

## **BURWELL MASTERPLAN WORKING PARTY MINUTES**

Minutes of a Meeting held at Mandeville Hall, Tan House Lane, Burwell on Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2011 at 6:30pm.

### **PRESENT**

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

### **OTHERS**

Shirley Blake – Principal Sustainability Development Officer  
Sally Bonnett – Infrastructure & Projects Officer  
Adrian Scaites-Stokes – Democratic Services Officer

41 members of the public

#### 20. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

No questions were submitted through the Public Question time box.

#### 21. **APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

There were no apologies.

#### 22. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

County Councillor David Brown declared a personal interest in the matters to be discussed, as he was both a County Councillor and District Councillor.

#### 23. **MINUTES**

It was resolved:

That the minutes of the Burwell Masterplan Working Party meeting of 8 September 2011 be confirmed as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

#### 24. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman allowed Parish Councillor Pat Kilbey to address the meeting. This was the first meeting in this new hall and apologies were offered as not everything was yet in place. The fault with the outside lighting would be addressed shortly. If anyone noticed any other problems they were asked to report it to her.

The Chairman thanked the shops and facilities that had drop boxes and posters during the consultation in September. Thanks were also given to the Burwell Bulletin for circulating the questionnaire.

The Chairman asked that agenda items 6 and 7 be taken together.

25. **BURWELL MASTERPLAN – STAGE 1 CONSULTATION FEEDBACK REPORT and BURWELL MASTERPLAN – EMERGING ISSUES**

The Working Party considered a report, L167 previously circulated, which noted the feedback on identification of issues for the Burwell Masterplan.

The Infrastructure & Projects Officer reminded the Working Party that the questionnaire had gone to every house and had been available elsewhere to place in the drop boxes. A first focus group meeting had been held with more to follow. A total of 402 returns had been received, equating to a 15% return rate. Some questionnaires would be distributed at Bottisham Village College for students living in Burwell, to encourage more responses from the younger people. The Officer went through the highlights from the consultation feedback and made the following comments:

- 40% of respondents could not agree whether Burwell had improved over the past 5 years or not.
- Half thought that the centre of Burwell needed improvement.
- More facilities for younger people and better public transport were needed.
- Although sports facilities were good, a better swimming pool and different types of sports were needed.
- Children had been able to attend their school of choice but the primary school should be expanded.
- There was concern about the distance to the sixth form college.
- The views on more green space were mixed but their facilities needed improving.
- The riverside area was just ahead in the priority list for improvements and there was strong support for the weirs and lodes to be enhanced.
- There was a split opinion over tourism, with some people thinking Burwell could make more of its tourism potential whilst others did not wish Burwell to become a tourist centre.
- Traffic was a big issue with complaints that lorries and commuters were speeding and causing congestion.
- There was concern about the potential impact that any new bypass would have.
- Better routes to Exning and more pedestrian crossings were also required.
- There was some disagreement that housing growth would be needed.
- New business should be encouraged, to provide more employment.
- There was less support for hi-tech businesses or tourism.
- Overall the top three concerns were: traffic and congestion, no change or development, improve public transport.

Around 100 people attended the 'drop-in' event and had generated a lot of comments and ideas, which would go into the Options Stage. These included: some people liked the long sprawling character of Burwell with no main centre and requests for walking and cycling routes.

Some meetings had been held with stakeholders, with more to come. Anglian Water had declared that there would be no drainage or water issues with further development. The County Council expected the primary school to fill with a requirement for an extra class next year. Current traffic levels could not justify a new by-pass, although it was accepted that there were traffic and noise problems. It was noted that there was a shortage of some types of houses, there was limited business space and tourism infrastructure was needed.

Emerging issues included: housing, transport and traffic, primary school, tourism, jobs and business, youth and sport facilities, and the built environment.

The Committee considered a report, L168 previously circulated, which noted the issues in respect of the Burwell Masterplan.

The Principal Sustainable Development Officer advised the Working Party that a strong view had emerged that the village should not grow significantly. Potentially 172 dwellings could be built up to 2031, from developments in infill. Growth scenarios were now being developed, ranging from no new houses up to infill plus high growth levels. There was a high level of owner/occupied housing in the village but most demand was for 1 or 2 bedroom houses. The population was getting older as a whole, so more provision for the elderly could be needed.

