

## **BURWELL MASTERPLAN WORKING PARTY MINUTES**

Minutes of a Meeting held at Mandeville Hall, Tan House Lane, Burwell on Wednesday 7 December 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 Sustainable Development Officer  
Sally Bonnett – Infrastructure and Projects Officer  
Melanie Sage – Democratic Services Officer  
Jane Thompson - Infrastructure Programme Manager  
John Goodricke – Anglian Water  
Mungo Graham – Anglian Water  
Paul Bland – Huntingdonshire District Council  
Michael Huntington – Huntingdonshire District Council

District Councillor Michael Allan

34 members of the public

### 28. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

The following questions had been received prior to the meeting from Chris Stolberg and were read out by the Chairman:

1. Will the Working Party please give the people of Burwell Village an assurance that the amount of all monies/funds raised as a result of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) from developers building in Burwell will be made known to the people of Burwell?
2. Will the Working Party assure the people of Burwell that all such monies/funds from the CIL will be spent on Burwell projects within a clearly stated period of time, and that the funds raised/costs of improvements and developments will be made transparent to the people of Burwell?
3. Will the Working Party give the people of Burwell their promise/assurance that no part of Burwell's CIL monies/funds will be retained by any Authority e.g. East Cambridgeshire District Council or Cambridgeshire County Council for any other purpose, including investment?

In response the Chairman confirmed that the money obtained via the CIL would be known and transparent to the residents of Burwell. However, it was not known if the money would be spent in Burwell or for any other purpose. The Chairman explained

that work regarding the CIL was underway and he noted that the County Council had requested that a proportion of the CIL monies be allocated to education provision. Discussions regarding this matter were currently being held.

Councillor Brown further added that from a County Council perspective a number of children from Burwell attended the secondary schools at Soham and Bottisham. Councillor Williams MBE clarified that the 'meaningful proportion' of CIL money allocated to the Parish Council would be retained within the Parish.

29. **APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies for absence received.

30. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

31. **MINUTES**

It was resolved:

That the minutes of the Burwell Masterplan Working Party meeting of 3 November 2011 be confirmed as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

32. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman made no announcements.

33. **PRESENTATION BY ANGLIAN WATER**

The Burwell Masterplan Working Party received a presentation on the Burwell Waste Water Treatment Works from John Goodricke, Project Manager and Mungo Graham, Process Engineer, who were consultants to Anglian Water. A summary of the presentation is as follows:

- A graph depicting the Final Effluent Quality for 2010/2011 was displayed which illustrated the Environment Agency quality standards, known as Consent Levels, and the actual levels achieved during this period. The levels measured Total Suspended Solids, Biological Oxygen Demand and Ammonia.
- A graph depicting the Total Daily Discharged Flow for 2009/2010 was displayed including the Consent Levels for Dry Weather Flow and Flow to Full Treatment.
- During 2010 – 2015 Anglian Water had obligations to implement phosphorous removal from discharged effluent from 29 of its Waste Water Treatment Works.
- Phosphorous in effluent caused accelerated eutrophication in watercourses resulting in increased plant growth, a reduction in dissolved oxygen content and harm to many fish and aquatic organisms.

