
TITLE: BURWELL MASTERPLAN OPTIONS CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

Committee: Burwell Masterplan Working Party

Date: 2nd April 2012

Author: Sally Bonnett, Infrastructure and Projects Officer

[L325]

1.0 ISSUE

1.1 To receive feedback from the Burwell Masterplan Options Consultation and agree next steps in the Masterplan process.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 It is recommended that Members of the Working Party:

- a) Note the feedback from the Burwell Masterplan Options Consultation.
- b) Confirm 100 homes, plus infill, over 20 years as the preferred level of growth for the Burwell Masterplan.
- c) Approve further research to be carried out to confirm the infrastructure requirements for this level of growth.
- d) Approve further research to be carried out into the Ness Road, Newmarket Road sites and other sites to be agreed by the Working Party, and the implications of development of each of these for Burwell and its infrastructure.
- e) Approve, as part of this further research, some further Focus Group consultation, one with young people and one with Burwell Parish Council, specifically on site issues.

3.0 BACKGROUND

3.1 The Burwell Masterplan Consultation Strategy proposes public consultation at each stage of the Burwell Masterplan work, including the Options development stage. The options for consultation were agreed at the Working Party meeting held on 2nd February 2012.

4.0 PROCESS

4.1 The Options consultation ran from 27th February – 12th March 2012. The consultation was promoted via a flyer which was delivered to every home in

Burwell, posters displayed around the village, press releases in the local newspapers and also on the ECDC website and the Burwell village website.

- 4.2 Four public exhibitions of the options were held, to which over 450 people were recorded as visiting. A questionnaire for people to give their views on the options was available on-line, at the exhibitions and from the Jubilee Reading Rooms, Burwell Post Office and Burwell Sports and Community Centre. 253 questionnaires were completed, a 9.2% response rate. However the response rate from young people was very low.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 Appendix 1 provides detailed feedback from the Burwell Masterplan Options Consultation. The key conclusions were:

- No option emerged as a preferred option.
- However, the 100 homes, plus infill (over 20 years), level of growth received the most support.
- A number of additional comments were made; the majority of these were raising concerns about the impact of new development on Burwell and its infrastructure. Comments indicated that a number of local people still prefer a no growth or infill only option, although it had been agreed at previous working party meetings (3/11/11 and 7/12/12) that these would be unrealistic options when looking at a plan for a 20 year period.
- Five other sites for housing were proposed and details of these will be displayed at the meeting.

- 5.2 It is therefore proposed that the 100 homes, plus infill, (over 20 years) be endorsed as the preferred level of growth for the Burwell Masterplan.

- 5.3 Because of the mixed public views on the location of new housing it is recommended that further research be carried out into the Ness Road and Newmarket Road sites to weigh up their advantages and disadvantages.

- 5.4 The working party are asked whether they wish further work to be carried out in respect of any of the other sites which have been put forward by respondents during this latest consultation.

- 5.5 The research should also seek to confirm the implications this level of growth will have on Burwell and its infrastructure, and be reported to the Working Party at its meeting on 27th June 2012.

- 5.6 It is also proposed that as part of this additional research that further Focus Groups are held, one with young people to specifically seek their views, (in view of their low representation in the options consultation) and one with Burwell Parish Council to discuss the potential sites in more detail.

6.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

6.1 Costs of the consultation were met from existing budgets.

6.2 An Equality Impact Assessment (INRA) will need to be carried out on the final Burwell Masterplan document.

7.0 APPENDICES

7.1 Appendix 1: Burwell Masterplan Options Consultation Feedback Report

<u>Background Documents</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Contact Officer</u>
Burwell Masterplan Consultation Strategy	Room FF102, The Grange, Ely	Sally Bonnett, Infrastructure and Projects Officer (01353) 616451 E-mail: sally.bonnett@eastcambs.gov.uk
Draft Burwell Masterplan Working Party Meeting minutes 02/02/2012		

Appendix 1

Burwell Masterplan Options Stage Consultation Feedback

The Burwell Masterplan Options consultation ran from 27th February – 12th March 2012. The consultation was promoted via a flyer which was delivered to every home in Burwell, posters displayed around the village, press releases in the local newspapers and also on the ECDC website and the Burwell village website.

Four public exhibitions of the options were held, to which over 450 people were recorded as visiting. A questionnaire for people to give their views on the options was available on-line, at the exhibitions and from the Jubilee Reading Rooms, Burwell Post Office and Burwell Sports and Community Centre. 253 questionnaires were completed, a 9.2% response rate.

Exhibitions

- 92 people attended the first exhibition on 29th February 2012 (3pm – 8pm), at the Mandeville Hall
- 235 people viewed exhibition at Burwell at Large on Saturday 3rd March (1pm – 5pm)
- 101 people viewed exhibition at Burwell at Large on Sunday 4th March (2pm – 5pm)
- 28 people attended the final exhibition on Wednesday 7th March (9am – 12 noon), at the Mandeville Hall

The purpose of the events was to enable people to view and discuss the options presented and give their feedback, share their ideas and to ask questions they may have. A total of 456 were recorded as visiting the exhibitions and spoke with Officers and members of the Working Party. As well as the questionnaires, blank maps and a comments book were also available for people to record their comments and ideas.

Questionnaires

Total responses = 253

Number of dwellings in village = 2750
Response rate = 9.2%

Respondent profile:

A resident of Burwell – 91.1%
An employee working in Burwell – 5.3%
A local business owner – 6.5%
A visitor to Burwell – 1.2%
A developer or local landowner – 2.4%
Other – 4.9%

2.9% aged under 20 (this age group accounts for 22% of population aged 0-20)
6.3% aged 21-34 (this age group accounts for approx 17% of population)
27.5% aged 35-49 (this age group accounts for approx 19% of population)
40.6% aged 50-64 (this age group accounts for approx 22% of population)
22.7% aged 65+ (this age group accounts for approx 20% of population)

Under representation from younger age groups.

Male – 52.8%
Female – 47.2%

Which of the Burwell Masterplan options do you support? Please tick the relevant boxes.

	% Support	% Do not support	% No view
Option 1 (100 + infill)	43.4	44.4	12.1
Option 2 (100 + infill)	39.2	47.7	13.1
Option 3 (200 + infill)	44.8	47.8	7.2
Option 4 (350 + infill)	30.7	63.4	5.9
Option 5 (350 + infill)	19.5	73.7	6.8

Which is your preferred option? Please write the number of your preferred option below.