Concern had been expressed about the volume and speed of traffic in Ness Road/High Street and how this should be managed. Lorries were also a key concern, as was parking near the clusters of shops. A dangerous bridge was highlighted that needed work. It was difficult to travel to Cambridge or Ely using public transport.

The primary school was currently 2 form entry but the County Council expected that to increase and temporary measures would be taken. Even low growth would put additional pressure on the school. 3 form entry was the favoured solution but the School Governors would have to be consulted.

There was some potential for modest tourism growth. There was also potential for enhancements linked to Wicken Fen. A marina had been suggested with potential for boat trips or riverside cabins. Business sites would be identified through the Masterplan but the preference would be to consolidate the existing retail businesses.

The next steps in the Masterplan process would be to hold focus groups, consider the primary school, meet local employers and to develop options or scenarios.

The Chairman then opened the meeting up for public participation. The public then asked a number of questions and made various statements:

- What does infill development mean?
- Would selling off the allotments be considered to help pay for further facilities?
- No growth would not generate an influx of the younger generation.
- There were 57 people on the Housing Register but if low growth was agreed that would mean they would not get a house in Burwell. As a village there was a need to be aware of the housing needs when considering growth.
- The County Council owned land along Newmarket Road and this could be used to build houses, thereby changing the demographics of the village. How could

the District Council be sure that the Government Minister would not overrule the local community and Councils to get houses built?

- Some Burwell people did not want a Masterplan so should not the Council put a stronger view across as to why it was needed? This point was not being transmitted to the people of Burwell.
- Burwell had previously had large scale developments with executive homes, but that sort of development was not wanted.
- Young people on low pay looking for homes could not get a mortgage, so youngsters were being lost to the village.
- There did not appear to be anything in the report about the effects of climate change on water supplies.
- What about the D S Smith factory site?
- It was noted that the planning laws were under review.
- Could a secondary school come to Burwell?
- Were people in favour of expanding the primary school up to 630 children? If so, would developers interpret this as Burwell wanting to expand?
- There was only one crossing that school children could use, which they used at the busiest times.
- Lorries caused a lot of congestion and nuisance. Perhaps their yard could be relocated near the A14

In response to these questions and statements, Members and officers of the Working Party made the following comments:

- Infill was deemed to be larger sites within the village boundary but specifically did not include gardens.
- If the allotments were used for housing this would have to be with the permission of the Secretary of State and other land for allotments would have to be found.
- The age profile for Burwell was available and the Principal Sustainable Development Officer would circulate with the minutes.
- The stronger and more robust the Masterplan was, the better the chance that it could be used to resist threats from developers or the Government. The system allowed developers to appeal against decisions and then the local documents, such as the Masterplan, would be tested.
- The Masterplan could address the sort of developments that came forward and help young people.
- A couple of developments had been built for the people in the community.
- The only area with development potential was the County Council-owned land which could accommodate 100 houses, 40 of which would be affordable.
- Anglian Water had informed the Parish Council that there was a problem, as the sewage works would not be upgraded.
- Officers had an appointment to meet D S Smith to discuss their site.
- A lot of growth would be needed for the introduction of a secondary school in Burwell.
- Road traffic figures were not high enough to justify a by-pass. This also had to be taken in comparison with other national priorities. There was also a concern that a by-pass would encourage more traffic.
- Exning bridge was a major issue.
- Not many responses had been received from young people but they should be asked what facilities they wanted.

- Officers had met Arts Development in East Cambridgeshire and the Youth Service, who had stated that facilities were lacking for the youth to hold activities and events.
- The high growth and no growth options should be taken out of the list of options to be considered.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the feedback that had been received to the Stage 1 Issues consultation work be noted;
- (ii) That the emerging issues which had been identified for further investigation by officers be noted.

27. **BURWELL MASTERPLAN WORK PROGRAMME**

The Committee considered a report, L99 previously circulated, which noted the work programme for the Burwell Masterplan.

It was resolved:

That the work programme be noted.

The meeting concluded at 8.04pm.