- At the Burwell Waste Water Treatment Works the proposed phosphorous removal scheme was driven by the Water Framework Directive introduced by the European Union and enforced by the Environment Agency.
- Initial assessment of the flow and effluent quality data indicated that Burwell Waste Water Treatment Works had insufficient load and flow to operate efficiently. The current population that the Waste Water Treatment Works serviced and the treatment capacity of the existing process units verified this. For example the current primary settlement tanks were designed to treat 82 litres per second. However, the current average flow was 12 litres per second.
- Lack of flow resulted in:
  - Excessive retention time in the primary settlement tanks causing septicity and resulting in the production of additional load to be treated;
  - Low flow rate in the trickling filters causing media to dry out and resulting in a loss of biological treatment capacity;
  - Excessive retention time in the humus settlement tanks causing carry over of suspended solids.
- Biological treatment works such as Burwell Waste Water Treatment Works had a hierarchy of reactions, first was the reduction of Biological Oxygen Demand and the second was the reduction of ammonia.
- Ammonia treatment capacity was compromised by low flow as additional Biological Oxygen Demand load was produced in the primary settlement tanks. The septic environment created in the primary settlement tanks must be corrected before nitrification occurs to treat the ammonia. Consequently tertiary filters were installed at Burwell Waste Water Treatment Works to remove ammonia.
- Sizing the works to treat maximum flows severely compromised the effectiveness of the treatment capacity at normal flow rates.
- On assessing the published growth predictions for 2031 it was suggested that the Flow to Full Treatment Consent Level should be reduced from the current 71 litres per second to 41 litres per second to allow the storm flows to be balanced and gradually treated once a storm had subsided.
- 41 litres per second was the capacity of one Primary Settlement Tank and would correct the issue of additional Biological Oxygen Demand formation and septicity.
- The introduction of additional flows from Reach Waste Water Treatment Works assisted in resolving the low flow problem and were accounted for within the proposed 41 litres per second Flow to Full Treatment Consent Level.
- An Urban Pollution Management study was conducted to assess the impact of the proposed reduction of the Flow to Full Treatment Consent Level to 41 litres per second. This study was presented and verified by the Environment Agency. The Urban Pollution Management study confirmed that there would not be any deterioration to the watercourse and also confirmed that the proposed storm storage capacity of 354m<sup>3</sup> would not result in storm spills into the watercourse during an average year.
- An illustration depicting the site layout of the Burwell Waste Water Treatment Works was displayed and the proposed modifications were highlighted and explained.

Councillor Kilbey enquired why low flow was experienced at Burwell Waste Water Treatment Works. It was explained that the actual flow was not low for the population size. However, the Waste Water Treatment Works were too large for the

capacity it received, hence the low flow. Councillor Kilbey enquired of the impact the proposed modifications would have on the capacity of the Waste Water Treatment Works should the population of Burwell increase. It was explained that additional flow would increase the current performance of the Waste Water Treatment Works and the proposed modifications were based on the predicted population growth figures in Burwell for 2031 of 6089 people (in 2010 the Burwell population was 5780) and in Reach for 2031 of 267 people (in 2010 the Reach population was 253).

Councillor Brown noted that within the Council's Local Development Framework documents Anglian Water had stated that they could not support any development of the Burwell Waste Water Treatment Works until 2014 at the earliest. In response it was explained that initially there had been some misunderstanding regarding this issue and the proposed modifications were a viable solution that would be undertaken during the 2010-2015 investment period.

The Chairman allowed members of the public to speak and in response to a question it was confirmed that storm water from roads was usually deposited into the rivers. In response to a further question from a member of public it was explained that the flow from Reach had been diverted to the Burwell Waste Water Treatment Works to increase the amount of flow and performance at the Works.

Councillor Williams MBE stated that the issue appeared to be that the population figure that had been initially supplied to Anglian Water had varied so significantly to the actual population that it had resulted in the construction of a Waste Water Treatment Works too large for the need. Councillor Williams MBE suspected that the County Council had not supplied the figures, as those supplied were usually accurate. Councillor Williams MBE therefore urged Anglian Water to verify the population figures that they were proposing to adapt the Burwell Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate. Councillor Williams MBE noted that the population growth was only predicted to grow by 300 people. However, Burwell was already experiencing the development of 28 dwellings per year.

The Chairman allowed members of the public to speak. A member of the public noted that storm flow had been a concern. However, suggested that dryness was more of an issue. It was explained that the media within the Waste Water Treatment Works was drying out due to the low flow rate and that recirculation within system had improved this issue. It was noted that the site had never yet needed to discharge its storm water.

A member of public assumed that there was some flexibility within the predicted population growth figures so that issues would not occur at the Waste Water Treatment Works if the population in Burwell exceeded 6089. It was explained that there was not a set point in which the Waste Water Treatment Works failed and that the Waste Water Treatment Works processed in stages and it was the least stage that determined the capacity of the Works. It was explained that the main source of pollution was in the sludge, which was sitting in the system too long and impacting on the effluent treatment stage.