Option 1 - 18%
Option 2 – 22.2 %
Option 3 – 15.9%
Option 4 – 15.9%
Option 5 – 8.6%

No support indicated for any option - 14.5%
More than one option indicated - 3.2%
Infill only given as response - 1.8%

Additional Comments from Questionnaire

Infrastructure

- 39 comments made regarding infrastructure capacity either saying isn't capacity or asking if there will be sufficient capacity for growth
- Services mentioned as being at capacity or will be needed if growth in Burwell: Doctors, businesses, roads, schools, facilities for children (9-16 year olds) more shops, local security, sewage, water supply, drainage, parking at shops, utility services, hydrants
- New community centre not needed – 3 comments
- Develop facilities we already have e.g. sports centre, Swimming pool, recreation ground – 1 comment

Roads/traffic/public transport

- Burwell needs a bypass – 4 comments
- Volume of traffic through the village now needs to be addressed – 4 comments
- All the options will increase the traffic on the roads in the village – 3 comments
- Need better public transport service – 3 comments
- The traffic survey which stated that there has been no increase was carried out too late in the morning and should have included the Swaffham Road to capture commuters travelling west out of the village. This would have given a more accurate indication of the traffic flow through the village and whether the present road system can take more if larger developments are to be considered – 2 comments
- Take down the old railway bridge between Burwell and Exning – 2 comments
- Traffic lights needed at Newmarket Road and High Street junctions – 2 comments
- No speed bumps – 2 comments
- Road safety measures already needed – 2 comments
- No plans for traffic away from the centre of the village seems to have been made – 2 comments
- The road layout of the village is the major constraining factor for potential growth – 1 comment
- I would not consider it a good idea to have a perimeter route running through residential areas or behind residences – 1 comment
- Traffic rerouting needed to stop the "rat run" – 1 comment
- My thoughts on the Newmarket Road developments are that the exit from the new homes onto Newmarket Road would be dangerous due to speed of the traffic entering the junction meeting a 't' junction – 1 comment
- Some options would create the rat run situations – 1 comment
- Concerned over access for residents (new and existing) if houses are built along Newmarket Road because of type of road and transport that use it – 1 comment
- We also do not want more traffic pollution – 1 comment

- Any further development in Burwell must be accompanied by improvements in traffic management – 1 comment
- Why no relief road for HGVs from Ness Road to the end of North Street industrial site? Articulated lorries route - Toyes Lane - Silver Street - North Street – 1 comment
- A Ness Road development would require most of its commuter traffic to go all the way through the village – 1 comment
- Improved transport links would enable better access to Ely and Cambridge for employment – 1 comment

Walking/cycling

- Safe footpath/cycleway to Exning needed -3 comments
- Concern about pedestrian access through established estates - increased traffic - more people walking through - destroys feelings of safety to residents. Potential for more crime. Devalues homes with quiet locations/edge of estate positions – 3 comments
- Safe footpath/cycleway to Newmarket needed –1comment
- Direct cycle route to Cambridge, preferably alongside the B1102 through Quy
- Creation of a walk/cycle path linking the health centre to the Felsham chase development – 1 comment
- Linkage walk between Old School Close and Baker Drive not a good idea as will be used as a 'rat run' between developments – 1 comment

School

- Extend existing school– 4 comments
- Build new school – 4 comments
- Need more school places – 3 comments
- Do not want 2 schools – 2 comments
- School will become too big if more houses built – 1 comment
- Need to see how additional school places will be paid for before moving forward – 1 comment
- Build another school on D S Smith site, Reach Road – 1 comment
- Do not feel we should concern ourselves with this issue – if we will need more school spaces, EC therefore will be obliged to create them rather on the back of extra funding from building more houses – 1 comment

Employment

- More shops – 3 comment
- Please do something with old factory site, Reach Road – 2 comments
- No time has been spent focussing on employment opportunities – 2 comments
- All options seem to include additional industrial development on Reach Road, adjacent to the existing designated area - over the past near - decade the uptake on the existing area has been limited, so why is additional area required? – 2 comments
- Include more growth in employment opportunities than the present Masterplan proposes – 2 comments

- By providing housing with no employment opportunities Burwell will increasingly become a dormitory town for Cambridge (and Newmarket) – 1 comment
- I think the new industrial sites should be light industrial such as electronics and science based especially due to our proximity to Cambridge – 1 comment
- I strongly believe that additional employment development would NOT be required if public transport links with Ely (especially the rail station) AND Cambridge were improved – 1 comment
- There is nothing in the options concerning the development of small and medium businesses, for instance the provision of areas for light industry and commercial use, except for a small area off Reach Road. Small businesses provide employment and a sense of community not just a dormitory village – 1 comment
- The old paper mill site needs to be used first before permission can be given to companies to move onto a greenfield site – 1 comment
- Develop sites for light and future technology industries to provide employment for villagers and reduce those having to commute to Cambridge – 1 comment

Marina

- Concern about access to marina and increase in traffic in this area – 2 comments
- In support of marina proposal – 2 comments
- Against marina proposal – 2 comments
- More details wanted – 2 comments

Sports facilities/allotments and open spaces

- In favour of more sports facilities/playing fields - 3 comments
- Include a bowling green and club house in new recreation ground – use existing green for housing – 1 comment
- Need a gym - 1 comment
- Move allotments to recreation ground and build on allotments – 2 comments
- Preserve allotments on current site - 1 comment
- Improve sports facilities we have - 1 comment
- Why should green edge to west be protected, is an ugly untidy area - 1 comment
- Do not need access to Wicken Fen - 1 comment
- Need more space between any developments and existing housing - 1 comment
- Housing crammed in little green space - 1 comment

Location of development

- Do not support Ness Road location – 7 comments
- Do not build on agricultural land, need it for growing food - 4 comments
- Do not support Newmarket Road location – 4 comments
- Development in 1 or 2 blocks on outskirts rather than infill - 4 comments
- Spread housing out more so not all in one area – 3 comments

- Housing in centre of village rather than expanding current boundaries - 2 comments
- Would prefer smaller developments on all three sites suggested rather than one large site and one smaller site off Newmarket Road – 1 comment
- Concerned about highly visible building development and buildings on green sites – 1 comment
- More play areas/ facilities on Newmarket Road and not all in centre of village – 1 comment
- The danger of building near the 'Felsham Chase' estate is that you could be creating one big 'modern' estate – 1 comment
- I fail to understand why the Cambridge end of the village has managed to achieve the 'protected' status; how was this determined?? Why could the Fordham or Exning ends not have been 'protected' or indeed any other aspect of the village? – 1 comment
- Further development should go to places where it's really needed – 1 comment
- I also support the development of land to the north of the village – 1 comment
- The aerial view shows Burwell is heavily built on the west side of the main road in Burwell. The east side i.e. Newmarket needs to take some of the burden – 1 comment
- Build new homes on the south side of Burwell so traffic from Cambridge doesn't come through Burwell – 1 comment
- The playing fields with changing facilities in option 1-5 are not a good idea. A playing area on the edge of the village tucked away will encourage teenagers, under age drinking and all that is associated with these areas – 1 comment
- I believe that options 2 & 5 would provide a better aspect as you drive into the village from Fordham as this would be more 'infill' than building on the other side of the road near Slade Farm – 1 comment

