

---

**TITLE: Draft Burwell Masterplan Consultation Feedback**

Committee: Burwell Masterplan Working Party

Date: 9<sup>th</sup> January 2013

Author: Sally Bonnett, Infrastructure and Projects Officer

---

## 1.0 ISSUE

1.1 To consider the results of the public consultation on the draft Burwell Masterplan and whether amendments are required to the plan to reflect the outcomes of the consultation.

## 2.0 RECOMMENDATION(S)

2.1 Members are requested to:

- a) To consider the results of the public consultation on the draft Burwell Masterplan.
- b) To consider the recommendations for amendments required to the draft Burwell Masterplan as a result of the consultation, as set out in section 5 of this report.
- c) To delegate any other minor editorial amendments to the Chairman.
- d) To recommend the draft Burwell Masterplan, as amended by 2.1 (b) and 2.1 (c), 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.

## 3.0 BACKGROUND

3.1 The draft Burwell Masterplan (see Appendix 1) was approved by the District Council's Development and Transport Committee on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2012 as a draft for public consultation purposes. The public consultation was undertaken over a six-week period from 20<sup>th</sup> September - 31<sup>st</sup> October 2012.

## 4.0 CONSULTATION RESULTS

4.1 A report of the consultation results is attached as Appendix 2. This summarises the responses received and provides an analysis of these. A full breakdown of all the comments received to each individual question on the consultation questionnaire and a summary of the 23 individual letter/email comments are also included. Officers will give a presentation highlighting the key findings at the meeting.

## 5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS ON TEXT AMENDMENTS

- 5.1 The analysis of the results has identified a number of common themes and concerns about the Masterplan proposals and these are detailed below:

### Housing growth

Some respondents commented that the level of housing growth proposed doesn't reflect the results of the previous options consultation, where the 100 dwellings (plus infill) option and 200 dwellings (plus infill) option received higher levels of community support.

The level of housing appropriate for the village has been discussed at length throughout the Masterplan process and it is clear that there are split views on this within the village community. Following the options consultation the Working Party requested further research on both the 100 dwelling option and the 350 dwelling option. Following consideration of this information, it was the Working Party's view that 350 dwellings represented the most appropriate level of growth for the village over the 20 year period of the plan, bearing in mind that this still represented a lower rate of growth than in the previous decade, would help to support needed infrastructure, and would help to reduce the pressure for infill growth which has not been popular in the village.

This level of growth has been tested in the latest public consultation and has been supported by a greater majority of the community (56% support or strongly support the future housing growth level, 42% oppose or strongly oppose it, 2% have no view).

**Recommendation: Working Party to consider whether they wish to revise or retain the 350 dwelling proposal.**

### Infill housing figure

The draft Burwell Masterplan contains an infill figure of 128 dwellings based on the 2011 housing trajectory. The 2012 infill estimate is for 114 (excluding 35 log cabins for tourism use only which have planning permission). In order for the Masterplan to be as accurate as possible, it is proposed that the 2012 figure be used in the final version of the Burwell Masterplan. This will reduce the total number of homes proposed in Burwell over the plan period from 478 to 464 dwellings.

**Recommendation: Amend infill figures in draft Masterplan to 2012 figures.**

### Building on farmland

Some respondents disagree with building on farmland, citing a world food shortage as the reason. There is a need, however, to balance food production with the need for housing.

The National Planning Policy Framework advises allocation of land for development on sites of lesser environmental value or where there is previously developed (brown field) land. The site appraisal work indicated that the Newmarket Road site represented the most sustainable location for housing, taking into account proximity to local facilities and the need to avoid elongation of the village.

**Recommendation: No change to location of housing growth**

Footpath linkages through Felsham Chase

Some respondents are opposed to the footpath linkages through Felsham Chase, as they believe they will encourage anti-social behaviour and/or be used as 'rat runs' for mopeds/motorcycles.

Both English Heritage and Cambridgeshire County Council advocate linkages through Felsham Chase estate to increase pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the existing village core and to aid integration with the existing community. However, they will need to be designed in such a way as not to encourage anti-social behaviour or 'rat run' for mopeds/motorcycles. Transport Assessments will also need to take into account any implications for the Ness Road/Felsham Chase junction. These would be assessed at the planning application stages.

**Recommendation: No change to footpath linkages.**

Location of sports pitches/housing near Ness Court

A petition was received opposing the proposed location of sports pitches in close proximity to sheltered housing, stating that the vulnerability of the elderly occupants of Ness Court must be taken into account, and that plans must allow space for the expansion of Ness Court if necessary in the future. The petition covering letter also expressed concern that the proposed access between 32 and 34 Ness Road will become an area for anti-social behaviour.

The development layout in the Masterplan document is indicative only and the exact location of the housing and sports pitches will be determined through a site specific Masterplan for the site. However, impact on adjoining residents should be minimised and it is proposed that a green buffer be added to the maps in the draft Masterplan. The access between 32 and 34 Ness Court is an existing access which serves as an emergency access and must remain, but it can be designed in such a way as to prevent it being a focal point for anti-social behaviour e.g. lighting etc.

**Recommendation: 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.**

#### Traffic through the village

Some residents expressed concern about levels of traffic though the village, both now and with the additional housing. Suffolk County Council commented that the Masterplan should note that development at Burwell of this scale will impact on roads in Newmarket and the A14/A142 junction.

Studies commissioned by Cambridgeshire County Council confirm that the roads in Burwell have capacity to take the additional traffic that will be generated. However, heavy traffic is an issue at peak times in the morning and evening and a Transport Assessment will need to be carried out before development commences to mitigate the impact of extra traffic.

**Recommendation: Amend draft Masterplan to include text noting the requirement for developers to carry out transport assessments, which include impact on A14/A142 junction and Newmarket's transport network.**

#### Jobs target

Some respondents stated that they felt that the target of 630 new jobs over the plan period was unrealistic.

630 new jobs is an aspirational target based on figures developed in the East Cambridgeshire Jobs Growth Strategy 2012. The aim is to present a balanced Masterplan that puts the same value on jobs growth as it does housing growth. By including the target in the Masterplan and Local Plan it will signal to potential developers that the village is a suitable location for small scale office and industrial uses and encourage such development in the area.

**Recommendation: No change to jobs target.**

#### Green edge protection

Some respondents were against the proposal to retain a green edge to the west of the village, on the basis that there are already restrictions in place to prevent development in this area.

**Recommendation: Green edge is a reiteration of the 'open countryside' policy already in place - Masterplan text be amended to make this clear.**

### Employment - DS Smith site

Owners of the site submitted a written response to the consultation outlining why they believe the site is not deliverable for employment growth and therefore should not be allocated for such in the Burwell Masterplan.

The site appraisals carried out as part of the Masterplan development work identified concerns about the use of this site for housing – including issues about the distance of the site from the main centres in the village and elongation of the village. Public consultation has also indicated a strong preference in the village for this site to be retained in employment use. The site agents advise that they have marketed the site for employment use but unsuccessfully. They suggest that the site is not, therefore, deliverable for employment uses – however no further details have been offered on the reasons for it failing to attract any interest, and the agents have been asked for this information.

The draft Local Plan proposes removing the site from within the development envelope as it is not considered a sustainable site for housing. Pending further information from the site agents, it is recommended that the site remain allocated for employment use in the Burwell Masterplan.

**Recommendation: No change to employment allocation of this site.**

### Employment – Reach Road Site

The agents for the Reach Road site have identified a need for greater flexibility in the proposed split between B1 and B2 uses in order to enable them to respond to the market demand for such uses.

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

## 6.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

6.1 Most of the work on the Burwell Masterplan has been carried out in-house, utilising the skills and experience officers have gained from producing previous Masterplans. Officers from Huntingdonshire District Council are providing professional technical advice under an existing Service Level Agreement. The costs of consultation and printing have been met from existing budgets.

6.2 A draft Equality Impact Assessment (INRA) is attached as Appendix 3.

## 7.0 APPENDICES

- 7.1 Appendix 1 - Draft Burwell Masterplan *[please note that due to the size of the draft Burwell Masterplan document only copies have been provided for Members of the Committee. A copy is available for viewing at the Council offices or via the Council's website]*  
Appendix 2 - Draft Burwell Masterplan Consultation Feedback Report  
Appendix 3- Draft Equality Impact Assessment

---

<b><u>Background Documents</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>	<b><u>Contact Officer</u></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Burwell Socio-Economic Assessment</li><li>• Burwell Masterplan stage 1 Consultations Feedback Report</li><li>• Burwell Employment Report</li><li>• Potential Site options - Site Appraisals</li><li>• Draft Burwell Masterplan Options Paper</li><li>• Burwell Masterplan Options Consultation Feedback Report</li></ul>	Room FF115 The Grange, Ely	Sally Bonnett Infrastructure and Projects Officer (01353) 665555 E-mail: sally.bonnett@eastcambs.gov.uk

### Draft Burwell Masterplan Consultation Feedback

The public consultation period for the draft Burwell Masterplan ran from 20<sup>th</sup> September – 31<sup>st</sup> October 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 and the Burwell village websites.

Two public exhibitions of the proposals in the draft document were held and attended by around 120 people. A questionnaire for people to give their views on the proposals was available on-line, at the exhibitions and from the Jubilee Reading Rooms, Burwell Post Office and Burwell Sports and Community Centre. 182 questionnaires were completed, a 7% response rate.

#### Exhibitions

Two public exhibitions held in the Mandeville Hall, Burwell, on 12th and 13th October 2012. The purpose of the exhibitions was to enable people to view and discuss the proposals presented and give their feedback, share their ideas and to ask questions. A total of 122 were recorded as visiting the exhibitions and many spoke with Officers and members of the Working Party. In addition to the questionnaire, a comments book was also available for people to record their comments and ideas.

#### Questionnaires

Total responses = 182  
 Number of dwellings in village = 2750  
 Response rate = 7%

#### Respondent profile

A resident of Burwell – 91%  
 An employee working in Burwell – 5%  
 A local business owner – 2%  
 A visitor to Burwell – 0%  
 A developer or local landowner – 1%  
 Other – 7%

12 people recorded 'other', giving the following responses:

Adjacent Local Authority – 2 people  
 Agent on behalf of house builder – 2 people  
 Hoping to move to Burwell – 2 people  
 Resident of Reach – 2 people  
 Councillor – 1 person  
 Family connection – 1 person  
 Planning consultant on behalf of landowner – 1 person  
 Representative of a statutory organisation – 1 person  
 Trustee of Family property – 1 person

1% aged under 20 (this age group accounts for 22% of population aged 0-20)  
 3% aged 21-34 (this age group accounts for approx 17% of population)  
 30% aged 35-49 (this age group accounts for approx 19% of population)  
 33% aged 50-64 (this age group accounts for approx 22% of population)  
 33% aged 65+ (this age group accounts for approx 20% of population)

Male – 55%    Female – 45%

#### **Questionnaire Responses**

#### **Burwell Masterplan Vision**

How strongly do you support or oppose the vision for Burwell set out in the draft Burwell Masterplan?

A total of 158 people answered this question, 62% either support or strongly support the vision and 31% oppose or strongly oppose the vision. 7% of respondents had no view.