A member of public enquired of what would happen if the population reached 8,000. It was explained that the Waste Water Treatment Works would continue to work. However, the situation would require assessment.

A member of public noted that tankers had been transporting what had been assumed was sewage from the Waste Water Treatment Works. However, from the explanation that sludge was sitting in the system for too long, the member of public sought clarification that it was sludge and not sewage that was being transported out of Burwell. It was confirmed that tankers were transporting the sludge to Cambridge for advanced treatment.

In response to a question from a member of public it was explained that a new recirculation pump was installed at the Waste Water Treatment Works to ensure that the media was kept constantly moist. As a result of this recirculation there had been a 50% increase in the performance of the trickling filters. It was noted that should the flow experienced at the Works achieve nearer 41 litres per second there would not be a need for recirculation and the recirculation pump could then be deactivated.

In response to a question by the Infrastructure and Projects Officer, it was explained that the modifications to the Waste Water Treatment Works would commence in the New Year and be completed by June 2012.

A member of public referred to the Urban Pollution Management study that had confirmed that the proposed storm storage capacity of 354m<sup>3</sup> would not result in any storm spills into the watercourse during an average year. The member of public enquired of what would happen in the event of an above average year. It was explained that in exceptional circumstances storm water could be discharged directly into the watercourse. However, it was noted that the storm tanks at the Waste Water Treatment Works were of the best design.

The Chairman thanked Mr Goodricke and Mr Graham for their presentation.

#### 34. **BURWELL MASTERPLAN: FOCUS GROUPS FEEDBACK**

The Burwell Masterplan Working Party considered a report, L209 previously circulated, which summarised the feedback from the Burwell Masterplan Focus Groups.

The Infrastructure and Projects Officer explained that sessions were organised on 2 November, 9 November and 16 November, with a total of 46 people attending the three sessions. The purpose of the Focus Groups was to discuss the emerging key issues from the issues stage consultation, to gain participants views on these issues, to check if there were any issues that had been missed and to discuss any ideas or solutions to address some of the issues.

At each session the attendees were divided into three groups to discuss each of the topics in turn. The three discussion topics were 'new housing and business', 'transport and access' and 'facilities and tourism'. Full details of the process and issues discussed were attached as Appendix 1 of the officer's report.

The key conclusions from each of the discussion topics were as follows:

##### **New Housing and Business**

- Deciding the appropriate level of growth is the key priority.
- More 'affordable' housing should be provided with a mix of types, which included lower priced housing.

- Reach Road area identified as the preferred location for employment. The former DS Smith site was seen as an eyesore.
- The style of any new development should be sympathetic with the character of Burwell, attractive and low density but not necessarily traditional.

#### Transport and Access

- Traffic management required on Ness Road/High Street/Swaffham Road due to the volume of traffic at certain times.
- Pedestrian crossings needed on the main through route for safety reasons.
- Exning Bridge cycle route needs addressing urgently and consideration of any alternative routes to Newmarket.
- Public Transport solutions essential particularly for sixth form students and access to Addenbrookes. Also lack of weekend public transport.

#### Facilities and Tourism

- The Primary School was clearly a top priority, followed by sports facilities and facilities for young people.
- The emphasis should be on improving existing facilities rather than adding new ones.
- Many people thought that improvement of the lodges and tourism was much less important.
- There was much concern about the Burwell Bulletin finishing and the need to receive information about facilities and “what’s on” in the village.

It was resolved:

That the feedback from the Focus Groups be noted.

### 35. **BURWELL MASTERPLAN OPTIONS DEVELOPMENT**

The Burwell Masterplan Working Party received a report, L210 previously circulated, which requested that the Working Party discuss the ideas and emerging options received following a presentation by Mr Paul Bland and Mr Michael Huntington of Huntingdonshire District Council’s Urban Design Team.

The Principal Sustainable Development Officer explained that Huntingdonshire District Council’s Urban Design Team had been engaged to review the data which had been collected about Burwell from the desk top research and the issues stage public consultation, and to develop ideas about the options for the future development of the village.