Alternative locations/options suggested for housing

- A combination of options of 2 and 3 - 2 comments
- Heath Road – 1 comment
- Infill further along river North Street/Dysons Lane – 1 comment
- Use vacant houses in Burwell – 1 comment
- Land at back of Isaacson Road, lower High Street and Swaffham Road and left and right on Heath Road (behind Margaret's Field) – 1 comment

Type/style of new developments

- Affordable housing for local people – 3 comments
- No more 'executive homes' – 2 comments
- Accommodation for retirees – 2 comments
- Development must only be for the 'recognised' local need – 1 comment
- More supported living schemes such as Ness Court needed – 1 comment
- Provision of reasonable sized front gardens – 1 comment
- Homes for younger local people – 1 comment
- Family houses with gardens – 1 comment

- Appropriate sized garages –1 comment

Level of growth

- Low to medium growth would keep the village character – 4 comments
- 350 homes is too much – 2 comments
- The option for 400 new homes over 20 years will invigorate the village, jobs, activities, village, schools and address the shortage of homes for younger local people – 2 comments
- Support extra 100 dwellings plus 50 infill any more is too much – 2 comments
- Are higher growth options viable - is there sufficient demand? – 1 comment
- I am not convinced of the need for much further growth in Burwell. There has already been too much in-fill and garden grabbing, and the current infrastructure will not support another housing estate – 1 comment
- Keep new housing to absolute minimum – 1 comment
- I do not feel the case has been made for any significant level of housing development (which would just turn Burwell into a large dormitory housing estate for those working in Cambridge) although option 2 might provide housing for young local residents – 1 comment
- A much larger population would inevitably lead to more crime - we have little at the moment – 1 comment
- Please do not turn Burwell into a town now it is a pleasant and safe place to live with enough shops for everyday needs – 1 comment
- Stick to the Local Development Framework growth scenario, i.e. 100 new dwellings on Newmarket Road with 40% socially affordable and cut out the spin – 1 comment
- 150 additional dwellings seems more than enough to accommodate the assumed extra housing needs whilst at the same time retaining the 'village feel' that Burwell quite clearly has – 1 comment

No Growth

- Burwell is big enough/no growth - 18 comments
- Why no option for no growth? 4 comments

Why:

- With people moving, passing away etc, there would be sufficient housing available – 1 comment
- Schools and roads would struggle to cope with the extra influx of people added to the village – 1 comment
- Burwell is a lovely village the way it is – 1 comment
- Could lead to an increase in 'trouble' – 1 comment

No Growth would lead to population decrease

- Disagree population will decrease if no housing growth - 6 comments
- Could sustain existing services even with drop in population – 3 comments
- As more gypsies, travellers and Eastern Europeans settle here population will increase – 2 comments
- Better care in the community could free up large family houses – 1 comment

Infill Only

- Would prefer infill only – 9 comments
- Infill only should have been presented as an option – 3 comments

Why:

- If Burwell gets too big will lose community/village feel – 4 comments
- Any large development would create further traffic problems. Most houses have 2 + cars. Parking is already a problem in Burwell – 1 comment
- This is my preference, not option 1 - I have only put that in to get the response accepted electronically. I do not think Burwell is the right location for Cambridgeshire housing growth, as it will only lead to more commuter miles for Cambridge city workers. This is hardly environmentally sustainable development. The last 20 years' housing development in Burwell seems to have included too many large family houses and not enough affordable starter homes or retirement homes and the next developments should redress the balance – 1 comment

Pro growth comments

- I am happy to see Burwell grow and develop – 1 comment
- Burwell is in need of reasonable development over the next few years to ensure that the current businesses in the village can thrive. We also need more employment areas in the village to reduce the daily mass exodus from the village – 1 comment
- Growth needed to ensure village and businesses here survive. Two developments (houses) and green site development more likely to achieve this – 1 comment
- It is very important that Burwell grows because of its closeness to Cambridge. If it does not grow housing will be unaffordable for local residents – 1 comment
- A small local community is good but it is about the future and the village needs to grow – 1 comment
- Critical mass for a community is important and population numbers must rise to assist this. However, more important is the appearance of all new builds. Attractive housing makes for better community spirits – 1 comment
- This plan seems to be well thought out. I think the plan for additional houses a good one; more people will give more support to commercial and social options – 1 comment
- Assuming funding is available I prefer some growth - but it must not be done on the cheap!! – 1 comment

Comments on Individual Options

Option 1

- The building of these dwellings and vehicles involved are dangerous hence the reason I am only supporting option 1 for access during and after construction and not clogging up the village – 1 comment

- I prefer option 1 because it is nearer the shops, makes a better a shape of the village – 1 comment
- I support this option as it seeks to utilise the councils own land that was already ear-marked for growth in the previous LDF documents of 2010-2011, I am however, loathe to say that this proposal doesn't offer much scope for a 20 year growth plan and would be inclined to add that, though an apt area, the development does not provide enough in new homes or green space amenities – 1 comment
- Option 1 is the "best of the worst" – 1 comment
- Option 1 is unrealistically low rate of development – 1 comment

Option 2

- If there has to be more development in Burwell then Option 2 is the best – 1 comment
- I am not in favour of this option as it seeks to make the village envelope extend towards Fordham – 1 comment
- I am not convinced that growth is needed for Burwell. However, if it is decided that development is necessary, then I would prefer option 2. The other options are adding far too many houses – 1 comment

Option 3

- 3 is the best option – 1 comment
- This option is by far and away my preferred; similarly because it uses the councils land for growth as in option one, and also that it reflects a sensible split-scheme of homes along with the much needed introduction of a new playing field and facilities. This option balances the village footprint nicely, and provides a good deal of new housing in an area that has the requisite infrastructure to support the growth proposed. The layout is also sensitive to the Felsham Chase residents and in my opinion does not appear to be too imposing on them, which cannot be said as per options 4 + 5. I do feel though that the detail of option 3 could be reviewed in order to consider in the region of up to 250 planned homes, 80 nearest Ness Rd as per the current plan, with a further 170 closer to the Newmarket Rd end. In amending the volume of houses will find some middle ground between the high-end development options 4 + 5 seek to offer, making option 3 a more rounded long-term proposal – 1 comment
- Hopefully 3 is the right balance – 1 comment
- I think 3 is a good compromise. It will enable the village to grow and provide additional open space. It would be good if the open space made provision for 9 - 16 year olds – 1 comment
- I enjoy driving to visit friends and family in Burwell and feel that Option 3 is the most likely to not spoil the pleasant village that Burwell is – 1 comment
- Realistically the village of Burwell will inevitably have to expand over the next 20 years, so Option 3 would be a middle option which neither restricts the village to stagnation, but keeps a lid on excessive development which would push the village towards a 'town' feel – 1 comment

