

BURWELL MASTERPLAN WORKING PARTY MINUTES

Minutes of a Meeting held at Mandeville Hall, Tan House Lane, Burwell on Wednesday 9 January 2013 at 6:30pm.

PRESENT

District Councillor Peter Moakes (Chairman)
County Councillor David Brown
District Councillor Lavinia Edwards
Parish Councillor Pat Kilbey
District Councillor Hazel Williams MBE

OTHERS

Shirley Blake – Principal Sustainable Development Officer
Sally Bonnett – Infrastructure and Projects Officer
Tracy Couper – Principal Democratic Services Officer

Approx 35 members of the public were in attendance at the meeting

68. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

10 questions were received from Parish Councillor Gus Jones. These were read out at the meeting and responded to individually by the Principal Sustainable Development Officer. The Chairman stated that a formal written response would be sent to Councillor Jones (a copy of the questions and responses is appended to these Minutes).

69. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

70. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

As declared at previous Burwell Masterplan meetings, County Councillor David Brown declared a personal interest in the matters to be discussed, as he was both a County Councillor and District Councillor.

71. MINUTES

It was resolved:

That the minutes of the Burwell Masterplan Working Party meeting held on 3 September 2012 be confirmed as a correct record.

72. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman made no announcements.

73. **DRAFT BURWELL MASTERPLAN CONSULTATION FEEDBACK**

The Working Party received a report (M208 previously circulated), detailing the results of the public consultation on the draft Burwell Masterplan and requesting consideration of whether amendments were required to the Plan to reflect the outcome of the consultation. A presentation was given by Sally Bonnett, Infrastructure and Projects Officer summarising the consultation findings.

Ms Bonnett reported that a total of 182 questionnaires were completed representing a 7% response rate. In addition 23 written responses were received from stakeholders, agents/landowners, public and statutory consultees. 122 people were recorded as attending the 2 exhibitions and one petition had been received from residents of Baker Drive. Ms Bonnett summarised the top 5 types of comments on the key areas of the Masterplan such as housing growth; development objectives; employment growth; housing location, mix and design; traffic and transport; community facilities; and green spaces, cycleways, footpaths.

Ms Bonnett reported that a formal response now had been received from Cambridgeshire County Council highlighting slight textual amendments to correct anomalies and reiterating their previous comments regarding highways capacity.

Attention also was drawn to the petition by signed by 92 residents of Baker Drive opposing the proposed plan of sports field and car park and any housing development behind the properties due to proximity to sheltered housing; concerns about the impact of additional traffic using the sports facilities; anti-social behaviour and access between 32 and 34 Ness Road; and requesting that plans for the expansion of Ness Court bungalows for the elderly be included in the Masterplan.

Ms Bonnett highlighted the following areas where common themes had emerged from the consultation responses, and the views of the public and Members of the Working Party were requested on whether amendments to the Masterplan were required in the light of these. Comments were received and responded to and recommendations made by the Working Party as stated below:

(a) **Housing Growth**

Councillor Kilbey commented that the Parish Council had considered the growth figure of 350 houses over the 20 year period of the Masterplan as realistic, but recent information provided as part of the Village Vision process indicated that this might not be the final figure and that the Planners might consider the development of other 'exception sites' such as 12-15 houses at Barkways/Cornfields. If this was the case, it was considered that the 350 houses figure should be reduced to take account of such exception sites. A Member of the public commented that the whole purpose of the Masterplan as presented locally was to prevent such uncontrolled development. The Chairman confirmed that this was the case. In response, Ms Bonnett commented that the Barkways/Cornfields site was already included in the overall infill figure in the Masterplan.

A member of the public referred to the written consultation submission by Cheffins relating to the development of land at Toyes Lane, which had been rejected as part of the Masterplan process in favour of the single development of 350 dwellings at Newmarket Road. Therefore, he asked what assurance could be given that further

large developments beyond the 350 houses in the Masterplan would not be approved over the life of the Plan. The Chairman stated that this was the point of having a Masterplan, as it placed the District Council in a stronger position to control growth and resist such unplanned developments. However, no guarantees could be given.

A member of the public questioned whether the housing growth figure could be validated by such a low response rate to the consultation of 7%. The Chairman stated that this was a very good level of response compared to other local and national statistics and Councillor Williams commented that this was the last phase of consultation and that higher response/participation levels had been achieved throughout the whole Masterplan process. All villagers had been given an opportunity to participate in the process.

A number of members of the public and Members of the Working Party commented that the Masterplan and Village Vision growth figures and development sites should be consistent with each other. The Principal Sustainable Development Officer stated that the Masterplan would inform the Village Vision process and that there would be further consultation on the Village Vision in February/March. A member of the public queried the status of the Masterplan. The Chairman reported that the Masterplan was not a statutory document but was an effective way of ensuring controlled growth. The Village Vision was the statutory process but would be informed by any Masterplans.