The Burwell Masterplan Working Party received a presentation on the ideas that had been generated for development options for the Burwell Masterplan. A summary of the presentation is as follows:

- An illustration of Burwell was displayed that demonstrated that it was a linear village.
- Separate illustrations were displayed that indicated the conservation areas; the main areas of green spaces and areas of activity, such as shops and schools; major traffic routes through Burwell including major and secondary flow; main areas that had experienced development over the last 15 years.

- An illustration was displayed that provided examples of recent infill development at Myrtle Drive, land off Toyse Lane and land off Newmarket Road. It was noted that planning policy had recently changed to help prevent 'garden grabbing' as demonstrated in the infill development at land off Toyse Lane and land off Newmarket Road.
- Three Growth Scenarios had been developed. Growth Scenario 1 was infill only growth, which could provide an additional 128 houses if the current development rate in Burwell of 28 dwellings per year was maintained. However, it was difficult to find further opportunities for this type of development as much infill development had already occurred. There could be potential if greenfield development was considered, although this would not be appropriate to the west of Burwell due to the areas protected from growth.
- Growth Scenario 2 was achieved via a small amount of greenfield development and was a infill and low growth option. An illustration was displayed depicting this option of providing 100 dwellings to the north of Burwell. Pedestrian accesses, additional playing fields, traffic calming and traffic access through the development were illustrated.
- Growth Scenario 3 was a larger amount of greenfield development with a new three form entry school and community facilities to the east of Burwell providing approximately 210 – 275 dwellings.
- Due to the close proximity with Wicken an employment/tourism opportunity might also be available. The Wicken Fen Project was underway and as part of improving the vitality of Burwell it could be possible to develop a link with the village to this project. The lode was a viable waterway and a number of examples of similar developments were available across the country. The lode could also provide an opportunity for attractive and unique small business units.

Councillor Brown noted that within the Council's Local Development Framework documents an option similar to Growth Option 2 had been proposed and enquired why a smaller alternative option had not been proposed. It was explained that there were two potential areas for growth available regarding this option. One was indicated on the illustration as displayed to the north of Burwell. The other option was to the east of Burwell, by Felsham Chase.

Councillor Williams MBE stated that two different primary schools would not be an ideal option.

The Chairman allowed members of the public to speak. A member of public noted that officers had spent the longest time explaining Growth Scenario 3 and therefore enquired if this was the preferred option. The Chairman emphasised that no decision had been taken regarding the preferred option. Mr Huntington explained that the third option had taken the longest to explain as Growth Scenario 1 was infill only development and it was difficult to find areas for further development of this type, particularly as it was now easier for local authorities to object and refuse 'garden grabbing' planning applications. Mr Huntington reiterated that the area of growth identified on the illustration could also be applied to the east of Burwell, by Felsham Chase, which was indicated to the Working Party. It was also explained that the proposed location for a new school was suggested to encourage people to walk to the school.

Councillor Williams MBE emphasised that the Working Party were receiving the potential options for the future development of Burwell for the first time at tonight's meeting and that no decision had been made. The Infrastructure and Projects Officer noted that the following agenda item requested the Working Party to consider forms of public consultation regarding the potential development options for Burwell.

The Chairman allowed members of the public to speak, and in response to questions it was explained that housing density in Growth Scenario 3 could be amended and that a capacity study would be required.

A member of public acknowledged that with the Growth Scenarios the 'devil was in the detail' and suggested that the current school could be relocated to a new site and the original site developed into starter flats, with the playing fields being retained as public open space. However, it would be necessary to firstly know the amount of new development required to fund a new school to know if a new school was a realistic option. Mr Huntington noted that one major benefit with the suggested siting of the new school was that it was County Council owned land. A member of public noted that a new school was required due to the amount of children attending other local schools. Councillor Brown also noted that there was going to be an issue with accommodating the intake for the forthcoming academic year due to the number of children.