Option 4

- Option 4 is the most cohesive plan. It gives the village a more rounded pattern of settlement and goes some way to meeting housing demand over the next 20 years. It should allow a good number of low cost affordable homes/social housing – 1 comment
- Too much housing (far too much) on Newmarket Road – 1 comment
- Option 4 gives greatest flexibility as still leaves the opportunity for expanding NW of Ness Road in the longer term; it is the only option which provides the opportunity for a new school, something which must surely be considered within 20 years; it is the only option which gives rise to a more circular shape for the village, which is the natural shape for a community, to minimise travel between points for most people; were the school to move to the new site it would free up a central part of the village to generate a proper village centre with shops and businesses - something that the village is in desperate need of so as to enhance the village and reduce the need for the growing population to travel outside the village for employment – 1 comment

Option 5

- Too many homes being proposed for Burwell – 2 comments
- I firmly believe option 5 is the best future for the village. It would offer an exciting future for Burwell – 1 comment
- Option 5 puts too much housing (far too much) on Newmarket Road – 1 comment

Comments relating to more than one option

- Options 2 and 3 could possibly be combined – 1 comment
- Options 3,4, & 5 will require much more planning and expenditure on infrastructure – 1 comment

Other

- A beautiful village that should not be used to line pockets, but should be thought about for the future of our children's children because once the charm and beauty has had its facelifts, botox and anymore disfigurements, it will be too late to hide the scars.
- Need to have an option that will be fit for purpose to support growing population.
- Under this Masterplan Burwell will be even more of a dormitory town/village.
- Thank you - well presented options and graphics.
- The planning committee side with the developers regardless of local opinion. The developers and planning officers have a cosy relationship that borders on the corrupt. This Masterplan concept and supporting material is disgustingly one-sided.
- We should be doing more and making a concerted effort to use our vote to remove these people from the whole decision-making process. We should be suggesting to the committee and our MP that we take broader look at alternative and more innovative methods of local decision-making.

- Burwell is no longer a village as such and with even more housing will become a town
- What is question 5 all about? It is forcing people to state a preferred option that will give a green-light to some form of development.
- The lack of any certainty regarding S106/CIL/Developer contributions combined with the systems woeful ability to secure any meaningful contributions and direct them to genuine needs, means that there is a huge risk attached to promotion growth in housing at the present time. Burwell did not get the supporting infrastructure it needed when Felsham Chase was constructed - will an untried and untested developer contributions system be any better.
- There has been concern about a hidden agenda, which keeps getting dismissed, but councillors have to build trust. This presentation erodes the work done to date.
- The option boards and information presented seem very divisive and seem to be totally about housing growth and do not address the issues mentioned by the community in any way.

Comments from Sustrans (UK charity enabling people to travel by foot, bike or public transport)

To enable sustainable and healthy local travel options all residential development (apart from selective in-fill) should be in the Ness Road/ Newmarket Road quadrant, which is reasonably well-served by east-west on- and off-road paths (giving "selective permeability") linking it conveniently to Burwell's existing community facilities. It should be scaled to use the full capacity of the school site, which must define the maximum size of the village extension, and the path through the school site should be improved (along with others) to become a principal non-motor access route.

The Masterplan's intentions for housing layout and design envisage a "traditional", upmarket, car-dependent new dormitory extension which would risk not relating well to the existing village... like the school site, the residential extension should be intensively developed, as was Burwell's historic village core, to generate non-motor movements and high levels of social encounter. The links via Green Lanes, School Lane and public footpaths through Priory Wood to Hightown Drove should be improved and funded as part of the development plan, to form a high-quality pedestrian/ cycle route to the Fens area and the new Lodes Way.

Maps

Blank maps were available at the exhibitions for people to write/draw their ideas for alternative options on. The following suggestions were made.

- Identify areas of optimum importance for conservation/biodiversity on map as well as history
- 'No building here' marked along south and east of Burwell

- Question mark drawn on Ness Road site.
- Extend Burwell Village College
- Build on allotments
- Do not build on allotments
- Move allotments to recreation ground
- Do not move allotments to recreation ground
- Build on Newmarket Road site
- Do not build on Newmarket Road site
- Locate new playing field to rear of Felsham Chase
- Locate new playing field to rear of Felsham Chase – why?
- Pedestrian crossing throughout village – locations marked on map – some opposed
- Footbridge across Burwell Lode x 2 comments
- Allotments adjacent to recreation ground
- Cycle track round edge of village joining up either end of Weirs Drove
- Footpath to join missing section of dismantled railway
- Traffic calming along Swaffham Road
- No traffic calming along Swaffham Road
- Community wind farm – 4 mills to supply Burwell
- No community wind farm
- Land rear of Newmarket Road behind Ness Court – Green burial ground with chapel, meeting room/café, community orchard, hedges, composting areas
- Land off Newmarket Road – allotment gardens with central play ground
- No allotments off Newmarket Road – too dry

Comments book

A comments book was made available for people to make comments on the options or the exhibition itself. The following comments were received:

- Very well displayed.
- Visually impressive display, which omits the ritual considerations: water supply, sewage and food security for this community, also access to wildlife, hedgerows and trees within this village. Trees are not 'landscaping'.
- If there is any community money to come with more housing the swimming pool desperately needs knocking down and starting again.
- Provide a park for the very young and elderly – trees, flower borders and seats for people to relax.

Alternative Site suggestions

- Land off North Street
- Land off Low Road
- Land off Isaacson Road
- Land off Heath Road
- Land West of Low Road

Written responses

12 written responses were made to the consultation plus:

- Representation re land adjacent to Cornfields
- Representation re land west of Ness Road
- Representation re Land adjacent Low Road
- Representation re land to west of Low Road
- Representation re land at Judes Hole, North Street

Written responses:

1)

There is a fundamental misunderstanding underpinning the assumptions about traffic flow on which this masterplan is based. There is no doubt that the traffic through the village has increased considerably over the past 10 years, yet your survey is quoted as stating that this is not so. As was expressed at two of the meetings I attended, and as can be heard from most people in the village, the increase is primarily along the High Street and into Swaffham Road and Cambridge. Your survey looked only at traffic volume along Newmarket Road, which has always had far less. Councillor Peter Moakes was at pains to state that residents would be consulted and their views taken into account but it is apparent that the views about traffic expressed at the meetings and when residents viewed the plans were paid no attention at all.