Comments made:

### **Housing**

- Too many houses proposed (7 respondents)
- Oppose location of proposed housing (due to impact on sheltered housing or own home) (5 respondents)
- Oppose building on agricultural/green land (5 respondents)
- Support self build development (2 respondents)
- Support providing starter/small homes (2 respondents)
- Prioritise infill over loss of farmland (1 respondent)
- Oppose infill of 128 homes (1 respondent)
- Keep development within existing boundaries (1 respondent)
- Number of homes seems reasonable (1 respondent)
- Need to build decent homes (1 respondent)
- Against affordable housing (1 respondent)
- Not convinced as to reasons for new housing (1 respondent)

### **Infrastructure**

- Infrastructure needs to be delivered before/alongside housing (5 respondents)
- Local facilities are already stretched (school, doctors surgery) (4 respondents)
- Plan needs to be in place for S106 and infrastructure delivery (2 respondents)
- Not sure enough infrastructure is being added (1 respondent)
- Expanding school will impact on the size of the green space in the centre of Burwell (1 respondent)
- Need to consider water supply for new housing (1 respondent)

### **Transport**

- Don't support vision as will lead to increase in traffic (on already busy roads) (5 respondents)
- Oppose footpath linkages through Felsham Chase (4 respondents)
- Need to improve bus service (2 respondents)
- Support proposal for footpath around Exning Bridge (2 respondents)
- Need to coordinate with Suffolk County Council re traffic issues at local level i.e. Road between Burwell and Exning and at Strategic level i.e. A14/A142 junction (1 respondent)
- Pedestrian access off Ness Road will become hotspot for anti-social behaviour (1 respondent)
- Vision doesn't address increase in volume of traffic (1 respondent)
- Vision doesn't address size of vehicles using village streets (1 respondent)
- Need pedestrian crossings on Ness Road (1 respondent)
- Need cycle path along whole road to Exning – not just around bridge (1 respondent)
- Support improved cycle routes (1 respondent)
- Need cycle routes to Cambridge, Newmarket and Ely (1 respondent)

### **Employment**

- More industrial units/offices will increase traffic using Reach Road – lorries will struggle to get past cars parked on road (1 respondent)

### **Community Facilities**

- Support sport facility proposals (2 respondents)



- Little provision in village for youth/teenagers after school hours (2 respondents)
- Oppose location of new sports pitches (1 respondent)
- No mention of evening education provision (1 respondent)
- No mention of swimming pool (1 respondent)
- No mention of new children's play equipment (1 respondent)
- Include bowling green and pavilion alongside new sports pitches (1 respondent)
- Need to update existing recreation grounds (1 respondent)
- Move Burwell Sports Centre to Newmarket Road site alongside pitches (1 respondent)
- Although reference made to some facilities requiring replacement/improvement (e.g. swimming pool) no mention in plan of doing this (1 respondent)

### **Green spaces**

- Welcome improvements to the Lode (2 respondents)
- The meadow in between the DS Smith site and Pauline's Swamp should remain a green meadow and not become part of DS Smith site development (1 respondent)
- Essential that any planning approvals also incorporate adequate landscaping (1 respondent)
- Think again about reuse of existing open space – especially the 'rec' (1 respondent)

### **Character of Burwell**

- More housing will change Burwell from village to town and it will lose rural character (8 respondents)
- Burwell must keep its village feel and not become a town (3 respondents)
- Burwell lost its rural character several developments ago (2 respondents)
- Please explain what the character of the village is and why it has not been applied in the past? (1 respondent)
- Strongly support the vision for growth while retaining the village character. Both are possible with careful design (1 respondent)
- You are ruining Burwell by jamming in housing in what used to be back gardens (1 respondent)
- Your proposal means a packed village/town of many too small homes and no spaces to live in (1 respondent)
- Would add 'has retained a balanced mix of ages within the community' to the vision (1 respondent)
- We like Burwell as it is, it is a good place to live please do not change it (1 respondent)

### **Masterplan Process**

- Draft Masterplan does not reflect the views of residents as expressed in previous consultations (re housing numbers) (4 respondents)
- Not sure Masterplan will be adhered to (3 respondents)
- Vision lacks prioritisation (2 respondents)
- Masterplan will need to be revised on regular basis (1 respondent)
- Need to take into account close proximity of Newmarket with regard to access to employment, shopping, services and community facilities (1 respondent)
- Strongly support vision but implementation is equally as important. I hope general public will be involved in that aspect as we have been in earlier stages (1 respondent)
- While I strongly support the vision statement I have no hope that it will be achieved (1 respondent)
- We support the draft Vision's focus on ensuring a 'thriving rural community' but consider that it should be made clear within the Vision that this is only achievable and sustainable in conjunction with a *deliverable* plan for housing and employment growth. We suggest an alternative along the lines of:

*"Burwell in 2031 will be a thriving rural community with a variety of local shops and services adequately supported by a modest supply of sensitively designed new homes and high quality employment sites. The growth of Burwell will work to sustain facilities, strengthen community support networks and enhance the village's distinctive local character."* (1 respondent)

- I support the general sentiments expressed, but do not understand how the Masterplan can support the 350+ option for increase in housing, when the Vision states that "local people don't want Burwell to grow into a town". (1 respondent)
- This is a bland 'motherhood and apple pie' statement when it is the details that really matter. People are hardly going to suggest the village should go into decline. (1 respondent)
- This is a long overdue plan and hopefully it will progress at pace and not end up just as a vision (1 respondent)
- I would like to see the Masterplan Vision and the Burwell Vision newly presented as one document or at least with objectives agreeing (1 respondent)
- With the expected growth of the population, plans need to be in place (1 respondent)

## Development Objectives

A total of 153 people answered this question. 63% of respondents either support or strongly support the vision, 26% oppose or strongly oppose the vision and 12% of respondents had no view.

Comments made:

## Housing

- The proposed housing numbers are too high (5 respondents)
- Support proposed housing mix and idea of new development being in keeping with Burwell character (4 respondents)
- Oppose location of proposed housing (3 respondents)
- Oppose building on agricultural land (2 respondents)
- 40% social housing is too high (2 respondents)
- Support use of local builders (2 respondents)
- Support everything except the housing proposals (1 respondent)
- Most workers appear to work in Cambridge. I would like to see more housing supplied there to ensure congestion increases as little as possible (1 respondent)
- I think all settlements should take their fair share of development and am thus not against these plans (1 respondent)
- Objectives are reasonable as long as development isn't too large, especially houses (1 respondent)
- These development objectives could be better met by identifying additional sites off Ness Road (north of Toyse Close and Toyse Lane) for housing and open space, and reducing the size/scale of housing development at Newmarket Road (1 respondent)
- The objective to "ensure new housing developments contain a mix of housing, in terms of tenure and size, and affordability" (pg. 20, bullet four) should be reworded to suggest a market-led approach to housing mix. This will ensure that the policy is flexible enough to respond to changing housing needs over the coming plan period (1 respondent)
- Traditional building materials and techniques are often limited by availability or expense, flexibility of design have to be introduced within existing building planning regulations (1 respondent)
- If half of the DS Smith site was OK for building a few years back then why isn't the second half ? (1 respondent)
- Tenure, size and affordability - for whom? To buy? To rent? (1 respondent)
- Please no eyesore housing of tall buildings (1 respondent)
- Would want strong limits on the number of new dwellings - Burwell is already a "dormitory" town for those working in Cambridge (1 respondent)
- Infill needs to be closely controlled (1 respondent)

## Infrastructure

- School places should be addressed before any future development (3 respondents)
- Small housing projects may be sustainable over this period (i.e. affordable housing), but the schools, and transport facilities available would not be sufficient for 350 homes (1 respondent)
- The school is at capacity with the largest influx of children this school year, which will continue throughout their time at this school (1 respondent)

- Robust plan needs to be formulated for the piecemeal housing development and its impacts on existing facilities before its final completion (1 respondent)
- Provision of community facilities at midpoint and not the end (1 respondent)

### **Transport**

- Concerns about the increased volume of traffic and how it will be overcome (3 respondents)
- Need improved public transport (2 respondents)
- Better walkways and cycle ways would be good (2 respondents)
- Increasing the population will inevitably create more traffic (2 respondents)
- More pedestrian crossings needed (1 respondent)
- I'm not sure how our plan for future growth will sit with the planned expansion of Exning which will also be using the Burwell roads? (1 respondent)
- Access round Exning Bridge required on both sides (1 respondent)
- Sort and implement double yellow lines for no parking by Co-Op/Premier (1 respondent)
- Identifying additional sites off Ness Road (north of Toyse Close and Toyse Lane) for housing and open space, and reducing the size/scale of housing development at Newmarket Road would help to address both traffic volume and speeding issues, by providing traffic calming features on both Ness Road and Newmarket Road at prominent entry points into the village (1 respondent)
- The transport study has completely missed the point. It is the B1102 road through Burwell that is the major concern (1 respondent)
- If the transport problem is not solved Burwell must have a bypass (1 respondent)
- Do not believe the transport infrastructure can support the proposed increase in housing (1 respondent)
- Because Burwell is such a long and deep village people will continue to use their cars - by having sports fields behind Baker Drive, Ness Court and the Felsham Chase estate these roads will become car parks (1 respondent)
- The only way to address the traffic problem is to keep Burwell the size it is (1 respondent)
- Oppose pedestrian walkways through Felsham Chase (1 respondent)

### **Employment**

- Regarding employment/office sites of mixed sizes. If this is on the DS Smith site - 1st you need to purchase this by Compulsory Purchase Order as DS Smith want it for housing development. 2nd - who is going to use it? Burwell residents or people coming here to work from other places? It needs to be established first if there is a need for this type before building can go ahead. (1 respondent)
- Good to encourage local jobs (1 respondent)
- I wish there was a scheme for the young people of the village to develop their skills by being allowed workshops which they would be able to rent to start up their own businesses within the village (1 respondent)
- Do we need more houses to create more jobs? (1 respondent)
- Facilitate the creation of additional employment/office sites – but do not consider that the Masterplan is able to successfully deliver this objective (1 respondent)

### **Community Facilities**

- Oppose location of sports pitches (2 respondents)
- Conservation Area's where the houses have the ancient character can be spoilt in an attempt to enhance and improve tourism (1 respondent)
- Sports pitches would be good as 3G astro pitches which could be used by all and a hard set of tennis courts/basketball courts (1 respondent)
- What about developing existing sports facilities i.e. sports centre, swimming pool (1 respondent)

### **Green spaces**

- The green western edge is a good idea but has already been eroded by the large green industrial unit already there - what stops the whole area going the same way? (1 respondent)
- Why is it acceptable for the western green buffer to be protected, yet residents to the east of the village lose their green buffer? (1 respondent)

- Please protect the eastern edge of Burwell facing Exning (1 respondent)
- Clear Lode and surrounding area - eyesore at present time (1 respondent)
- Identifying additional sites off Ness Road (north of Toyse Close and Toyse Lane) for housing and open space, and reducing the size/scale of housing development at Newmarket Road would help to protect the open and rural nature of the edge of the village by reducing the size/scale of development proposed off Newmarket Road, which has a very open edge to the surrounding countryside, and would be visible for a considerable for many years before landscaping could screen that impact (1 respondent)
- It is unclear where the objective to “protect the open and rural nature of the western green edge of Burwell facing onto the Fens” (pg.20, bullet 12) has emerged from as there is no landscape designation within the adopted Core Strategy. In order to justify such protection, this should be supported by a robust landscape assessment or removed from the Masterplan (1 respondent)

### Character of Burwell

- We are already a large village - do we need to be any bigger? (3 respondents)
- The intention to seek to keep the character of the village is a good idea (2 respondents)
- Focus on what the village already offers and support maintenance of its current character and infrastructure (1 respondent)
- Not happy with the proposed location of new housing (due to impact on own home) (1 respondent)
- I disagree with the fundamental opinion of the county council that the "survival" of the village relies on growth. The village is of a sufficient size and population to continue attracting young families, without providing yet more housing (1 respondent)
- The development that is proposed will have a dire impact on everything we love about this village (1 respondent)
- Broadly in agreement new homes will need to go somewhere as growth is inevitable (1 respondent)
- It is essential that these objectives are undertaken on a controlled and regular basis and any developers comply with these requirements (1 respondent)

### Masterplan Process

- On page 21, 428 houses is considered high but on page 20 it is described as modest (2 respondents)
- Some development objectives seem aspirational rather than practical e.g. 1, 5 and 7 in particular (1 respondent)
- The objectives of the draft do not reflect earlier survey results. In particular the large scale housing proposed was not supported in the earlier responses (1 respondent)

### Masterplan Proposals

What are your views on the proposals suggested in the draft Burwell Masterplan?

A total of 160 people this question.