A member of the public queried if exception sites outside of the village envelope counted as 'windfall' sites. The Chairman and Ms Bonnett stated that rural exception sites did not count as windfall sites but that these had to comprise 100% affordable housing to be approved. Cllr Kilbey commented that the Barkways/Cornfields site was not all affordable housing. Councillor Williams commented that the Barkways/Cornfields site also was not specifically referred to on the Masterplan.

Members of the Public and Members of the Working Party stated that clarification was required on the level of growth in the Village Vision and the Masterplan and that the two needed to be consistent with each other. It was suggested that the 350 growth figure could be reduced by 15 houses to take account of the Barkways/Cornfields site.

Councillor Brown stated that he was reluctant to revise the 350 figure, as this had received the strongest level of support in the consultation process. However, a member of the public commented that the Barkways/Cornfields site had not been consulted on as part of the Masterplan process and therefore the growth figure of 350 should only be retained if assurance could be given that the 15 houses on this site were to be part of the overall infill figure. The Chairman stated that the 350 growth figure should be supported as it had the greatest voracity from the consultation process. However, a member of the public referred to the fact that only 58% of the 7% of respondents had supported this, not 58% of the entire village, and 42% of respondents had not supported it, so the case was not clear cut, even if he personally was supportive of the proposed growth figure. A member of the public also commented that there had been no clear consensus on the growth figure at the previous consultation stages.

In response to a question by a member of the public, the Chairman confirmed that traveller pitches were not included in the growth figures. In that connection, the member of the public commented that travellers still used local facilities such as medical services and schools for children.

A Member of the public referred to the response made in relation to the concern expressed in the petition regarding the access between 32 and 34 Ness Court that it was an existing emergency access that must remain, and commented that it could not currently be used as an emergency access due to the area being very overgrown. The Chairman stated that the access currently belonged to Cambridgeshire County Council and that an appropriate use for the access could be stipulated as part of the detailed development plan for the Newmarket Road site.

A member of the public asked if the Parish Council could have control of the allocation of the self-build plots proposed on the Newmarket Road site, to encourage purchase by local people. The Chairman reported that this would not be possible.

In the light of the above discussions, it was RECOMMENDED:

- 1. That the growth figure of 350 dwellings be retained.**
- 2. That the Development and Transport Committee be requested to ensure that the growth figures in the Village Vision and the Masterplan are consistent with each other.**

(b) Infill Housing Figure

It was proposed that the infill figure be based on the 2012 estimate of 114 (excluding 35 log cabins for tourism use only which have planning permission) in order for the Masterplan to be as accurate as possible, rather than the infill figure of 128 dwellings based on the 2011 housing trajectory currently included in the draft Masterplan. Members of the Working Party agreed that the infill figure should be based on the most up to date projection.

A member of the public enquired about the status of the log cabins and Ms Bennett explained that these were temporary tourist dwellings, which could not be occupied for all 12 months of the year.

It was RECOMMENDED:

That the infill figures in draft Masterplan be amended to 2012 figures.

(c) Building on Farmland

It was RECOMMENDED:

That no change be made to the location of housing growth.

(d) Footpath Linkages through Felsham Chase

Councillor Brown commented that emphasis should be placed in the Masterplan on the fact that this was a detailed design issue to be addressed at the Planning stage.

It was RECOMMENDED:

That no change be made to the footpath linkages through Felsham Chase.

(e) Location of Sports Pitches/Housing near Ness Court

Councillor Brown commented that with an ageing population both nationally and within the village, proposals should be included in the Masterplan for the expansion of the sheltered development.

It was RECOMMENDED:

That the draft Masterplan to be amended to include a green buffer between development and Ness Court and the sheltered housing and to also include space for potential expansion of Ness Court and Sheltered Housing.

(f) Traffic through the Village

A member of the public queried if the traffic capacity threshold assessment by the County Council was based on a village or a town. Ms Bonnett stated that it was assessed on a percentage basis and that Burwell was well within the target levels. A member of the public referred to the focus on the A14/A142 junction, but there was also an issue of traffic flows on the B1102 at peak times for drivers using this as an alternative route into Cambridge. Therefore, this also needed to be included in the transport assessments.

A member of the public queried if the delayed traffic census for Swaffham Road had been timetabled by the County Council yet. Ms Bonnett stated that she was not aware that this had been scheduled. The member of the public requested that the County Council be pressed to organise this in the near future.

In response to a further question by a member of the public, Ms Blake confirmed that the impact of the development of the Newmarket Road site for housing had been accounted for in the County Council traffic projections.

A member of the public reported that the brickworks had been purchased recently, which was likely to lead to an increase in heavy plant movements within the village.

It was RECOMMENDED:

That the draft Masterplan be amended to include text noting the requirement for developers to carry out transport assessments, which include impact on A14/A142 junction, B1102 and Newmarket's transport network.

(g) Jobs Target

Councillor Williams commented that the jobs target was challenging and aspirational, but that efforts should be made to increase the proportion of people able to work within the village to reduce out-commuting.

It was RECOMMENDED:

That no change be made to the jobs target.