Residents who wish to get into Cambridge before 9am or onto the A14 have to leave the village by 7am in order to avoid lengthy queues at the traffic lights at Stow-cum-Quy. Until a traffic survey is undertaken on the Swaffham Road these plans are based on erroneous information and need to be changed.

2)

Here in Burwell, we are suffering from excess local development. We have far too many houses for this formerly quiet village, and consequently far too many road vehicles.

As you are probably aware, East Anglia has more useless homes than any other part of the country - just look at the wastes of Red Lodge or the unused former American service homes in Newmarket.

We are suffering from over-population; and from the mad desire of our masters in Whitehall to reach ludicrous unnecessary housing "targets", to cover our pleasant land with concrete; and from the plans of local authorities to expand their empires in the belief that this will add glory to their status. There is only one item of construction which we need hereabouts - and that is an extra reservoir to help

combat the severe water shortage which the madmen of Whitehall are intent on making worse by house building.

What we need in Burwell is a complete stop to house building, a ban on on-road parking, a ban on gas gun bird scarers, steps to prevent trials motor cycles being tested on the Weirs path, the removal of the silly skateboard facility to somewhere where its noise is not intrusive (such as Heath Road), a ban on the use of fireworks, a serious restriction on public house entertainment which should never be allowed after 8 pm., a ban on farm operations after dark, and a general effort to reduce the horrific noise pollution which has sprung up here in the last few years.

What we certainly do not need is any more business premises in Burwell, nor any job creation here. This is a village, a place with a sizeable elderly population who want rest and repose. It is not a town and its residents do not want it to be turned into one.

3)

I am writing to express thoughts related to the recent Burwell Master-plan Exhibition.

We accept that this village, placed as it is conveniently for Cambridge and other surrounding towns, is destined to develop and grow – this is a normal evolutionary process. Some of the ideas presented on the various slides, however, raise cause for comment.

Proposed marina / tourism / employment opportunity.

This is a fairly vague title and could, clearly, incorporate any number of outcomes – some more desirable than others. At this stage we would oppose such a development and would like to make the following comments:

- The area in question has both historical and environmental attributes that should be preserved.
- The existing pathways and riverbank are well used by local residents for walking and leisure – it is a well - established, long standing part of the village – it would be a mistake to destroy or change the habitat / wildlife that exists and replace it with ‘tourism’ related development; this seems wholly inappropriate for this existing green space.
- Access to such a development is a cause for concern – is it proposed that new roadways and infrastructure be introduced ? How would vehicular access to such a site be planned ? The level of heavy goods traffic that uses North Street is already of concern to residents – particularly where, as in our case, historical properties are owned; we would oppose a move that adds to this. There are many rules and regulations in place that owners are obliged to follow in caring for their listed buildings etc – surely this should be reflected and supported by the same level of concern to immediate surroundings by our local authority / planning department ?

- 'Tourism' opportunity – what does this phrase mean ? if there is any suggestion that the area be developed in the way that this phrase suggests (cafés, shops, holiday accommodation etc ??) then we would STRONGLY oppose such a move. It is completely inappropriate for this area and creating infrastructure to support such a development would cause a very negative impact on the surrounding area.

Development of additional housing in Burwell

As above, we accept that a level of growth and development must occur, but would comment as follows :

- Burwell has changed significantly over the years – it is losing its 'village' feel and characteristics due to the amount of people now resident here. This is not a factor that can be remedied solely by eg building in character...
- All facilities in Burwell have become notably more congested and busy – at present we do not feel that the numbers of additional residents proposed in some of the growth options could be supported by existing services and facilities.
- Traffic in Burwell has become notably heavier – certain areas (eg around the Co-op etc), despite attempts to improve them, remain problematic. This would be significantly worsened by introducing the numbers of new residents suggested in some of the options.
- Schooling – Burwell Village College is already a very large school for a primary school – very careful consideration should be given to the educational facilities offered to such young children. Expansion of the existing school seems inappropriate – perhaps an additional school in Burwell would be preferable, should numbers warrant it.
- Building development – wherever possible, large, sprawling estates constructed by major developers should be avoided. It seems preferable, in a village, for smaller developments to be planned.

We hope that you will consider all comments before moving forward with this initiative.

I wish these comments to remain anonymous although am happy for them to be shared, should this be part of the process, with my name removed.

Please add me to the master-plan database – I am interested in new information as it becomes available.

4)

I'd like to express views on some issues raised at the recent exhibition regarding:

- Proposed marina
- Primary school provision
- Expansion options

- Housing densities and character

Proposed Marina

I see that the slides for growth options 1 to 5 all include the suggestion of a marina/tourism employment opportunity around the area of the Anchor Bridge. I would like to object to this idea. That area of riverbank is currently one of the more beautiful parts of the village, with lovely paths beside the lodes and drains and plenty of wildlife. Developing this area would change its character and diminish one of the best green spaces in the village. It seems foolish to plan new green spaces, which will take considerable time to establish themselves and simultaneously to tinker with one of the best established areas we already have. I, along with others, love that area for its peacefulness, and this would be spoiled by developing a marina here. Many villagers use this area for walking their dogs or their children and I've often seen fishermen and photographers enjoying this peaceful area. The area to the south of the bridge has a community/village feel, with a small number of boats, and the area to the north has a much more countryside atmosphere. I have enjoyed watching kingfishers fishing and nesting in the banks here, and water voles swimming. These are shy creatures, and I suspect they would be driven away by tourism-style development.

Primary School Provision

I believe that the school is already too big for this age group, and is a very daunting prospect to the youngest children starting. To enlarge it further would be an error. Any options which involve enlarging the school should be resisted.

Expansion Options

Some expansion is healthy in a community like ours, but I see a conflict between the assertion in poster 3 that lack of expansion would equal shrinking, especially in numbers of younger people and families, and then in the 5 growth options requiring expansion in the school. I would vote firmly for keeping to the idea of infill development, so that growth is at a level which can be sustained without expansion in the size of the school. Users of the local shops, doctors etc will know that there is already plenty of custom to keep these facilities alive and healthy without requiring the growth implied by the options beyond infill opportunities. Try queuing at Peter the butcher on a Saturday morning, or at the Co-op at a weekend when all tills are open and busy to see that there is already a good level of support for local services without aggressive expansion.