	Support or strongly support (%)	Oppose or Strongly oppose (%)	No View (%)
Future housing growth level (350 homes plus infill over 20 years)	<b>56</b>	42	2
Employment growth (630 jobs)	<b>70</b>	11	19
Housing location, mix and design	<b>60</b>	32	8
Traffic and transport	<b>68</b>	23	9
Community facilities	<b>74</b>	14	13
Green spaces, cycle ways and footpaths	<b>80</b>	8	12

n.b. A petition with 92 signatures was also received in respect of a range of concerns relating to the Newmarket Road site (see page 32). These numbers have not been included in the questionnaire analysis to avoid any double counting.

Comments made:

## Housing

- Proposed housing level too high (14 respondents)
- Oppose putting all 350 new homes on one location (2 respondents)
- Oppose building on farmland (2 respondents)
- Support the mix and design of housing proposed (2 respondents)
- New homes should be smaller houses 1-2 bedrooms (2 respondents)
- There has been too much infill development ( 2 respondents)
- Lack of low cost housing must be addressed (1 respondent)
- Can Burwell ban buy-to-let? (1 respondent)
- Needs of ageing population re housing i.e. supported housing for frail elderly people – could Ness Court be expanded? (1 respondent)
- What can be done to provide young people born in the village an opportunity to occupy the proposed new properties? (1 respondent)
- Can see need for homes for young people who have grow up in Burwell – these need to be mixed tenure, modest size with reasonable gardens (1 respondent)
- Housing should be old style, not new town houses like on DS Smith site (1 respondent)
- New housing should be built on brown field sites (1 respondent)
- It is not clear what, if any, evidence has been used to determine the proposed village housing target (1 respondent)
- Strong consideration should be given to providing blocks of 4 maisonettes for low cost and single occupancy accommodation (1 respondent)
- Strongly agree with avoidance of a volume house builder- support organic growth (1 respondent)
- Need more bungalows (1 respondent)
- 11dpa infill +low growth (1 respondent)
- Maintain the river as natural boundary to village development (1 respondent)
- Maximum of 350 homes – otherwise we will lose village feel (1 respondent)
- Proposed housing is too dense – gardens need to be bigger (1 respondent)
- Less affordable housing (1 respondent)
- More 4 bed detached houses needed with 3-4 parking spaces each and double garages (1 respondent)
- Development will cause major disruption to all that live on Felsham Chase (1 respondent)
- Council has not properly assessed the range of ‘combinations’ of various potential development sites as per earlier consultation stage (1 respondent)
- Splitting 350 homes between land at Newmarket Road and land off Ness Road would still achieve several key objectives (1 respondent)
- If 630 jobs do not arise is the housing necessary? (1 respondent)
- Support the need for housing and agree that it needs to be phased to minimise impact on village (1 respondent)
- I think the numbers are too conservative, both in terms of homes and employment (1 respondent)
- If it goes ahead new site will need to be designed in such a way that it has limited impact on Felsham Chase estate i.e. no create 1 big estate (1 respondent)
- The green ‘buffer’ needs careful thought and planning not to create areas for unsociable behaviour (1 respondent)
- Support the growth proposals but would like to see a coordinated plan (1 respondent)
- Location and mix of housing is inappropriate (1 respondent)
- Concern about 450 dwellings in Burwell and 150 proposed in Exning (1 respondent)
- Masterplan does not give demographic evidence to support the number of houses proposed (1 respondent)
- Proposed development off Newmarket Road preferable to excessive infill (1 respondent)
- Infill on back gardens off Newmarket Road has spoilt the attractiveness and character of Burwell (1 respondent)
- One of joys of living in a village is walking past green space – infilling takes away these spaces for us and wildlife (1 respondent)

- Need some measure of control over infill sites to make sure they don't put too much strain on village roads etc in parts of the village which are unsuitable for extra traffic (1 respondent)
- My vision would be for continued infill development with supplementary smaller developments contributing to the housing need (1 respondent)
- Relocate school and cricket field to Newmarket Road site and use these sites for infill (1 respondent)

### **Infrastructure**

- Oppose expansion of school (4 respondents)
- Infrastructure must be in place before building work commences (3 respondents)
- Public transport is inadequate (3 respondents)
- Community infrastructure (education and medical) must be increased (2 respondents)
- Some facilities already at capacity (2 respondents)
- Extra dwellings will put immense pressure on infrastructure and services (2 respondents)
- Recycling must be boosted (1 respondent)
- Maintain village/community feel of the school (1 respondent)
- School development – top priority (1 respondent)
- Expansion of school on present site must be permanent construction (not mobile classrooms) (1 respondent)
- No mention of Museum as part of tourism attraction in Masterplan (1 respondent)
- Also need to look at secondary schooling provision (1 respondent)
- Traffic, community and green space plans should be progressed without the millstone of additional housing (1 respondent)
- Any building must be phased over lifetime of plan to ensure steady intake of children to local schools (1 respondent)
- Newmarket Road site should be used to relocate the school (1 respondent)
- In terms of flood risk, the location of future development is in accordance with the principle of the sequential test – new development is directed to areas of lesser flood risk. (1 respondent)
- Concerns re impact on waste water treatment infrastructure and resulting water quality (1 respondent)
- Village is already well equipped and doesn't require any additions (1 respondent)

### **Transport**

- Need improved public transport/bus service (10 respondents)
- Safety concerns about impact of extra traffic on existing road junctions (7 respondents)
- Need to address traffic using Burwell as route to Cambridge (6 respondents)
- Cycle path all the way to Exning needed ( 5 respondents)
- Village roads already busy (5 respondents)
- Heavy goods vehicles need an alternative access to industrial sites (3 respondents)
- No further development should be allowed until Quay bottleneck resolved (3 respondents)
- Improved cycle links should be encouraged (3 respondents)
- Need to make major improvements to the road network before adding additional housing (2 respondents)
- Cycle lanes to Fordham needed (2 respondents)
- Exning old rail bridge should be knocked down (2 respondents)
- Already enough cycle paths (2 respondents)
- Need more pedestrian crossings (2 respondents)
- Consider access to proposed sports area from along the Weirs (1 respondent)
- Bring back our train station (1 respondent)
- How about requiring developers to provide a bypass for through traffic before exiting roads become clogged with new traffic (1 respondent)
- Peak traffic is really what matters not 24 hour average (1 respondent)
- Do not adopt excessive traffic calming measures (1 respondent)
- Before any further housing is built in Burwell must sort Fordham/Newmarket A14 intersection (1 respondent)

- Footbridge over the Lode needed (1 respondent)
- The Lodes Way needs to be upgraded to level suitable for road bikes (1 respondent)
- Creative solution (not speed bumps) is required to slow traffic down (1 respondent)
- Introduce village car pooling (1 respondent)
- Traffic calming measures could create congestion at peak times (1 respondent)
- Perhaps having dynamic speed limits e.g. much lower limit of 20mph during peak times would help (1 respondent)
- More parking needed near community facilities (1 respondent)
- Sort and implement double yellow lines for no parking by Co-op/Premier (1 respondent)
- More thought needs to be given to the impact on existing residents regarding traffic management (1 respondent)
- You have not taken into account traffic along Reach Road now Station Gate has been built (1 respondent)
- Traffic through the village needs to be regularly monitored and action taken if it gets any worse (1 respondent)
- I think it would be preferable to relocate the footpath next to Ness Court further along Ness Road – next to the Cemetery (1 respondent)
- Priorities for traffic at major junctions from residential areas should be changed. Mini roundabouts at main junctions would act as form of traffic calming (1 respondent)
- Agree direct link to park and ride would be good (1 respondent)
- Re traffic and transport - nothing proposed to support (1 respondent)
- Doubt pedestrian access to new sports area will be used – people will park on roads in Felsham Chase (1 respondent)
- Concerns about safety of route to and from school from new development especially when safe alternative via Newmarket Road is already available (1 respondent)
- Re-instate the railway line to Cambridge as a foot/cycle path (1 respondent)
- Housing growth needs to be phased in conjunction with predicted total traffic impact (1 respondent)
- Concerned that footpaths past my hose (currently on cul-de-sac) into new development will encourage additional footfall onto from Newmarket Road and Isaacson Road (1 respondent)
- Speeding problem along Ness Road (1 respondent)
- Need a bike lane all the way to Cambridge
- Cycle ways needed for children to use to get to school, cubs, the 'rec', etc (1 respondent)
- Cycle path around village would be great (1 respondent)
- Access round Exning Bridge needed on both sides (1 respondent)
- Improved pedestrian and cycle facilities needed around Budgens (1 respondent)

## Employment

- Is growth of 630 jobs achievable? (11 respondents)
- Growth of this size will pull more traffic in from outside the village (2 respondents)
- Incentives needed to encourage employers (1 respondent)
- Work hub should be strongly considered (1 respondent)
- 630 new jobs good – but where will 630 cars park? (1 respondent)
- The aim should be to half the numbers commuting out of the village to work (1 respondent)
- No guarantee new jobs would go to Burwell people (1 respondent)
- Rather than sports facilities, put business units for shops on Newmarket Road site (1 respondent)
- Employment and business growth should include a mix of retail and business (1 respondent)
- How will roads cope with increase in industrial traffic? (1 respondent)
- Favour lower industrial/economic growth (1 respondent)
- DS Smith site should not be allocated for employment uses (1 respondent)
- DS Smith site should be considered for housing development (1 respondent)
- Derelict employment sites should be released for residential development (1 respondent)
- Appears jobs figure not based on any economic forecasts (1 respondent)

- Being 10 miles from Cambridge means out-commuting in that direction is a fact of life and we must plan for this (1 respondent)
- Green field land should be allocated for employment (1 respondent)
- Employment growth would be a positive (1 respondent)

### **Community Facilities**

- Adult education courses needed (1 respondent)
- Centralising sports facilities is a priority (1 respondent)
- Football pitch is far too limited an option – lets have tennis courts and swings too (1 respondent)
- More recreational facilities needed – especially for young people (1 respondent)
- Provision of bowling green with shared facilities (1 respondent)
- Oppose ‘marina’ development – is already a small marina along the riverbank, do not need a second or larger one (1 respondent)
- Community facilities must include provision for children’s football pitches (1 respondent)
- Swimming pool not mentioned in Masterplan (1 respondent)
- Better sports facilities are urgently needed (1 respondent)
- Something needs to be done to make swimming pool operative again (1 respondent)
- Like the idea of consolidating sports area but should retain the flexibility of keeping the smaller sites around the village for those sports that do not wish to amalgamate (1 respondent)
- As well as changing rooms should be a social club/bar/meeting facility (1 respondent)
- Ensure football/cricket can be played at same time – don’t overlap pitches (1 respondent)

### **Green Spaces**

- Improve Lode and surrounding area (2 respondents)
- Need to include maintaining trees (2 respondents)
- Very little proposed – how about a village pond? (1 respondent)
- Burwell has high potential to benefit from tourism as Wicken Fen grows - no account seems to be taken of this (1 respondent)
- Need to keep the green spaces/improve them (1 respondent)
- Space laid aside for community could be put to more creative use – village has enough sports facilities (1 respondent)
- What landscaping will you do behind my house and the proposed football pitches? (1 respondent)
- Although trees along the Causeway look pretty the roots crack the path and make it dangerous (1 respondent)
- Concern that if we allow a greater number of houses the ‘green’ space on the Newmarket Road site will not be adequate to meet the needs of the village (1 respondent)
- Proposed green edge of village unfair on residents who live there (1 respondent)

### **Character of Burwell**

- Burwell should remain as it is (5 respondents)
- The potential increase in traffic and population will completely change the characteristics of the village (2 respondents)
- It is important that the village feel and character is maintained (2 respondents)
- The ‘safe’ feel of the village should not be compromised (1 respondent)
- Oppose plans for building in this area (due to impact on own home) (1 respondent)
- Why destroy villages when vast areas of land have been assigned to be developed in Cambridgeshire e.g. Cambourne (1 respondent)
- Consultation has indicated that new developments have changed the character of the village – fail to see how a new large scale development on the edge of the village would address that concern (1 respondent)

### **Masterplan Process**

- Some of the wording is good, but past experience suggests it will not be upheld (1 respondent)



