted to Groundwork East.

5. Items for the next agenda

None received.

6. Dates for the next meeting(s):

10th August 2026

12th October 2026

Signed:

Dated:

4. Brundall Village Park Working Group feedback to Groundwork East

Country Park

The Working Group was broadly supportive of the initial draft for the CP with some observations.

The **car park** proposal is supported and seems proportional. It will need a height restriction barrier (which could be opened) similar to our Countryside Park. You may have noted that there is only one vehicle width dropped kerb at the entrance which may require widening. We will need to allow access to grass cutting or maintenance machinery on to the CP which should be designed in by access through the car park or a separate access from the entrance near to Bay Bridge House (five bar gate there, previous access to farm buildings) but dependent on highways issues / visibility splay.

We support the **mown paths** but would need to have an understanding of the maintenance costs.

We support the **pocket path and picnic, and entrance grove**.

We do not think another **community orchard** is needed (we have one at the countryside park) but trees and hedges need to be in abundance. Some seating will be required. Picnic tables could be problematical and lead to rubbish.

We want to keep the CP as natural as possible and although the **boardwalk** over the pond is supported, others may think this compromises the natural element. We do not see the need for a slide or swing in this area.

An **accessible route** through the site is key even if some has to be completed in a future phase. The design doesn't seem to currently offer an accessible route from the car park. Perhaps we need to identify a key point in the proposed route at this stage where we would like the accessible route to reach.

Depending on EA permit requirements, we would like to see access along the whole **river area** (perhaps not disabled access at all points) and this is likely to be a mixture of mown paths, trod paths and boardwalk. All year round access is the ambition.

There is comment about 'desire to get wheelchair access to the river in later phases'. We should like this included in the design now please even if we can only fund later so we can understand the options.

No formal play areas but some of the boulders could create a more engaging space for children. The pond dipping area should be the only real play area on the CP. We don't want to encourage play in a formal sense as it is much more of a natural area.

Could the trim trail go across both areas to add a different dimension to the CP?

We need to think about shade and durability of the site for future expected climate conditions but also accessibility to the site in winter / periods of wet weather.

Any notice boards would need to be consistent with other PC boards eg at Countryside Park.

Village Green

The fundamental question regarding the VG is the **topography** and how the sewerage bulkheads will be managed. Reserved matters for the levels (and emergency access) have now been approved by Broadland as discussed at the meeting last week. Does your draft design take full account of the approved levels and/or some further work required to achieve a workable solution? We believe that understanding the levels are key to the design of the VG area including 'the amphitheater'.

We are concerned that the initial design for the VG includes a lot of **play equipment**. We were not expecting to see this, eg dual zip wire. We would like the proposals around the provision of play equipment reconsidered please for a number of reasons.

Firstly, our current and proposed Neighbourhood Plans include **important views** from the Links Avenue / Memorial Hall towards Blofield Church which was a key factor considered by the Planning Inspectorate. We must protect these views. Play equipment and (tall) trees in this sightline are not supported. Similarly, we need to be conscious of future occupants of the new houses regarding proximity of any play equipment for example.

We currently have Parish Council funded and maintained **play equipment on the Memorial Hall** site which we don't want to duplicate. We also have other parish play equipment at Meadow View to the south side of the housing. Both of these sites are close to the VG.

We want to complement the provisions by the **Memorial Hall** site and we haven't seen any reference in the draft to Memorial Hall site and how a **borderless plan** will work respecting the trustees land and parish land.

The focus in the brief on **informal recreation, picnics and community gatherings** is supported, with picnic benches to enjoy the landscape (see our comments above regarding the important views). We note the suggested intended provision for future coffee van or tuk tuk café but we are not 100% sure this is necessary in view of the facilities at the Memorial Hall.

The description of 'amphitheatre' may be too grand and we do not envisage organised events within the space. We think making a feature of the slope (once we understand the levels) would be good eg stone seating, but on an informal basis. If this then allows a **flatter area** to be created would be beneficial, although a formal grass area for potential performances etc is not really supported as it would be unlikely to be used for that purpose, but a large flat area is likely to be used by families for informal games etc. Stepped seating with views of the park and the church could work as long as they are not regimented. Gabions and wood seating may work in this area.

The **sensory river** is an interesting concept.

The **play equipment proposed for the lower levels** needs further consideration. We were only envisaging some natural play options perhaps with stone boulders to climb on or log stepping stones etc but nothing like the dual zip line or manufactured climbing structures. Any provision must be complementary to the Memorial Hall play area and not duplicating it.

The stone accessible pathway seems to be OK for people with disabilities and pushchairs but there are a lack of links to the CP. There is too much emphasis on access through the housing estate to the CP. People coming from the Memorial Hall side also need access to the CP.

We had envisaged **trim trail equipment** built into the plan perhaps on the western side, with consideration given to young and older adults.

General

Once the designs take further shape the **costings and affordability** will need to be considered together with the longer term **maintenance implications**, we anticipate that this will be a particular focus for the wider Council.

As mentioned above, we need to understand the likely availability of the CP in particular through the year and what mitigations can be introduced to maintain access under normal conditions. In other words, regular enforced closures of the CP during winter months would not be helpful.