(h) Green Edge Protection

Councillors Brown and Kilbey commented that the Village Vision was much weaker on this than the Masterplan and that there needed to be consistency between the two documents.

It was RECOMMENDED:

That the Masterplan text be amended to make it clear that Green edge is a reiteration of the 'open countryside' policy already in place.

(i) Employment – DS Smith Site

A number of members of the public expressed concern at the tactics being employed by the owner/agent to push forward the sale and development of the site for housing and the length of time that the site had been left unoccupied. Ms Bonnett stated that the removal of the site from the development envelope would help to resist such development.

It was RECOMMENDED:

That no change be made to the employment allocation for the DS Smith site.

(j) Employment – Reach Road Site

It was RECOMMENDED:

That the wording in the Burwell Masterplan text be amended to provide greater flexibility in terms of the overall split of uses.

In concluding the discussions, Councillor Brown asked about the timetable for approval of the Masterplan. The Chairman stated that it was to be considered at the Development and Transport Committee on the following day and recommendations made for final approval at the Council meeting on 21 February 2013. Councillor Kilbey asked that the final draft be sent to all Members of the Working Party before it went to full Council.

It was AGREED:

1. That the results of the public consultation on the draft Burwell Masterplan be noted.
2. That the amendments to the draft Burwell Masterplan as a result of the consultation, as set out in the recommendations above, be supported.
3. To delegate any other minor editorial amendments to the Chairman.

In the light of the above -

It was resolved TO RECOMMEND TO DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE:

That the draft Burwell Masterplan, as amended by 2 and 3 above, be recommended to the District Council's Development and Transport Committee for recommendation to full Council for approval as the Council's long-term vision for the future of Burwell.

The meeting concluded at 8.15pm.

Chairman_____

Questions/suggested amendments to draft Burwell Master Plan

Gus Jones
Burwell Parish Cclr.

1. During the compilation of the Burwell Master plan there has been confusion and controversy on what was a master plan and if there were any deviations during the stipulated period of validity. Can the title Burwell Master Plan title be amended to read "**Burwell Master Plan (phase 1)**"? This on the grounds there are no detailed drawings and the present findings can only be used for the development of a Master Plan.

Answer: No name change necessary - Page 7 of the Masterplan document sets out what the Burwell Masterplan is or isn't. It is a long-term vision and does not provide detailed layout plans for development.

2. Apparently the present panel will be disbanded when the final draft is accepted. As considerable knowledge has been accumulated by the present team, can the same team be used to work on the detailed layout of the 350 plots to complete the **Burwell Master Plan (phase 2)**?

Answer: It is up to the developer to appoint a team. We will help as much as we can.

3. Does the Master Plan guarantee (as originally stated) that the only expansion for domestic habitats will only be on the one site shown on the present draft and that there will be no further expansion during the 20 year validity of the plan?

Answer: This is the current plan proposed for Burwell, it may well be reviewed before 20 years.

4. At present Burwell has 15 football teams of all ages and the village has limited sports facilities can the drawing on page 27 be used to amend the present sketch shown on the draft page 24.

Answer: The map on page 24 shows the amount of land the developers have to provide under planning obligations. The map on page 27 is a desire dependent on the good will of the landowner.

5. Can the centralised outdoor sports facilities on page 31 be given a higher priority and placed in the short-term column 2013/2021?

Answer: Provision of the sports facilities and circular path in question 6 below is dependent on when the site is developed and when necessary funds have been raised. Though it would be desirable for this to occur sooner, realistically this is likely to be in the longer term.

6. Can the creation of a circular path around the village on page 31 be given a higher

priority and placed in the short term column 2013/2021

Answer: See answer to Q5

7. Most recorded speeding offences occur 200 to 500 meters from a restriction sign. Can Burwell be made into an experimental traffic calming area by alerting motorists with rumble strips at the 3 entrances to Burwell, in front of the 30mph signs. This measure to be supplemented by replacing the present flashing warning signs with traffic lights that turn red when allowed speeds are exceeded?

Answer: This would be better progressed through one of the County Council Highway Improvement Schemes

8. Agenda item page 5- DS Smith site- It is rumoured that the site was offered at too high a price to attract buyers. Is there any truth in this rumour?

Answer: We have not received this information from DS Smith, they have not demonstrated to us that the value they have placed on the land is appropriate for employment uses.

9. On the sale of land will all other revenues raised go directly to Burwell Parish Council?

Answer: A ‘Meaningful Proportion’ of the CIL money raised will go to Burwell Parish Council – the % rate that this will be has not yet been decided by Central Government.

10. Sustainability ((page 25) – Do the building methods include “Passive House Design”, This type of housing uses virtually no energy and the inside air is of a better quality than in standard housing. (Affordable housing of this type was built in Scotland and according to the internet The Government is going to make this a standard design from 2016) Is there also consideration for extracting energy from the ground and storing rainwater for flushing loos?

Answer: these details will be determined at the planning stage.