- The only constant throughout the consultation has been the determination of council to persuade residents to accept 350 homes on productive agricultural land owned by Cambridgeshire County Council (1 respondent)
- Draft does not reflect the earlier responses by residents (re housing growth) (1 respondent)
- Having sat through all the evening meetings we end up with the same old proposal of developing east of Ness Road/Newmarket Road (1 respondent)

### Additional Comments from Questionnaire

69 people made comments:

#### **Housing**

- Should limit the amount of affordable housing (4 respondents)
- Alternative or additional sites have been given scant attention and have not been adequately presented at consultation meetings (3 respondents)
- Proposed housing level too high (3 respondents)
- Oppose building on agricultural land (2 respondents)
- Infill development within the village should be seen as the priority, perhaps supported by smaller scale expansion(s) along the village fringes (1 respondent)
- You also need to think beyond the now. 350 houses is not going to be enough over this time, let alone what comes next (1 respondent)
- Please do not build any houses close to Baker Drive or have any possible sports use creating noise directly behind sheltered housing (1 respondent)
- I don't understand why you suggest building houses on green belt land when the D S Smith site in Reach Road is available and has been for many years (1 respondent)
- Re new housing proposed for Newmarket Road, how will noise and light pollution be lessened? What about drainage and impact on wildlife? (1 respondent)
- Strongly oppose location of new housing (1 respondent)
- Support the 'high growth' option, although we believe that housing growth over the next 20 years should be at least at the historic level of housing completions for the last ten years i.e. 28 dpa, or a total of 560 for the twenty year period (1 respondent)
- The development at Felsham Chase is a large housing facility and families are moving in and out all the time making way for new families (1 respondent)
- The development around the back of Isaacson Road was always marked for further housing; why wasn't the new housing earmarked for that site? (1 respondent)
- Newmarket Road is perfectly designed for traffic access for housing and sports facilities (1 respondent)
- There are enough small starter homes in Burwell already but they are out of the reach of our young people as 'buy to let' owners have pushed up the prices well out of the reach on our younger generation (1 respondent)
- The pressure on new housing development in the village is already causing trouble between neighbours (1 respondent)
- I strongly support the proposal to increase the amount of housing available for young people who are resident in Burwell (1 respondent)
- I would like an assurance that the village boundary will never be built on. What is now the village boundary (i.e. green arable land) should remain just that (1 respondent)
- I have concerns regarding the location of the preferred option that will effectively extend the Felsham Chase Estate. A large expansion in this area will further enhance the perceived feeling of isolation between the new estates and the village (1 respondent)
- History has shown that the introduction of large estate development does not fit well into the Burwell village mentality (1 respondent)
- I see elongation of the village as a lesser risk than implied in the initial consultation document; it provides character to the village, and there is ample spread in the village facilities to avoid isolation or unnecessary traffic movements (1 respondent)

- It appears that one of the major advantages of the preferred location is that it opens up the potential for more expansion. If this (potential expansion) is a contributing factor in the current planning decisions then the impact of the wider expansion should also be under scrutiny (1 respondent)

### Infrastructure

- Infrastructure already stretched (2 respondents)
- There needs to be enough school places if this development is to be successful (1 respondent)
- Concerned that there will be a shortfall on the cash provided from the developers to cover all the infrastructure needs created by the development (1 respondent)
- We do not wish to see development occur that would lead to a detriment in water quality within inland waterways. We would therefore like to work closely with your Authority and Anglian Water Services Ltd to review of findings of the WCS for Burwell (i.e. should any more up-to-date information be available). This should enable us to identify the capacity within the existing waste water system; the number of properties deliverable without failing WFD requirements; and any phasing requirements that may be necessary to facilitate growth (1 respondent)
- Some of these proposals will need funding and implementation on a much shorter timescale than 20 years to maintain a viable village (1 respondent)
- Any planning permissions should insist that any conditions relating to community benefits should be compiled with by the developer prior to sale (1 respondent)
- The village has grown exponentially over the last 30 years, with virtually no infrastructure development and it is time it was stopped (1 respondent)
- 630 pupil primary school is too large (1 respondent)
- Build a sister school (same head teachers) so that we don't lose what is best from a primary education (1 respondent)
- Such large scale expansion would further segregate the village and put strain on the infrastructure (1 respondent)
- If there is real potential for the wider expansion then it should be considered alongside the relocation of the village college and new community facilities (1 respondent)

### Transport

- Improvements to bus/public transport services needed (6 respondents)
- Roads already busy (6 respondents)
- Oppose proposal to open the woodland walk on Felsham Chase into a main link path to Newmarket Road (3 respondents)
- The Masterplan does not indicate that roads will be improved to allow for the extra residents of the village (3 respondents)
- The crossing at the foot of Felsham Chase is already dangerous, extra traffic will make it worse (2 respondents)
- Footpaths out of the village already exist, but there are only a limited number of waymark signs (1 respondent)
- Roads need to improve (1 respondent)
- I would like to see a footbridge from the Anchor side of the Lode to join up with the footpath to Factory Road (1 respondent)
- The old railway line should be reclaimed for future use as cycleway or even as part of a light railway in the area (1 respondent)
- Access round Exning Bridge on both sides required and a priority (1 respondent)
- Sort and implement double yellow lines for no parking by Co-Op/Premier (1 respondent)
- Problem areas already - outside Budgens, top of Causeway and junction of Newmarket Road, High Street (1 respondent)
- Road parking within the village at present is in the extreme (1 respondent)
- The roads are for a village within the existing boundary and any additional building works are over stress on these country roads (1 respondent)
- Major opportunity was missed by not introducing eastern bypass (1 respondent)

## **Employment**

- To attract business, need better broadband, post that arrives in the morning, not the afternoon and road/transport improvements to assist people to come to work to Burwell. Can't expect a business to just have staff based in Burwell (1 respondent)
- Provision of shops is very poor - what can be done to encourage new shops and so reduce usage of cars to get to Newmarket and Cambridge? (1 respondent)
- Would like to see retail opportunities encouraged around the village centre - not new buildings but better use of the existing (1 respondent)
- Businesses are not interested on using DS Smith land (1 respondent)
- The only growth needed is employment opportunities in the village, so that there is less need for local people to travel vast distances to work (1 respondent)
- Key concern is compliance with national policy and the deliverability of employment allocations (1 respondent)

## **Community facilities**

- I think it is important that the Masterplan addresses the lack of facilities for young people (Ages 11 to 18) in the village (3 respondents)
- Better demographic and social planning should be considered alongside other constraints (2 respondents)
- Insufficient thought has been given to crime prevention (1 respondent)
- There needs to be provision for an outdoor fitness facility which can be accessed at any time without need for supervision (1 respondent)
- Oppose locating sports pitches behind old people's home (1 respondent)
- Need for improved communication/information e.g. Burwell Bulletin type (1 respondent)
- Some mention should be made in Masterplan of financial support for existing sports centre (1 respondent)
- Perhaps as part of the maintenance and improvement of the existing community facilities, one of the facilities could be transformed into a Youth Centre (1 respondent)
- I would expect to see more definite plans for the swimming pool to be made (1 respondent)
- Public free tennis courts would be good (1 respondent)
- The proposed leisure / tourism facilities could include a marina making more use of the waterways (1 respondent)
- Wind turbines should be considered (1 respondent)
- Burwell is good for under 14 yrs old and over 65's, what about the rest of us? (1 respondent)
- A really good aim would be to centralise the sporting facilities of the village - think about moving the allotments to the recreation ground, developing the allotments for housing & employment and use the development cash to provide football pitches, cricket pitch, tennis courts, bowling green and other facilities such as changing rooms etc (1 respondent)
- Please consider community benefit of a Public Art Strategy as part of this process (1 respondent)
- Need more sports facilities (1 respondent)

## **Green Spaces**

- Keep existing riverbanks and footpaths (1 respondent)
- Clear Lode and surrounding area (1 respondent)
- Maintain the green areas as proposed (1 respondent)

## **Character of Burwell**

- Expansion of the village will make it a town ( 5 respondents)
- Firmly believe that Burwell can be developed but very concerned that you will overdevelop the village (1 respondent)
- Invest in the village as it is and uses scarce resources to enhance its character without expanding it (1 respondent)
- With the proposal to expand Exning the two villages boundaries will be compromised as the villages edge closer to each other (1 respondent)

## Masterplan Process

- Draft Masterplan does not reflect the views of residents as expressed in previous consultations (re housing numbers) (6 respondents)
- Very good consultation with plenty of information and good opportunity to participate (2 respondents)
- Keep all informed on regular basis with highlighted bullet points on adoption/changes to plan (1 respondent)
- As far as I can see, the plan is due to be adopted in 2013, and is due to run for 20 years. So how come it's due to run until only 2031? (1 respondent)
- Plan is too local focussed need to consider impact of Quay junction and extra houses proposed at Exning (1 respondent)
- Alternative small sites around the village have been arbitrarily excluded. Each suggestion from local people for alternative sites was rejected with little explanation. These sites were not all in current farming use so they would have done less damage to food supply (1 respondent)
- In all a strong plan that has listened to the people of the village (1 respondent)
- The emphasis throughout the masterplan seems to be that it should benefit the village and its development rather than allow a planning free-for-all (1 respondent)
- How come this draft was selected as two of the original drafts received the same amount of support/opposition? (1 respondent)
- Appreciate that the masterplan is our only realistic chance to have some input into the development of the village (1 respondent)
- Thank you for consulting us, it is difficult to accommodate everyone's views, but I think you've come up with a well considered plan (1 respondent)
- As a family new to the area, we are keen to settle here and more houses and school places will allow this to happen more than the current climate (1 respondent)

## Comments book

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

1) Burwell as it is can just about be called a village. There is no reason to build more houses in Burwell on the scale suggested by the Masterplan. Population growth is not a foregone conclusion. As the existing older population of Burwell diminishes there will be more vacant housing released.

Making the best of what is already here

Burwell is in a rural area, farming is the main activity around it. Farming is facing increasing challenges in order to provide for us. It therefore, seems crazy to destroy Melton Farm to replace it with more housing. It is an existing asset that could be used in the future as a farm shop outlet, more local produce growing etc (more jobs) etc. there are plenty of people who would put this into action. It is close enough for local people to access on foot. (Most farm shops are miles out in the country). There is a bus stop right outside.

There is another aspect which could link in with another existing underused village asset opposite Melton Farm, there is a lane which goes to the allotments. It could be used to provide access to the museum, there would be enough space at Melton Farm to provide parking for the Museum which is much nearer than the existing parking at the Memorial Hall and could encourage more museum visits. There is a need for a pedestrian crossing in this area of Newmarket Road.

350 new houses along Newmarket Road would in no way enhance the character of the village it would be merely an urban and dormitory place to live.

2) The proposed addition of 470 new houses is empire building by the Council. More housing equals more Council Tax gathering. The development off Newmarket Road does nothing at all to enhance the rural aspect of the village, merely make it worse for those already here.

3) Village will not be a village if anymore house are built.

4) It will destroy the village and all that is great about it. The village is already one of the largest in the country why does it have to be bigger?

5) It seems that the 350 house level was decided upon by a small group of people who were able to attend a particular meeting on a particular (early) evening, which neither my husband nor myself was able to attend. I hope that this will be over-ruled if the feedback shows this is not representative of the views of the village at large, rather than this very small group. Also, if this scale of development were to go ahead, then the need for infilling, which also reduces the rural feel of the village, this should therefore be very restricted, way less than the 120 envisaged in the plan. I agree with the need for larger gardens/lower densities. Also, the need is for affordable housing for local people to be able to stay in the village rather than more executive homes which would inevitably bring in more Cambridge commuters. The assertion on panel 3 that more housing growth will result in less out commuting seems to me to be a strange one.