Housing Densities and Character

In general, Burwell has grown like Topsy, which gives it a varied character worth preserving. Slide 10 claims that "Developers would now prefer to build at a larger scale". That may be true of the bulk of speculative box-shifter type developers. But there are smaller developers happy to build in twos and threes, as well as self builders who will often bring an architect-designed quality to their projects. This

would be likely to result in developments more in keeping with the existing nature of the village. These builds are perfectly viable financially, as long as the land is priced to suit development at this scale. Building in smaller tranches or in single dwellings would suit well with an infill-only policy, or is also achievable by breaking down larger sites into ones, twos and threes, if that is the outcome of this consultation.

5)

Would you please keep us updated as to the progress of the Burwell Masterplan. We are opposed to any building of houses in Burwell. Any building on green land would certainly harm the environment. We are also concerned that Burwell is losing its village identity. Extra houses will put extra cars on the road. This will add to the already growing traffic congestion problems in Burwell especially at rush hour times

6)

Regarding the above. I agree with the 8 options of concerns listed. The Exning Bridge does need a footpath/cycleway alongside it. We recently encountered a lady on horseback going over the bridge and have seen people walking over which seems very risky. I was pleased that the Green Lane allotments are remaining, but don't agree with the Marina bringing even more people into Wicken Fen. Neither my husband nor I can see what the 'Wicken Vision' is. Only that The National Trust is gathering more good farming land through to Cambridge, which will in time bring hordes of people into Wicken Fen where the wildlife will be disrupted. Having lived and worked in the fen we have seen many changes over the years. We have expected development to occur in time opposite us here in Newmarket Road, since our numbering was all changed to even numbers. We don't relish the fact, but it seems inevitable with a constantly expanding population.

7)

As you may remember, I attended one of the focus group sessions that you held in 2011.

My recollection is that the issue of the inadequate public transport links with Ely & Cambridge was something of a hot topic on the evening. I may have missed something in the intervening time, but I was shocked to discover that this issue seems to have dropped off the agenda and failed to make the 'Top 8' issues on the Board 3.pdf in the latest presentation. For example, how can this be considered to be less important than a cycle lane to Exning?

Please can you explain how this has happened, or point me in the direction of the communication / meeting minutes which describe this in more detail?

8)

It was good to have had input to the Burwell's Masterplan by the public. However some aspects that were given credence may not be in the best interest of Burwell's future. The emerging plan also suffers from the weakness in that it does not consider the surrounding countryside and villages.

In order to see What Burwell requires in the immediate and intermediate future one should first look at the village's strength, weakness and present urgent needs before the future is tackled.

Burwell's Strengths

- Burwell is a popular well kept village with easy access to all major roads going East, West, South and North
- Railway stations and international airports are within commuting/taxi/bus distance
- The village is surrounded by major attractions, Newmarket race course, Cambridge museums and universities, Ely Cathedral, Anglesey Abbey, Wicken Nature reserve, walks through the Fens and nearby Duxford Imperial War Museum
- Different types of food are readily available, Indian, Chinese, Turkish, Mexican, Italian and English
- The village is also the Gateway to the Fens as all parts of the fens can be accessed by foot, bicycle or car from Burwell
- Burwell Lode is accessible by boat from Kings Lynn and has an excellent turning point near the Anchor Pub for narrow boats. Until 1971 up to 10,000 tons of goods per annum were shipped from Burwell.
- Burwell has a good museum, a mill and other attractions including a non existent castle.
- There 2 four stars B & B's , a twenty acre caravan & tenting site with planning permission for 35 holiday chalets and a Caravan Club site for tourists, race goers etc.
- Four pubs and a club
- A cricket pitch and club
- The "BURWELL ANCHOR RAMBLERS" website showing some of sights to see and the different walks possible from Burwell
- Mandeville Hall possible money spinner if adapted for holding conferences or exhibitions

Burwell Weaknesses

- There is no secondary school. Burwell 11+ youth and higher are educated in Soham, Bottisham and Cambridge. Extra curricular activities not in Burwell parents have to ferry their offsprings.
- Burwell 11+ youth is further alienated because there is no outdoor free play equipment except a skateboard
- For the last 3 to 4 years Referees have declared Burwell football pitches unfit and too dangerous to allow play. All home games are played away from Burwell.

- Burwell has a medium sized industrial Unit which was modified as a Sports Hall. The few facilities that can be offered makes it difficult for the one full time and one part time employee to make it draw even.
- Swimming pool is too small to allow adult swimming.
- Burwell's infill is near capacity
- At present there are about 600 adults over 75. So in the foreseeable future there will be hundreds of habitations available. If these are not filled; the house prices in Burwell will go down
- There are insufficient industrial/ commercial units available to cope with present inhabitants of affordable and sustainable housing.
- During rain and due to mud the Right of Way on the far side of the Lode that runs parallel to North Street from Hythe Lane to First Drove becomes unusable for disabled buggies, elderly and parents with young children
- Due to the villages geographical location it has become dormitory/commuter village.
- Villagers don't seem to realise the importance of tourists if they want to keep the post office, bank, butcher, baker etc.
- There are no brochures, pamphlets etc in existence for tourists to appreciate the merits of Burwell. In the past Cambridge County Council brought out brochures for Reach, Wicken Stow cum Quy etc. but none for Burwell. (Burwell museum brochures were found in Newmarket tourist office. There were non in Ely or Cambridge City)

Immediate Needs

- Due to population growth the primary school needs extra accommodation

Threats to Burwell

- Urban Planners see the County Council field opposite the housing at Newmarket Road as a potential development area. Once an area is designated for development there is little any council can do to prevent development.
- Burwell is a dormitory/commuter village with over 6000 population and very few job opportunities within the village. As the youth of Burwell are already alienated due to schooling and lack of facilities in their village and as there are 5 villages between Burwell and Bottisham with population ranging between 400 to 900 which are within walking or cycling distance of Burwell; there should be ample room for affordable housing developments in those areas, so Burwell has no need to expand.

Alternative for housing development in Burwell

- Bottisham is a village of approximately 2000 population. It has superb facilities and amenities compared to Burwell e.g. better adult education facility, several good open air and indoor sports facilities. 3 flood lit full size astro turf tennis courts, mobile flood lighting and a large swimming pool. Bottisham is within 6 miles of Cambridge. All this should make it an ideal village for development of affordable and other housing.

