

Friends of Suffolk Punch

Additional Submission to support the Nomination of The Suffolk Punch Site as an Asset of Community Value.

Also a response to some of the Objectors claims

Delegated Decision to be taken 4 October 2016.

- 1) Further to the original nomination and having regard to the Officers comments at 3.6 and 3.7 of the report prepared for the Delegated Decision process for the 4 October 2016 further evidence is set out below to support the claim.
- 2) The original nomination of the 5 August 2016 was submitted very much based on the previous nomination of 2013 and with the time constraints did not address the issues now raised by Officers and the Solicitors for The Park's Trust and Riverside(Clapham) Limited.
- 3) The site was only de-listed on the 26 July 2016 so The Voluntary Body The Friends of The Suffolk Punch have been constrained by time as a planning application is now been submitted thus the nomination being lacking certain evidence.
- 4) In the 21 months that the Public House has been boarded up there was bidding process which closed in June 2015 where no reserve price was stated and the Community Bid mentioned was not successful as in reality it went to the Highest bidder.
- 5) It is incorrect to say that there was no interest expressed by the Pub trade in the premises – the Brewer McMullens of Hertfordshire asked to purchase the site in late 2014 to be told that it was not for sale but were offered a lease.
- 6) Greene King a former Tenant at the site expressed willingness to assist with competitive trade loans any community bid for the site as they were well placed to know the potential of any venture on the site from previous trading.
- 7) The Officer note that Public Houses are closing all over the UK is certainly true but the Suffolk Punch until Greene King were allowed to surrender a full repairing and insuring lease with out making good the premises posted turnover figures of over 680,000 pounds in 2009 (as advertised when marketed by Flurets)
- 8) The claims by both sets of solicitors that the premises were marketed for sale must be taken against the background that the property was in dis-repair (in particular the kitchen needed complete renovation) thus making a very poor option for any prospective purchaser.
- 9) The viability of the premises was compromised by bad business decisions and bad management coupled with mis-fortune when there was a kitchen fire which denied the supply of food thus continued the spiral of low turnover.

- 10)The one most telling bad decision was allowing Greene King PLC to surrender the lease as stated in point 7.
- 11)Despite several attempts by the Bradwell Parish Councillors to meet with the Park's Trust over the period there was reluctance to meet to discuss a community solution to the site in which all parties could achieve some of their aims.
- 12)In fact the latest request to speak to Ward Councillors for Milton Keynes in April 2016 was turned down.
- 13)The Developer was asked to discuss the site after the withdrawn planning application in October 2015 by Councillor R Bradburn but this was also declined.
- 14)The Friends of The Suffolk Punch and a majority of residents of Heelands wish for a community solution which due to the neglect of the building may well be a Community Hall with a Residents Club Bar attached – this facility could easily facilitate any requirement for a nursery. To further that end The Friends of The Suffolk Punch have now been recognised by the Bradwell Parish Council and at the meeting of the Council on the 26 September 2016 which resolved to support the group by assisting with advertising and administration and hold any funds that are collected through a Fighting Fund Campaign.
- 15)The note at 3.6 points that the existing premises can be changed.
- 16)In the short time since the site has been de-listed the Friends of the Suffolk Punch have worked as quickly as they can to start the process of looking forward to get the site in place for community use.
- 17)If this is not enough to support the nomination I would ask that the Delegated decision be deferred for 14 days so that more evidence can be brought forward.