## Written responses

No	Organisation	Comment	Officer response
1	Anglian Water	No issues or concerns to raise regarding the comments relating to sewer capacity or wastewater treatment. I would however, advise the developer to contact us at the earliest opportunity for pre planning advise and to confirm capacity and connection points.	Noted
2	Cambridgeshire County Council	Still awaiting response	
3	English Heritage	<p>English Heritage broadly agrees with the principles set out in the document and the suggestion that any new housing should be located on the east side of the settlement. However, we would recommend that future work is undertaken on the Masterplan for this development in order to ensure the best quality of development is delivered. In particular we would wish to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The subdivision of the site into clear character areas, including a clear identity for the area of development fronting onto Newmarket Road and a separate edge condition (at lower density) for those parts of the site backing on to open countryside</li> <li>• Maximised opportunities for pedestrian and cycle permeability through the development together with pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the existing village core.</li> <li>• Provide a clear hierarchy of roads through the development</li> <li>• Investigate using the playing fields as the start of a 'green wedge' that might provide linkage to the open countryside from the built up core of the village and from the new houses that would flank this 'green wedge'.</li> <li>• Ensure the setting of Stevens Mill is protected.</li> <li>• Clear guidance on heights, scale form massing and densities, and how much these might vary through the development.</li> <li>• Any views, vistas that need to be protected (e.g. to the windmill and/or church spire).</li> <li>• How the development might be phased over the 20 year plan period.</li> </ul>	Points raised to be fed into site specific Masterplan for site.
4	National Grid Re Gas Supply	<p>Network Analysis has been carried out based upon the current predicted load growth - with no diversionary works taken into account. The analysis results are shown as follows:</p> <p>Land off Newmarket (350 dwellings) - <b>Capacity is available and is available on a first come first serve basis. Currently there is no need for reinforcement.</b></p> <p>Land to the South of Burwell (employment) - <b>Capacity is available and is available on a first come first serve basis. Currently there is no need for reinforcement.</b></p>	Noted

5	Natural England	<p>Much of the masterplan falls beyond the remit of Natural England and we lack site specific knowledge on many of the areas put forward in the plan. We are, however, broadly supportive of the comments that relate to environmental issues. Whilst we understand the desire to exploit natural resources such as the Wicken Fen Site of Special Scientific Interest/Ramsar we are glad to see provisos such as the ‘need to carefully manage the impact of visitors on ecology.’</p> <p>We support the policy of improving current green spaces, cycleways and footways. Natural England believes that development should provide an opportunity not only to protect but also to enhance and add to Green Infrastructure. This can be achieved through a variety of initiatives, including but not limited to the provision of new green spaces, the improvement of the interconnectivity of open spaces and the enhancement of watercourses. For further information please refer to our Green Infrastructure Guidance, available at:  <a href="http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/35033?category=49002">http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/35033?category=49002</a></p> <p>The lack of further comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may be able to make comments that will help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of the environmental value of areas affected by this plan in the decision making process.</p>	Noted
6	Suffolk County Council	<p>Whilst the County Council has no objection to the proposals as set out, this letter does suggest several issues to be considered as this document progresses towards adoption. Should there be any growth in East Cambridgeshire that would have an impact on Suffolk infrastructure, please refer to the Section 106 Developer’s Guide to Infrastructure Contributions in Suffolk1 for information on Suffolk Local Authorities’ approach to cross border developer contributions.</p> <p>The level and distribution of development proposed by this document has potential implications for the A14, as a strategic route of importance to both Suffolk and Cambridgeshire, and also for Newmarket, a service centre for residents of Burwell.</p> <p>The document as drafted does not recognise that development in Burwell may directly contribute to pressures on the A14/A142 junction. As such the document should perhaps note that development at Burwell of this scale will be called upon to review any impacts arising on the A14/A142 junction and mitigate impacts as appropriate. Further transport assessment may be required, and it may be appropriate for eventual policies to set out specific transport measures.</p> <p>The second transport matter to note is the potential for additional pressure on transport routes to Newmarket and its services, through Exning. The document notes that many people in Burwell look to Newmarket for shops and services. As such, there needs to be consideration of how any additional transport pressure on Newmarket can be managed.</p>	Recommend that the Masterplan include text noting the requirement for developers to carry out transport assessments, which include impact on A14/A142 junction and Newmarket’s transport network

		<p>Existing concerns relating to Newmarket, including the need to effectively manage the safety of riders and horses, are set out in the Suffolk Local Transport Plan. The county council will seek the support of East Cambridgeshire District Council in meeting these ambitions, and development in Burwell should be planned in such a way as to minimise or mitigate impacts on Newmarket’s transport network, as appropriate.</p> <p>A potentially useful way of minimising private vehicle transport is proposed, with a suggested pedestrian and cycle link from Burwell to Exning provided via a new route around Exning Bridge. Suffolk County Council welcomes this proposal in principle, but would suggest that there will need to be further improvements along the B1103 (Burwell Road) to achieve a comprehensive and complete route. The document is correct in noting that the situation requires a coordinated and comprehensive effort by Suffolk and Cambridgeshire local authorities to deliver this route, and Suffolk County Council would be interested in further exploring the issues involved in developing this option as a way of minimising transport impacts and maximising sustainable transport options.</p>	
7	<p>Beacon Planning  (On behalf of the co-owners of the proposed Reach Road employment allocation)</p>	<p>The allocation of the Reach Road site (2.5 hectares) for proposed employment has been strongly supported throughout the public consultation on the Masterplan to date. Strong regard should be paid to this due to the emphasis in the NPPF on the involvement of local people in local plan preparation (para 155).</p> <p>Reach Road is a sustainable location for employment because of the close connectivity between the site with the retained existing employment sites. The site has good transport links to Cambridge and the rest of East Cambs and the site is close enough to the centre of the village to be accessible by sustainable travel options. Employment development on the site is deliverable within the plan period.</p> <p>The Masterplan should ensure that it is in line with the guidance in the NPPF which places strong emphasis on economic growth, stating that ‘planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth’ (para 19). In particular, the NPPF states that planning policies ‘should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances’ (para 21). Therefore, policies within the Masterplan should include a high degree of flexibility to ensure landowners are able to respond to market changes. The suggested mixed use scheme of B1 office and B2 light industrial units on the Reach Road site would provide small-scale units suitable for existing businesses in Burwell to relocate and for new start-up businesses, for which demand was identified in the first stage of the public consultation on the Masterplan and in the evidence base in the draft East Cambs Jobs Growth Strategy 2012-2031. The policy includes a ratio of 80% B1 use and 20% B2 use for the site, however development of the site should not be constrained by this. In practical terms, development is unlikely to take place if there is no</p>	<p>Noted. Recommend amend text to incorporate greater flexibility between B1 and B2 uses according to market conditions.</p>



		<p>demand for such premises. Therefore, in accordance with guidance in the NPPF the policy should include a degree of flexibility to enable the landowners to respond to changes in the market for units for different employment uses. The Masterplan should be worded appropriately to reflect this, for example referring to the ratio as a 'preferred' option for future development.</p> <p>The phasing set out on page 31 does not detail what is envisaged in the two phases of employment development. In any case, development of employment sites should not be constrained either by the requirement to coordinate development with housing growth, or by the phasing of the development of other employment sites in the village. Instead, there should be no temporal constraints on development to enable landowners to respond to changes in the market.</p>	
8	Cheffins on behalf of Client (David Wilson Homes)	<p>The Vision states that the Masterplan seeks to provide for a "modest" level of growth to meet housing need, which is then stated as being 350 new homes plus infill (128 homes) over 20 years, which equates to 24 dpa. This level of growth was referred to as a "high growth" option in earlier consultations (and in the table on page 21 of the Masterplan), whereas in reality this level of growth is lower than the comparable figure for the last ten years (2001-2011) when over 280 dwellings were built - an average of 28 dpa. It is very confusing to suggest that a high growth option has been chosen when it is actually lower than the historic rate of housing completions over the last ten year period.</p> <p>The Vision also suggests that a key principle of the Masterplan is for "balanced growth", promoting both job creation and new housing. We would submit that growth should also be balanced in terms of its location, as well as its scale, by locating new housing development in at least two different locations on the east side of the village. This will: reduce the overall visual impact on the surrounding countryside; allow the traffic generated by the new development to be more evenly distributed through the existing local road network; provide additional open space in more than one location; recognise ALL potential development land within an 800m radius of existing village facilities; and offer the ability to fund/implement traffic calming schemes and other highway improvements on the two busiest stretches of road into the village.</p> <p>The development objectives could be better met by identifying additional sites off Ness Road (north of Toyse Close and Toyse Lane) for housing and open space, and reducing the size/scale of housing development at Newmarket Road. Such a move would clearly help to: (i) retain the rural character of the village by providing discrete, more modest development sites on the east side of the village, thereby reducing the visual impact of having one large development site; (ii) address both traffic volume and speeding issues, by providing traffic calming features on both Ness Road and Newmarket Road at prominent entry points into the village ; (iii) protect the open and rural nature of the edge of the village by reducing the size/scale of development proposed off Newmarket Road, which has a very open edge to the surrounding countryside, and would be visible for a considerable for many years before landscaping could screen that impact.</p> <p>We strongly oppose putting all 350 new houses in one location north of Newmarket Road because this</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>An option for a split in development between Newmarket Road and Ness Road was explored at the options stage (option 5) but was not supported by the community. Ness Road site also not</p>

		<p>site is clearly NOT the only potential site for housing and open space development that has good access, close proximity to central areas of the village (within 800m radius of the village school), and is able to be linked to the existing built-up area via existing roads and footpaths. The sites off Ness Road (north of Toyse Lane and Toyse Close) are equally as accessible as the Newmarket Road site and can be integrated into the fabric of the village through the use of existing links into the surrounding area. The inclusion of these sites would also enable the provision of open space and sports pitches in two different locations, enabling them to serve different parts of the village. These sites (off Ness Road) were only looked at in the earlier stages of the consultation in the context of being the only site option for new housing development (growth option 2 in the Options Consultation) - the site was not assessed in conjunction with the Newmarket Road site once the 'high growth' option had been agreed.</p> <p>The Council has not properly assessed the range of 'combinations' of the various potential development sites, other than growth option 5, which acknowledged that splitting the 'high growth' level of 350 dwellings between the land off Newmarket Road and the land north west of Ness Road would still achieve several key objectives, namely: funding for a wider range of road safety improvements; and the opportunity to create a larger amount of formal open space for the village in two separate locations. We would ask that the Council carry out further assessment work on the benefits of splitting the potential development areas to several sites on the east side of the village, namely north of Newmarket Road and north-west of Ness Road.</p>	<p>supported in site appraisal work for housing sites. Masterplan is seeking to centralise provision of sports facilities to obtain economies of scale. PC reported at issues stage that the current dispersal of sports sites is difficult to manage.</p>
9	<p>Harrow Estates Interest in former DS Smith - proposing residential development scheme</p>	<p>Support Masterplan proposals with exception of land allocations The objective to “ensure new housing developments contain a mix of housing, in terms of tenure and size, and affordability” (pg. 20, bullet four) should be reworded to suggest a market-led approach to housing mix. This will ensure that the policy is flexible enough to respond to changing housing needs over the coming plan period.</p> <p>It is unclear where the objective to “protect the open and rural nature of the western green edge of Burwell facing onto the Fens” (pg.20, bullet 12) has emerged from as there is no landscape designation within the adopted Core Strategy. In order to justify such protection, this should be supported by a robust landscape assessment or removed from the Masterplan.</p>	<p>A market led approach could lead to a single tenure/size provision which is not the aim of the Masterplan. Current wording enable flexibility to meet housing needs. This is a key element of the vision, but not a statutory designation.</p> <p>Green edge is a reiteration of the 'open countryside' policy already in place. Does not alter</p>