Opportunity for Burwell under the new localism Act

- When the field at Newmarket Road becomes available, Cambridge County Council should hold this field in trust for Burwell Parish Council by allowing the field to be leased for up to 5 year periods to others; until Burwell Parish is ready to take the field over. This would eventually give Burwell total control to decide of what use is to be made of this area in the future without being dictated by developers or higher local government authorities
- To allow expansion of tourism planning permission should be given for building a marina

Summary

1. For localism to work, Burwell needs to have the field opposite the housing at Newmarket Road held in trust by the County Council for the Parish of Burwell until the community has the revenue to decide the facilities/amenities that is needed to face the future.
2. As Burwell is a dormitory/commuter village there is no need for further housing development outside the present boundaries of Burwell because there are sufficient smaller villages within walking/cycling distance of Burwell which would benefit by expansion and may already have better facilities than Burwell
3. Burwell has to upgrade its present facilities and amenities to ensure that the 11+ youth of the village have some sense of belonging.
The total population of six villages between Burwell and Bottisham (including Bottisham) is less than Burwell's and some have superior amenities to Burwell already. Housing development should be considered in those villages and not in Burwell
4. The number of industrial/commercial sites should be increased to ensure that the present inhabitants of affordable housing and other do not have to commute and have chance of having work available on their doorstep.
5. The primary school facilities in Burwell have to be expanded urgently
6. To keep existing post office, bank, library, butcher, baker etc. viable; tourism must be encouraged by allowing the building of a marina, emulating other villages and towns by planting flowers in public places. Ensuring that Pauline's swamp becomes a mini nature reserve, allowing HERITAGE rebuild the CASTLE as left in Mandeville's day or Heritage allowing the site to be used as a National BMX site, linking Burwell Ramblers web site to the Burwell sites, publishing brochures on the merits of Burwell etc.

9)

The decision to be made is either to allow development in a greenfield area or not. To allow only 50 houses to be built would only raise a small amount of revenue for the parish and not alleviate problems caused by the banking system to local government. Allowing expansion into the greenfield area would automatically allow any future development, restricted or otherwise.

Then only option that can give maximum benefit to both the County Council and Burwell Parish; is to allow the development of 350 domiciles on the field at Newmarket Road.

The revenue raised by the new housing estate would allow Isaacson Road to be linked to Ness Road at the Fordham end of the village. Burwell through traffic can then avoid the bottleneck between the Causeway and Hall Lane. Giving the inhabitants of the new development easy and fast access to employment areas at all three sides of the village.

The s106/£ per sq.m. could be used for establishing in Burwell a centralised sports facility. On the same field. This would ensure that all the needs for young and old sports enthusiasts within the village can be met. (At present most Burwell football activities occur in other parts of the district).

As all industrial/commercial units in Burwell are fully occupied: the owner of the derelict factory site at Reach Road may find it profitable to build new industrial/commercial units to provide possible employment for Burwell.

For Burwell parish, East Cambridgeshire District and Cambridgeshire County Council the 350 housing scenario is a win win situation. Burwell could solve current lack of adequate sports facilities. The revenue generated would allow the higher level councils to retain more of their experienced and trained personnel and mitigate some of the harsher decisions that will have to be made in the present economic climate. It will also create extra jobs.

The sooner building starts the less the damage to Cambridgeshire people and local government organisations.

10)

It is emerging that some sort of development will be made on the field at Newmarket Road. There seems to be no plans to improve the amenities and facilities for the village or build more industrial/office units.

It is also noted that most of the finance raised by 106 of square metre will go to the County Council to improve facilities in Ely, build secondary school in Littleport etc.

The present plans show that the proposed future development would be at the road leading to Exning. This may mean digging up a Saxon burial ground. It also suffers from the disadvantage that cars from the various houses will emerge onto the road where it is not easy to see oncoming traffic from Exning or Burwell.

Suggestion A

For the county Council and Burwell Parish Council to gain maximum benefit from any developments near Newmarket Roads the following is suggested:

1. The new proposed development is pushed back from the presently shown position to approximately half way between Ness Road and Fordham end of the village and Newmarket Road
2. A tarmaced Road to start at the new development ending at Newmarket Road. At the same time a unmade road to be constructed from the new development to join Ness Road at the Fordham end of the village.
3. The urban planners to mark out six football pitches on the field at Newmarket Road. Allowing for off road parking and space for spectators with a single access to the Newmarket Road.
4. The urban planners to mark out sites for possible development of commercial development in case the abandoned factory site at Reach Road becomes unavailable.

	Advantages	Disadvantages
1	Allows County Council to increase future developments on the site and improve access to Ness Road	The overhead power lines would have to be underground
2	Burwell Parish would have the opportunity to lease a centralised sports facility	
3	It would allow the new development easy access to Ness Road and Newmarket Road	
4	Single access to Newmarket Road would ensure safety and less interruption to normal traffic	
5	It would ensure that there was no need to consider building on the few remaining green open spaces left in the village	
6	It would avoid hold ups to building in case the Saxon burial ground was discovered near Newmarket Road	

Suggestion B

To increase the amenities of Burwell and allow local artisan an outlet to display their skills. It is suggested as follows:

1. As the present playing fields at the Burwell Recreation Ground are unfit for sport it is suggested that the field is made fit for agricultural use. The field then to be sub-divided into allotment plots with access to water and by car/lorry for each plot.
2. The present allotment be:
 - a. Turned into a car/bus park for access to Burwell Museum
 - b. At the sides of the car park erect small units to be used by local crafts people to demonstrate, show and sell their wares, e.g. paintings,

- jewellery, pottery, glass blowing, embroidery, cabinet making, carvings, candle making etc
- c. Build a nine hole crazy golf course

	Advantages	Disadvantages
1	Allotment holders will have a better car park with access to their plots by car/lorry and rationally distributed water supply	Present allotment holders will object to moving
2	Better access by bus/car to Burwell Museum	
3	Crazy golf will ensure an attraction that will not only raise revenue but both Burwell Museum and crafts people would benefit	
4	Large parking area will allow buses with tourists/school children access to the museum	
5	Large parking area would allow the parish to use it for special events	
6	The large parking area would allow occasional use as market square/car boot sale	

11)

Having visited the Burwell at Large exhibition and seen the latest proposals for the Burwell Masterplan I would like to make the following comments, which I would like to be considered as part of the Masterplan consultation process.

Firstly, I would like to say that I was disappointed that of the options presented there wasn't an option to build only on infill land or indeed a do nothing option. I spoke to a number of people at Burwell at Large and afterwards who were very disgruntled that these options were not available. I know there are plenty of people who think Burwell has growth large enough and does not need any more development. People live in Burwell because they like the village. If it grows any more it will lose it's feel and will become another Soham.