		<p>We support the draft Vision’s focus on ensuring a ‘thriving rural community’ but consider that it should be made clear within the Vision that this is only achievable and sustainable in conjunction with a <i>deliverable</i> plan for housing and employment growth. We suggest an alternative along the lines of:  <i>“Burwell in 2031 will be a thriving rural community with a variety of local shops and services adequately supported by a modest supply of sensitively designed new homes and high quality employment sites. The growth of Burwell will work to sustain facilities, strengthen community support networks and enhance the village’s distinctive local character.”</i></p> <p>In its current form, we do not consider that the approach taken to employment growth and land allocations within Burwell Masterplan is consistent with The Framework or sound.  <i>Lists number of points that Masterplan is not NPPF Compliant</i>  Regarding employment land allocations, Paragraph 22. of The National Planning Policy Framework explicitly confirms that:</p> <p><i>“Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of employment sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose.”</i></p> <p>The Framework includes clear guidance on the approach that should be taken to the allocation of employment land. Land allocated for employment uses should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Of the right type</li> <li>• Reviewed regularly in terms of suitability</li> <li>• Released from employment uses where there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for that purpose</li> <li>• Deliverable and should seek to address potential barriers to investment</li> </ul> <p>These key pieces of guidance are not reflected in the Draft Burwell Masterplan’s approach to land allocations. The <i>suitability</i> of the previous plan’s employment land allocations has not been reassessed to inform the Masterplan - the recent East Cambridgeshire Jobs Growth Strategy identifies the site as one that can potentially generate 293 jobs but does not consider the site’s current condition or remediation requirements. The long term protection of employment sites is clearly referred to in The Framework and is criticised as being an approach that should be avoided where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose.</p>	<p>the exiting village boundary.  Masterplan text be amended to make this clear.</p> <p>The additional points included in the amended vision are already covered in the development objectives.</p> <p>No evidence based assessments have been submitted to indicate that the site is not deliverable for B1/B2 uses during the Masterplan consultation process. Further information from the agents supporting their view is invited.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>In line with The Framework, the Masterplan's approach to allocations should encourage economic growth and seek to address potential barriers to investment by taking account of market signals, encouraging the reuse of previously developed land and giving careful attention to the viability and deliverability of their employment allocations.</p> <p>In order to ensure the highest possibility of attracting new businesses to the town, the land which is available to them must have the lowest possible level of financial burdens. Allocating greenfield land at Newmarket Road (B1103) for employment development would remove the cost and time associated with demolition and remediation, would offer a location for business development that has good road frontage and access to the A14 and, for these reasons, would secure the highest chances of economic growth and an increase in job opportunities in Burwell.</p> <p>One of three criteria listed in Policy EC 1 'Retention of Employment Sites' would need to be met in order to justify the site's release for uses other than employment. Through presenting evidence of unsuccessful marketing and information regarding the condition of the units, we consider that part a. of this policy (copied below) can be satisfied and the policy test can be met to justify the site's redevelopment for alternative uses.</p> <p><i>"Continued use of the site for employment purposes is no longer viable, taking into account the site's characteristics, quality of buildings, and existing or potential market demand;"</i> (East Cambridgeshire Core Strategy, pg.67)</p> <p>The East Cambridgeshire Employment Land &amp; Labour Market Study (2005) identified the site as an available employment site seven years ago. Since this time, no evidence-base assessments have been carried out on the quality and suitability of this site for continued employment uses.</p> <p>We are proposing a realistic solution to the problem which is to release greenfield land that is currently identified for residential development for employment uses. A comprehensive mixed-use urban extension is a deliverable solution that offers a considerably higher degree of certainty in attracting business investment into Burwell.</p> <p>Alongside this, the Former D S Smith site should be allocated for housing. The site is located within the development envelope, adjacent to a modern residential development, and offers a sustainable location for housing. Most importantly, a residential allocation is the only realistic and viable prospect of bringing the site back into use.</p> <p>It is envisaged that the site could deliver 80-100 two-storey residential dwellings, providing a mix of two-to four-bedroom properties and a development density in the region of 30dph. A residential scheme that</p>	<p>The site appraisal work during the masterplan assessment process indicates that this is not the preferred site for housing.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>provides a mix of family housing at a low density is consistent with the residential design aspirations within the Draft Burwell Masterplan. The principle of releasing a derelict employment site in a sustainable location for residential development is entirely consistent with The Framework and this approach should be endorsed by the Burwell community, local councillors, the Working Party and East Cambridgeshire District Council if the vision for Burwell is to be realised.</p>	
10	<p>Januarys Consultant Surveyors (on behalf of DS Smith)</p>	<p>We request that land at the former DS Smith site is not identified as a potential retained employment allocation. There is no evidence that the site will be developed for industrial uses, as demonstrated by marketing evidence, and in any event it would not be viable to redevelop the site for these purposes based on current rental levels in Burwell and the surrounding area. The proposed employment allocation will not be delivered as proposed in the draft Burwell Masterplan. The site could be identified as a potential development site; it does need to be redeveloped.</p> <p>We request that all references to the number of jobs to be provided in Burwell be deleted. The objective to create additional employment and increase jobs in the village could be retained, with the amount of land required to be determined through the Local Plan to 2031 process.</p> <p>Since there is clearly no interest in developing the site for industrial purposes, we consider that the site should be identified as a residential development opportunity; it is a previously developed site within the village, there is a need for additional housing in the village, and there is interest in developing the site for residential use from house builders and developers.</p> <p>The proposal in the draft Burwell Masterplan to identify the site as a potential retained employment allocation was clearly not based on any robust evidence. We could have provided that evidence if we had been asked. It is clear that one of the main elements of the draft Burwell Masterplan – to provide employment uses at the former DS Smith premises – cannot be delivered because there is no interest in developing the site for these uses. All strategies must be capable of being delivered.</p> <p>The draft Burwell Masterplan has not sought to tackle the question of why the former DS Smith premises has remained vacant. In our opinion, the site is one which is no longer required or needed for employment purposes and should be released for other uses e.g. residential.</p> <p>The former DS Smith premises were used for Class B2 purposes. This means that the site can be used for any industrial processes. The draft Burwell Masterplan incorrectly refers to B2 as light industrial.</p> <p>The former DS Smith site is identified as an employment site on the Proposals Map for the East Cambridgeshire Core Strategy. Policy EC1 seeks to retain such sites. It states:</p> <p><i>“The Council will seek to retain land or premises currently or last used for employment purposes unless it can be demonstrated that: a. Continued use of the site for employment purposes is</i></p>	<p>No evidence based assessments have been submitted to indicate that the site is not deliverable for B1/B uses during the masterplan consultation process. Further information from the agents supporting their view is invited.</p> <p>Whilst the agents refer to current rental values, this is a 20 year plan and values may change in the future.</p> <p>Work on the Burwell masterplan has been progressing in parallel with work on the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, taking into account District wide assessments of both housing and employment need and demand. The NPPF also advises that plans should</p>

	<p><i>no longer viable, taking into account the site's characteristics, quality of buildings, and existing or potential market demand; or .....</i>"</p> <p>The former DS Smith site has been actively marketed - using a variety of established marketing techniques - for well over 12 months. It has actually been vacant since 1997. There has been limited interest in the site for employment purposes, and no one has decided to take the site forward. The change of use of this site from employment use would comply with adopted policy.</p> <p>There appears to be an assumption within the draft Masterplan that if employment is provided in Burwell that local people will automatically work there. However, the relationship between where people live and where they work is not that straight-forward. There is no evidence that containment at the individual village level will actually work.</p> <p>It appears that the jobs figure has not been based on any economic forecasts of the number of jobs required in the District or any assessment of market demand for employment land in the District or in Burwell. These are matters that the emerging East Cambridgeshire Local Plan to 2031 will need to determine. It is likely that the jobs target for Burwell is too high. While we acknowledge that the local community wants more jobs in the village, these aspirations need to be firmly based on forecast demand and market conditions.</p> <p>It appears that the draft Masterplan is seeking to define a future development strategy for Burwell in advance of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan to 2031 while at the same time avoiding the formal process required for a Neighbourhood Plan. The draft Burwell Masterplan seeks to allocate specific housing and employment sites without any assessment as to whether the quantum of development is set at the correct level or whether the sites themselves are deliverable.</p> <p>We are concerned that the Masterplan content and the policies it contains are not based on robust evidence, and take no account of the relationship between Burwell and the remainder of East Cambridgeshire. The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that neighbourhood plans should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area. The strategic needs of East Cambridgeshire will be determined through the Local Plan to 2031 process, taking into account the needs of the whole district rather than the wishes of individual villages. The Local Plan to 2031 process may need to refine the amount of future development for Burwell and the location for that development within the village.</p> <p>It is not clear what, if any, evidence has been used to determine the proposed village housing target. It appears that the target has not been based on any demographic forecasts, or taken into account housing need and demand. These are matters that the emerging East Cambridgeshire Local Plan to 2031 will need to address. We note that Paragraph 47 of the NPPF seeks</p>	<p>take account of the local community input into the plan preparation process, and local consultation has indicated a strong view that the D S Smith site should remain in employment use.</p> <p>This masterplan is a vision for the village rather than a formal development plan document and it reflects the views of the local community. As such it will inform the Local Plan.</p> <p>Detailed allocations will be further addressed through the Local Plan process.</p> <p>The Burwell Masterplan is not a Neighbourhood Development Plan, as clearly this would be premature to the strategic Local Plan for the District.</p>
--	---	--

		<p>to boost significantly the supply of housing, and expects local planning authorities to use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area. It is likely that the housing figure taken forward in the Local Plan will be different to that proposed in the draft Burwell Masterplan.</p> <p>It is also not clear why a greenfield site – at land of Newmarket Road – has been selected in preference to previously developed land when the NPPF encourages the reuse of previously developed land.</p> <p>The reuse of vacant land and buildings is encouraged at a national level. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF defines the core land use planning principles that should underpin both plan-making and decision taking. One of those principles seeks to “encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value;....”.</p> <p>In terms of the reuse of vacant employment sites, Paragraph 22 states:</p> <p><i>“Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities.”</i></p> <p>There is no prospect that the former DS Smith premises will be used for employment purposes, and this is confirmed through the response to marketing.</p>	
11	Land owner	Not satisfied that my submission has been considered properly, or that it has been presented to the consultation meetings in any meaningful way.	Land has gone through same site appraisal process as other sites and results presented at Working Party Meeting. Officers have offered to meet land owner to discuss their concerns
12	Member of the public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not in support of the Masterplan. Live on Ness Road and there is already a big parking and speeding problem and the road is not suitable for a big increase on pedestrian traffic. People from the intended housing need to be directed away from this area. The primary school also adds to the parking problem, the area is busy with people and traffic.</li> </ul>	A Transport Assessment will need to be carried out before

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Something needs to be done about Quy – need a bypass round the whole area.</li> <li>• Oppose the double yellow lines outside Co-op as the car parked out the front used to slow the traffic down.</li> </ul>	development commences to mitigate the impact of extra traffic
13	Member of the public	<p>Concerned about proposed footway/cycle links from new housing development to Burghley Rise and Felsham Chase in particular:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Increased number of children crossing the Ness Rd mini Roundabout on route to and from school when there is already a safer alternative route. A far better and safer route to the school already exists via Newmarket Rd to the High Street, across the existing High Street pedestrian crossing, along The Causeway. Not linking the estates would force this safer route to be used.</li> <li>2) The proposed link will give access from adjacent areas to the currently very successful Burghley Rise country/dog walk that skirts around the back of the existing properties and could result in unsociable activities at existing country/dog walk with hidden access to rear of gardens</li> <li>3) The access could become a potential short cut 'rat-run' for mopeds and motorcycles from Newmarket Rd to Ness Rd.</li> </ol> <p>We hope that you find this helpful and encourage you not to link the estates as currently proposed.</p>	Both English Heritage and Cambridgeshire County Council advocate linkages through Felsham Chase estate. However, they will need to be designed in such a way as not to encourage anti-social behaviour or 'rat run' for mopeds/motorcycles
14	Member of the public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of indicative green hatching for 'green edge' and lack of indication of whether this is contiguous with the development envelope – impacts on rights of individuals owners to use and enjoy their own property in particular this affects the west side of North Street.</li> <li>• Do not support the continuation of the current adopted development envelope line or any line more draconian than it is already. I hope that the development boundary can be addressed satisfactorily through the Burwell Masterplan and emerging Local Plan.</li> <li>• The other important element of the draft Masterplan is the Design Guide, coupled with organic growth. The character should be maintained, especially through the proposed larger development off Newmarket Road, to prevent Burwell being swamped by generic housing which has characterised some of the larger developments in Burwell over the past 20 years.</li> </ul>	Green edge is a reiteration of the 'open countryside' policy already in place. Does not alter the exiting village boundary. Masterplan text be amended to make this clear.
15	Member of the public	<p>1) Housing Growth: At the first public meeting of the Masterplan process, we were told by the chairman that, if the community did not want growth, there would not be growth in Burwell. At the options stage consultation, a clear majority of 63% of respondents disagreed or disagreed strongly that Burwell needed to grow. Clearly, many residents feel there has already been too much growth in Burwell. My view is that the village is badly placed to serve existing and planned employment centres in Cambridge without encouraging an unacceptable increase in car commuting on routes that are already congested at peak</p>	Draft Burwell Masterplan consultation results show support for 350 (plus 128 infill) new homes