I was told at an earlier working party meeting it was agreed that infill development only or no development was not an option and hence should not be presented for consideration. However, when the first questionnaire was distributed I believe that over 60% of those who responded said that they did not want anymore development in Burwell. At the last working Party meeting Councillor Moakes repeatedly stated that the Masterplan was not being driven by central or local government but by the people of Burwell. It was for us o tell the working party what we wanted. IF the Masterplan is truly being driven by the people of Burwell how can an infill only or no new build option be omitted? Through the original questionnaire, over 60% of respondents have already told you that they do not want any more development in Burwell. I feel that the options as presented have been skewed so that the people of Burwell cannot express their true views.

My preferred option would be to build on infill land only (one of the options not presented). My reasons are as follows:

1. More building equal more people and will put more demand on local services and add to the traffic volumes in the village. One of the proposals is to build 400 new homes. Including children, this is likely to add 1000 people to the population of Burwell and will probably put another 600 cars on the road. This is going to put extra demand on medical services, social services, school places, transport and general infrastructure. These are demands that I think we will struggle to meet and quite frankly don't want.
2. At a time of population growth and predictions of an imminent global food shortage we should not be taking productive farmland out of use and building on it. It might not look as if the Masterplan proposals will take a lot of farmland out of use, but if every local authority in the country did the same it would soon add up to a vast amount of productive land lost. I propose therefore that there should be no development on farmland and if there is a need for any new development it should be on brownfield or infill sites.
3. On a similar subject, we need to consider the water needed to supply new properties. We live in the driest part of the country an area already in a drought zone with water shortages predicted for the summer. Global warming scientist are predicting that this is likely to become the norm, if not worse, in the future. In the south east in general population growth is putting an unprecedented demand on water supplies and abstraction rates are now at a virtually unsustainable level. If we build more new houses we are only going to add to the water shortage problem. National government is dictating that we need to build more new houses yet are burying their heads in the sand when it comes to the real problem of water. For some reason this is a very real issue that no one is prepared to address.
4. Most of the proposals show an access road, to new housing, being built on the currently unused land between Baker Drive and Old School Close/Holkham Mead. Such as access road round have no properties facing onto it and would be screened by high garden fences and walls. I am concerned that this could become a focal point for anti social behaviour, particularly after dark. Anyone who uses the footpath (at the end of Buntings Path) which connects Silver Street and North Street will be only too aware of the problems with vandalism, graffiti and general anti social behaviour. I fear that we could be developing another trouble spot, particularly with the possibility of up to 400 new houses at the end of the access road.

As I said at the beginning of my letter, my preferred option is for new building to be limited to infill land only. However, if I have to choose from the options presented I would choose option 2 as I feel it has the least impact in terms of the points I have raised. Interestingly when I left Burwell at Large I heard a number of people muttering in a disgruntled manner that they would choose option 2 because there was no option for infill land only or no new building. They felt that option 2 was the nearest they could get to the missing options.

People live in Burwell because it is a nice place to live and they like it the way it is. Please do not ruin our village.

12)

I have only recently had the opportunity to view the proposals for the Burwell Masterplan and having done so would like to express my views and opposition to some of the proposals. My main objections relate to growth scenario 3, to build housing, a school and playing fields off Newmarket Road and adjacent to the Felsham Chase development, Baker Drive and the cemetery.

My reasons for objecting are as follows:

1. At a time of population growth and predictions of an imminent global food shortage we should not be taking productive farmland out of use and building on it. You cannot eat concrete and bricks. It might not look like a lot of farmland out of use, but if every local authority in the country did the same it would soon add up to a vast amount of productive land lost. The Wicken Fen project is already going to take vast areas of productive farmland out of use, we should not be adding to this loss. I propose therefore that there should be no development on farmland and if there is a need for any new development it should be on brownfield or infill sites.
2. As part of the new school proposal I understand that the access points will be off of Newmarket Road and Ness Road. These are already the busiest roads in the village, particularly in the morning and late afternoon/early evening. We should not be adding to this congestion by putting school access points on these roads. We all know of the traffic and parking problems around schools at certain times of the day. In my opinion, in terms of traffic problems, this would be a nightmare scenario. I thought that part of the plan was to try and get people out of their cars and for parents to walk their children to school. This is obviously the most environmentally friendly and healthy option. However, placing a school on the very edge of the village will not encourage this and will make more parents drive their children to school. A school should as far as possible be on the centre of the village and if, as I suspect, there is no room to achieve this the school should be left on its current site. If the school needs to be larger, then the current site should be developed and of this means relocating the swimming pool, library or sports centre this should be considered.
3. The site for the proposed school and playing fields will be immediately next to Ness Court, which is a home for the elderly, and sheltered accommodation bungalows for the elderly. People in their latter years want a bit of peace and quiet. Is it fair to submit these people to the noise and disruption of a school and playing fields?
4. The need for a new school almost becomes self fulfilling. If more houses are built there will be more children and hence the need for a new school. The replies to the questionnaire showed that a large majority of people were against any further development in Burwell. If this is a true consultation exercise and local peoples views are to be respected then the issue of no further development should be of prime importance. I understand that for a new school to be built money needs to come from developers. Local peoples views should not be ignored simply for the local authority to get its hands on

developer's money. No new development would considerably reduce the need for a larger school.

5. We live in the driest part of the country an area already in a drought zone with water shortages predicted for the summer. Global warming is likely to make this problem worse in the future. If we build more new houses we are only going to add to the water shortage problem. National government is dictating that we need to build more new houses yet are burying their heads in the sand when it comes to the real problem of water. For some reason this is a very real issue that no one is prepared to address.
6. I understand that part of the proposal is to build an access road on the currently unused land (apart from wildlife) between Baker Drive and Old School Close/Holkham Mead. If so this will be a road with no properties facing onto it and effectively screened by high garden fences. I am concerned that this could become a focal point for anti social behaviour. Anyone who uses the footpath, at the end of Buntings Path, which connects Silver Street and North Street will be only too aware of the problems with vandalism, graffiti and general anti social behaviour. I fear that we could be developing another trouble spot. I also fear that such a road would be vulnerable to travellers pitching up on it, with the attendant problems and cost the Local Authority would be faced with to move them on.

Most of the foregoing also applies to growth scenario 2b. In its deliberations I would ask the Working Party not to lose sight of the people who live in Burwell for whom it is home. It is not a money making opportunity for developers and the Local Authority, nor is it a showcase for local planning. It is home and this should be the overriding consideration. Burwell is a nice place in which to live, I hope it will remain so.

Plus:

- Representation re land adjacent to Cornfields
- Representation re land west of Ness Road
- Representation re Land adjacent Low Road
- Representation re land to west of Low Road
- Representation re land at Judes Hole, North Street