		<p>times. To avoid this, housing development should be planned on a regional basis, rather than village by village.</p> <p>2) Infrastructure: I do not think the Masterplan process has considered sufficiently the traffic impacts of nearly 500 extra homes, mainly on Newmarket Road, on the direct commuting route into Cambridge: Isaacson Road, Swaffham Road and thence through the Swaffhams and Lode to the A14 junction at Quy, where there are already peak morning queues, exacerbated by the inappropriate traffic calming layout. The solution proposed, to give an alternative route via an improved A14 junction at Exning, would move the traffic to equally unsuitable roads through Exning village as well as adding to the distance travelled for Cambridge commuters.</p> <p>Support fully the provision of a cycle link with Exning, particularly a route around the old railway bridge just outside the village. Any plans that encourage traffic to travel to the A14 via Exning will make agreeing with Suffolk CC a cycle route alongside the B1102 all the more necessary (see above). I would add to this, a shared use path of minimum 2m width linking to the village on the Cambridgeshire side, and that any new crossings provided in the village should be on demand pelican crossings for both cyclists and pedestrians where appropriate.</p> <p>Several areas of Burwell are not on mains gas and I have found that the cost to an individual householder of connection is prohibitive. It would be a good use of the CIL to negotiate connections on a bulk basis to give everyone access to this infrastructure.</p> <p>3) Employment sites: Oppose strongly the extension of the Reach Road industrial area on greenfield land right up to the Earthworks Way path to the Devil's Dyke. There has already been industrial development on a greenfield site on the other side of the road outside of the existing envelope while adjacent brownfield land on the old DS Smith site within the envelope has lain undeveloped for many years. The priorities are wrong here and the most likely effect of allocating more greenfield land that is cheaper to develop is to reduce the incentive to use the most appropriate site.</p>	<p>CCC report that the roads in Burwell have sufficient capacity to accommodate this level of growth. In addition a Transport Assessment will need to be carried out before development commences to mitigate the impact of extra traffic.</p> <p>The masterplan seeks to obtain development of both sites for employment use in order to increase jobs available within the village.</p>
16	Member of the public	<p>How are we going to attract businesses to Burwell when traffic bottlenecks are such as Quy are an issue? With closure of Cambridge Sorting Office mail deliveries might get even worse.</p>	<p>Having a Masterplan in place will raise the profile of Burwell to businesses.</p> <p>ECDC sustainable</p>

			Development Team are promoting Burwell as a business location
17	Member of the public	<p>As the proposed Burwell Master plan has no real benefit to the parish, except a limited and temporary halt to development of expansion on green fields surrounding Burwell. Is it possible to mark the following on the proposed master plan:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On page 5 between Old School Close and Baker Drive an access from Ness Road to the proposed sports field is shown. Is it possible for the planners to use this access to find a potential short cut for pedestrians, cyclists and mobility scooters to Burwell surgery?</li> <li>2. On page 27 the desired sports pitch giving all year round use. Is it possible to have this drawn in on the master plan in dotted lines as potential sports area? If this is not drawn in, Burwell will not be able to negotiate a buy/lease for the desired sports area from the County Council.</li> <li>3. On page 24 access to the development from Fordham end of Ness Road and Newmarket Road is shown. Can two parallel dotted line be drawn between Newmarket Road and Ness Road to show a potential access to both development sites?</li> </ol> <p>The Burwell Master plan proposes carbon saving – building passive housing could help to achieve this. Building a solar farm to supply the development with electricity could be considered by the County Council.</p>	The diagrams in the Draft Masterplan document are indicative only. The final site layout, including locations of sports areas, footpaths and roads will be determined in a site specific Masterplan for the development.
18	Member of the public	<p>Re proposal to build 150 homes on Burwell Road, Exning. Traffic wanting to go to Cambridge and even Ely will come through Burwell. In light of this will the Masterplan be revisited? Masterplan proposes 350 homes, Exning 150, makes 500 homes with 2 cars per home makes additional traffic of 1,000 cars per day. Hope you are not taking just Burwell into account, but looking at the 'bigger picture'.</p> <p>Both developments are on prime agricultural land – are we not heading for world food shortage?</p>	A Transport Assessment will need to be carried out before development commences to mitigate the impact of extra traffic. Officers have been in contact with colleagues at Forest Heath District Council throughout the Masterplan process.

			Housing need is an equally pressing need – site is a small amount of agricultural land
19	Member of the public	Masterplan refers to the Broads area to 'Broads Road Business Park'. How and when was this area designated as a business industrial area as no previous Local Plan shows this?	Is not a designated business area – will delete legend on map in Masterplan
20	Member of the public	<p>There is no reason to build more houses in Burwell on the scale suggested by the Masterplan. Population growth is not a foregone conclusion. As the existing older population diminishes there will be more vacant housing released.</p> <p>Farming is the main activity around Burwell, and we are facing increasing challenges in order to provide for us. Therefore it seems crazy to destroy Melton Farm to replace it with more housing. Could be used in future as farm shop outlet. Opposite Melton Farm is a lane which goes to the allotments, it could be used to provide access to the museum with parking at Melton Farm. Need pedestrian crossing in this area of Newmarket Road.</p> <p>350 new homes along Newmarket Road would in no way enhance the character of the village – it would be merely an urban dormitory place to live.</p>	<p>One of the issues with an ageing population is that people are living in their home for longer. Therefore, vacant housing is not released.</p> <p>Housing need is an equally pressing need – site is a small amount of agricultural land.</p> <p>Careful planning and design e.g. a mix of housing types at a low density will help to avoid this.</p>
21	Member of the public	Productive farmland should not be taken out of use and used for house building – houses should be built on brown field sites	Housing need is an equally pressing need.

		<p>Re creating more local employment – the expectation is over optimistic. Burwell is on the wrong location to attract businesses and lacks the infrastructure. My view is that part if not all the DS Smith site should be considered for housing.</p> <p>Cannot see that the need for another 478 homes is justified. An increase in people over 75 will still be living in existing homes or care homes and the number of children aged 0-14 and adults 25-64 is predicted to drop so why so we need to build 478 new homes?</p> <p>Concerns re access to new development from Ness Road. No properties face out onto it and it is screened by high garden fences and walls so it could become a focal point for antisocial behaviour. Is it fair to expose elderly and Ness Court residents to these potential problems? People in this locality would feel a lot happier if this land was put to another use. Though narrow, could design 2 sheltered accommodation bungalows one at either end with access from Ness Court and Holkham Mead. Alternatively the land could be fenced off and used as a wildlife refuge.</p> <p>The Housing Association that owns Ness Court and the sheltered accommodation bungalows was looking to extend – has this been taken into account?</p>	<p>Jobs figure is an ambitious target – DS Smith site is allocated for employment uses only.</p> <p>Housing numbers agreed by Working Party and supported in recent consultation. The Housing Register includes around 70 Burwell residents looking for housing.</p> <p>Access serves as an emergency access and must remain as such. It can be designed in such a way as to prevent it being a focal point for anti-social behaviour e.g. lighting etc</p> <p>Draft Masterplan to be amended to include space for expansion of Ness Court and Sheltered Housing</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Also concerns re parking – people may be tempted to use this pedestrian access and park cars in Ness Road, Baker Drive and Old School Close. These narrow roads are not suitable for any significant degree of street parking.</p> <p>Under heading of transport – should be some sort of direct public transport access to Addenbrookes as existing public transport is very slow.</p>	<p>Can be prevented with yellow lines/other traffic measures.</p> <p>Need for improved public transport is referred to in draft Masterplan</p>
22	Member of the public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Largely in agreement with proposed spacial planning for the village. Encouraged by recognition of need for quality as well as affordable housing and importance of organic growth rather than large scale development.</li> <li>• Pleased the plan acknowledges the importance of variety in the street scene and benefits of using local builders and good mix of dwelling design and building materials.</li> <li>• Hope Masterplan will encourage appropriate development and the planning authority will continue to encourage small scale development of individual empty sites whether these are located inside or outside the village envelope.</li> </ul>	Noted – Masterplan does allow for some infill development
23	Member of the public	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Wants development envelope behind their house at North Street put back to ‘pre 1988 position’ as has planning permission for 2 dwellings and would like more room to build them</li> <li>2) New development of 350 homes would benefit from 5% allocation of self builds for local purchase only to aid homeownership for Burwell young adults and diversity to the built form of dwellings.</li> <li>3) The road infrastructure outside the new estate does not show how it will cope at peak times.</li> <li>4) Further fen edge protection unnecessary as is already protected by planning process and conservation area. Do not believe the introduction of new criteria is justified in any form.</li> <li>5) Support marina proposal if it can be achieved on a single storey with natural (possibly wood) finish, to limit its impact on the area. Will be good for local youth employment, exercise and leisure.</li> </ol>	<p>Detailed development envelope is not an issue for the Masterplan.</p> <p>Masterplan includes proposals for an element of self-build</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be needed to inform the most appropriate road infrastructure needed for the new site.</p>

			No further fen edge protection is proposed. The Green edge is a reiteration of the 'open countryside' policy already in place and highlights a key element of the vision for Burwell.
--	--	--	---

**Petition**

Title 'Residents of Baker Drive oppose proposed plan of sports field and car park behind properties and any housing development'

92 valid signatures (13 discounted as name, full address and signature not given)

Covering letter included following points:

- Many residents unaware of Masterplan and not enough public input into draft plan.
- Concerned about proposed location of sports pitches in close proximity to sheltered housing.
- The vulnerability of the elderly occupants of Ness Court must be taken into account.
- Proposals mean good agricultural land will be lost at a time of concern on global food scarcity.
- No indication given of how open spaces will be protect from anti-social behaviour.
- Ness Court expansion not included on plan.
- Concerned that proposed access between 32-34 Ness Road will become area for anti-social behaviour.
- Can the opening of the access between 32-24 Ness Road be given careful consideration and ensure there is no vehicular access.
- Vitally important that plans for expansion of Ness Court and bungalow for the elderly be included in the Masterplan
- Impact of extra traffic using the sports facilities will cause further pollution, noise and nuisance

**APPENDIX 5****Impact and Needs/Requirements Assessment (INRA)**

<b>Name of Policy:</b>	Burwell Masterplan
<b>Lead Officer (responsible for assessment):</b>	Infrastructure and Projects Officer
<b>Department:</b>	Development Services
<b>Others Involved in the Assessment (i.e. peer review, external challenge):</b>	Sustainable Development Team
<b>Date INRA Completed:</b>	19/12/12

**'Policy' needs to be understood broadly to include all Council policies, strategies, services, functions, activities and decisions.**

**(a) What is the policy trying to achieve?** i.e. What is the aim/purpose of the policy? Is it affected by external drivers for change? What outcomes do we want to achieve from the policy? How will the policy be put into practice?

The purpose of the Burwell Masterplan is to suggest a strategic framework for managing the future development of Burwell over the next 20 years. It provides a comprehensive plan to enhance the village, showing how modest growth can be accommodated and identifying the scope to improve the village infrastructure and services.

The development of a Masterplan for Burwell was undertaken because of the size of Burwell, its function as a key service centre, and various complex issues, such as primary school provision in the village.

Previous housing development without accompanying infrastructure has led to high levels of out commuting for work, congestion, and concerns about the capacity of local community facilities and services. The Burwell Masterplan seeks to set out a clear strategy for managing and planning modest growth of the village. It proposes a controlled level of growth to provide the population base to support new facilities and services, alongside an ambitious jobs growth target to provide local jobs. It also contains proposals to ensure that essential infrastructure is in place to support the new development.

Following extensive consultation, the Burwell Masterplan is due to be formally adopted by East Cambridgeshire District Council in February 2013 as its longer term vision for the future development of Burwell. It does not have the status of a formal planning document, but can be taken into account as a material consideration in the assessment of planning applications. The proposals in the Masterplan have informed the Village Vision for Burwell which forms part of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, which is a statutory planning document.

The Masterplan vision for the future development of Burwell is:

"In 2031 Burwell will be a thriving rural community with a variety of local shops, services and employment that has retained its village character and community support networks".

There are twelve development objectives in the Masterplan - these reflect the issues and challenges which the local community have indicated that the Burwell Masterplan needs to address:

1. Retention of the rural village character, in terms of both size of village and community networks.
2. Provide for modest development over the plan period to 2031
3. Ensure new development is in keeping with the character of the village, reflecting its distinctive

- design characteristics and with densities that respect the rural tradition of the village.
4. Ensure new housing developments contain a mix of housing, in terms of tenure, size, and affordability.
  5. Address the traffic volume and speeding issues as new development takes place, seeking to promote walking and cycling wherever possible, and find alternative public transport solutions to address the current limited bus service.
  6. Promote a pattern of village development that encourages walking and cycling and minimises use of the car.
  7. Facilitate the creation of additional employment/office sites of mixed size in Burwell.
  8. Ensure sufficient primary school places are provided for the planned future size of the village.
  9. Facilitate the maintenance and improvement of the existing community facilities in the village and seek to consolidate outdoor sports facilities on a single site.
  10. Provide for modest development of tourism infrastructure facilities, but do develop Burwell as a tourism centre.
  11. Manage the impact of development on ecology, archaeology and the landscape and promote areas of open space for informal recreation.
  12. Protect the open and rural nature of the western green edge of Burwell facing onto the fens.

**(b) Who are its main beneficiaries?** i.e. who will be affected by the policy?

The community of Burwell, the surrounding villages and the East Cambridgeshire community generally will be affected by the Burwell Masterplan. That is, the people who live in Burwell and in the surrounding villages, work or own businesses in the area, students who attend schools in Burwell, as well as visitors to the town. It is intended that the Masterplan will benefit as many people as possible. There may also be some impact on the neighbouring district of Forest Heath, in particular the village of Exning and Newmarket.

The main stakeholders in the policy are:

Local residents

Local businesses

Local workforce

Local authorities, including East Cambridgeshire District Council, Burwell Parish Council, Parish Councils in surrounding areas, Cambridgeshire County Council, Forest Heath District Council, Suffolk County Council.

Local landowners

Other statutory agencies, utilities and organisations, for example Environment Agency, Sustrans, Network Rail, local bus companies, NHS Cambridgeshire, and the Greater Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership.

**(c) Is the INRA informed by any information or background data (quantitative or qualitative)?** i.e. consultations, complaints, applications received, allocations/take-up, satisfaction rates, performance indicators, access audits, census data, benchmarking, workforce profile etc.

Substantial consultation was carried out with all of these groups during the development of the masterplan to ensure that they had the opportunity to put forward their views on the future development of Burwell.

This consultation work included a questionnaire and public exhibitions at each stage of the Masterplan process and information was available on the District Councils website. 678 people attended the public exhibitions and 869 people submitted written or questionnaire responses to the consultation documents. Burwell Masterplan Working Party meetings were held in Burwell and were very well attended by local residents.

Presentations and displays were also given at Neighbourhood Panel meetings during the Masterplan process and at 'Burwell at Large'. Meetings have also been held with key stakeholder organisations.



Desk top research was also carried out using Census data, Cambridgeshire County Council Research Group data and other data accessed via the Local Futures website.

**(d) Does this policy have the potential to cause an impact (positive, negative or neutral) on different groups in the community, on the grounds of (please tick all that apply):**

**Ethnicity**  
**Gender**  
**Disability**

X
X
X

**Age**  
**Religion and Belief**  
**Sexual Orientation**

X
X
X

**Please explain any impact identified (positive, negative or neutral):** i.e. What do you already know about equality impact or need? Is there any evidence that there is a higher or lower take-up by particular groups? Have there been any demographic changes or trends locally? Are there any barriers to accessing the policy or service?

This section examines the extent to which the Burwell Masterplan will have a positive, negative or neutral impact on different groups in the community.

**Ethnicity**

The Burwell Masterplan proposals do not seek to deliberately exclude or promote any of the ethnic groups and none of the proposals have any ethnic significance. All ethnic groups will be equally affected the Masterplan proposals. The Burwell Masterplan does not specifically address the need for traveller sites – however this is fully covered by other statutory Council documents.

In respect of the Burwell Masterplan consultation processes, language and cultural barriers can make it harder for ethnic groups to actively participate and influence the development of the Masterplan. A full page insertion in the Burwell Masterplan document makes clear that a free translation service is available from the Council – to date no requests have been made for this service.

Conclusions – the impact of the Burwell Masterplan in terms of ethnicity should be positive, with no differentiation between ethnic groups.

**Gender**

The Burwell Masterplan should not have either a markedly positive or negative differential impact in terms of gender equality. Both genders will be equally affected by the Masterplan proposals.

Conclusions – the impact of the Littleport Masterplan in terms of gender should be positive, with no differentiation between genders.

**Disability**

Some of the Masterplan proposals relate to transport, and this will impact of those with disabilities. These could be both positive and negative impacts. For example, the Masterplan places considerable emphasis on developing public transport provision – this will benefit those who are unable to drive, but may be more restrictive for those whose mobility problems prevent them from using public transport and are reliant on cars. The Masterplan recommends that car related transport provision also needs to be addressed as well as public transport. Similarly the Masterplan proposes modest housing growth in Burwell – this could have positive impacts in respect of opportunities to require developers to provide specially adapted housing for those with disabilities, but negative impacts if the health infrastructure is not in place to meet the additional demands from housing growth. The Masterplan recommends that infrastructure should be put in place alongside new housing growth. On going identification of and mitigation against adverse impacts will need to be identified as the strategic ideas in the masterplan are taken forward to a more detailed level of

planning.

Conclusions – the Burwell Masterplan proposals could have both positive and negative impacts for those with disabilities and this will depend on how the detail of specific proposals are worked up. This Masterplan is not, in itself, discriminatory. However, in view of the potential for adverse impacts, subsequent more detailed plans and the statutory planning processes will need to monitor this and ensure that any necessary mitigating factors are put into place.

**Age**

Burwell and East Cambridgeshire as a whole has an ageing population. The Masterplan proposals will address the needs of many different people from many different age groups. The proposed enhancements to green open spaces will improve access to the countryside for all groups, attracting more local employment will benefit those of working age, enhancement of the public transport and pedestrian and cycleway networks will benefit a range of age groups. The Masterplan has noted the ageing profile, and notes the need for expansion of provision of community facilities with easy access and medical and community centres. Future more detailed plans could also require the provision of lifetime homes in new housing development and/or expansion of expansion of Ness Court and sheltered housing.

The consultation process sought to involve young people through a specific consultation with the local school. The older age groups were well represented in responses to the consultations.

Conclusions – the Burwell Masterplan proposals should have a positive impact on all age groups.

**Religion and Belief**

There is no evidence that the Burwell Masterplan will have any unequal impact in terms of local people’s religion and belief. The Burwell Masterplan does not deliberately exclude or promote any groups on the basis of religious beliefs. All community groups will be equally affected by the Masterplan proposals.

Conclusions - the impact of the Burwell Masterplan in terms of religion should be neutral, with no differentiation between those of different religious beliefs.

**Sexuality**

There is no evidence that the Burwell Masterplan will have any unequal impact in terms of local people’s sexuality. The Burwell Masterplan does not deliberately exclude or promote gays, lesbians or bisexual people. All community groups will be equally affected by the Masterplan proposals.

Conclusion – the impact of the Burwell Masterplan in terms of sexuality should be neutral, with no differentiation between the different groups.

This assessment concludes that there is no specific evidence that the implementation of the Burwell Masterplan will have direct adverse impact on any of the target groups or will discriminate by way of ethnicity, gender, disability, age, sexuality or religion.

When the Masterplan concepts are further developed, any disproportionate impact or adverse effect arising from a scenario that has not been possible to predict can be mitigated against in the more detailed policy documents and through the use of planning conditions and planning obligations in the statutory development control process. On going monitoring can be put in place for this.

**(e) Does the policy have a differential impact on different groups?**

<b>NO</b>
<b>NO</b>

**(f) Is the impact *adverse* (i.e. less favourable) on one or more groups?**

**(g) Does it have the potential to disadvantage or discriminate unfairly against any of the groups in a way that is unlawful?**

<b>NO</b>
-----------

**(h) What additional information is needed to provide a clear picture of how the activity is impacting on different communities and how will you collect this information, i.e. expert groups, further research, consultation\* etc?** Where there are major gaps in information that cannot be addressed immediately, these should be highlighted in your recommendations and objectives at the end of the INRA.

The Burwell Masterplan contains a number of proposals and as such any activity will have to be assessed as individual projects are developed and delivered.

Any activity that occurs as a result of the Burwell Masterplan will have to adhere to government planning policy which sets out the requirement for planning policies to ensure that the impact of development on the social fabric of communities is considered, seek to reduce social inequalities, address accessibility for all members of the community including particular requirements relating to age, sex, ethnic background, religion, disability or income.

The Burwell Masterplan has been prepared in line with this plan guidance and mitigation measures to prevent disproportionate impact have been built into the plan's development principles so far as is possible with a strategic document such as this.

\* The Consultation Register is available to assist staff in consulting with the Council's stakeholders. If you are consulting on a new or revised policy contact the Principal HR Officer.

**(i) Do you envisage any problems with these methods of information collection?** i.e. not accessible to all, timescale not long enough to obtain all of the necessary information, translation facilities not available, insufficient resources etc.

No - it will be a requirement of the planning application.

**(j) If it has been possible to collect this additional information, summarise the findings of your research and/or consultation (please use a separate sheet if necessary).**

N/A

**(k) What are the risks associated with the policy in relation to differential impact and unmet needs/requirements?** i.e. reputation, financial, breach of legislation, service exclusion, lack of resources, lack of cooperation, insufficient budget etc.

Lack of funding to implement projects or provide necessary infrastructure/services could result in differential impact and unmet needs/requirements.

Lack of cooperation from landowners and service providers to implement projects or provide necessary infrastructure/services could result in differential impact and unmet needs/requirements.

**(l) Use the information gathered in the earlier stages of your INRA to make a judgement on whether there is the potential for the policy to result in unlawful discrimination or a less favourable impact on any group in the community, and what changes (if any) need to be made to the policy.**

Option 1:	No major changes, the evidence shows no potential for discrimination.	X
Option 2:	Adjust the policy to remove barriers or to better promote equality.	
Option 3:	Continue the policy despite potential for adverse impact or missed opportunity to promote equality.	
Option 4:	Stop and remove the policy – if the policy shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination it must be stopped and removed or changed.	

**(m) Where you have identified the potential for adverse impact, what action can be taken to remove or mitigate against the potential for the policy to unlawfully discriminate or impact less favourably on one or more communities in a way that cannot be justified?** Include key activities that are likely to have the greatest impact (max. 6). Identified actions should be specified in detail for the first year but there may be further longer term actions which need to be considered. To ensure that your actions are more than just a list of good intentions, include for each: the person responsible for its completion, a timescale for completion, any cost implications and how these will be addressed. It is essential that you incorporate these actions into your service plans.

N/A

This completed INRA will need to be countersigned by your Head of Service. **Please forward completed and signed forms to Nicole Pema, Principal HR Officer.**

All completed INRAs will need to be scrutinised and verified by the Council's Equal Opportunities Working Group (EOWG) and published on the Council's Intranet to demonstrate to local people that the Council is actively engaged in tackling potential discrimination and improving its practices in relation to equalities. Please be aware that you will be asked to attend a half-an-hour session to summarise the findings of the INRA to the EOWG Verification panel.

**Signatures:**

**Completing Officer:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Head of Service:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_