Councillor Williams MBE noted that Mr Huntington had explained during his presentation that the Burwell Masterplan would set a standard for what was expected from developers and she stated that previously the developer had guided development. Councillor Williams MBE also noted that Mr Huntington had suggested that future development could be at a lower density incorporating larger gardens. However, Councillor Williams MBE stated that such housing would therefore not be affordable.

The Chairman allowed members of the public to speak. A member of public referred to the illustration that indicated the traffic routes through Burwell including major and secondary flow and requested that the Fordham to Cambridge route be amended on the plan to indicate that it was a major traffic flow route. Councillor Brown suggested that to resolve this the illustrations include all traffic flow routes rather than differentiating the type of routes, which was agreed.

A member of public noted that a larger school would be the cheapest option. However, an increase in development in Burwell would result in an increase in congestion and any additional traffic to Cambridge via Stow-Cum-Quy would be a disaster due to the traffic calming measures through Stow-Cum-Quy. Councillor Williams MBE was of the opinion that the majority of Stow-Cum-Quy residents were pleased with the results of the traffic calming measures.

In response to a public question regarding who would make the final decision on the development options, the Chairman explained that the decision would be made based on the public consultation responses.

To conclude, the Principal Sustainable Development Officer summarised the debate that the ideas that had been generated for development options for Burwell should be further expanded including more details on the vitality of the options, as well as the educational and transport issues.



A member of public stated that the chosen option had to be affordable. A member of public also stated that the amount of new development required to fund a new school should be investigated and the most benefit for the village should be achieved with the least amount of development.

Councillor Brown requested that the ideas and emerging options that the Working Party had received at tonight's meeting also be presented to Burwell Parish Council.

It was resolved:

- i. That the Burwell Masterplan Working Party discussed the ideas and emerging options presented by Huntingdonshire District Council's Urban Design Team.
- ii. That additional work, as per the discussions, are required to further develop the proposals, which are to be reviewed again at a further Burwell Masterplan Working Party meeting prior to the public consultation.

36. **BURWELL MASTERPLAN: OPTIONS STAGE PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROPOSALS**

The Burwell Masterplan Working Party received a report, L211 previously circulated, detailing proposals for public consultation of the Burwell Masterplan options stage.

The Infrastructure and Projects Officer explained that a community questionnaire to obtain local people's views on the proposed options was to be produced detailing different scenarios for the future development of Burwell, which would ask people to select their preferred option. The Infrastructure and Projects Officer explained that the questionnaire would be available on-line via the District Council's website. However, the Working Party would need to consider alternative delivery options should they wish the questionnaire to be received by every household, as the Burwell Bulletin was no longer in circulation. One option was to use a delivery company, although this would cost approximately £420 plus printing costs. Alternatively questionnaires could be left in key locations around the village for people to collect, sent to community groups for distribution to their members, circulated via the Burwell Masterplan database that currently had contact details of just over 200 people and be made available at the 2 day exhibition. Collection of questionnaires would be via collection boxes located around the village, subject to agreement of premises owners.

It was suggested that the questionnaire could be delivered with a Burwell Community publication called 'Clunch'. The Infrastructure and Projects Officer explained that this had been considered. However, the 'Clunch' publication timetable did not coordinate with the Burwell Masterplan work programme.

The Chairman suggested that funding be identified to enable every household to receive a questionnaire. Councillor Williams MBE did not agree as there were other options for circulating the questionnaires, such as, being available in key locations around the village for people to collect and circulated via the Burwell Masterplan database.

The Infrastructure and Projects Officer explained that it was proposed that a Burwell Masterplan Options Exhibition be held over two days during the consultation period

on dates to include a Saturday from 9am – 2pm and a weekday from 3pm – 8pm. The purpose of the exhibition would be to allow local people to view and comment on the options proposed. The Infrastructure and Projects Officer enquired whether there were any weekdays that were preferable for the exhibition. Councillor Williams MBE suggested that Fridays were best avoided.

It was also proposed that officers contact a number of local shops and public buildings to seek their permission for an unmanned display regarding the Masterplan process to increase awareness of the public consultation.

Officers met with key stakeholders as part of the issues stage consultation and it was proposed that stakeholders be sent a copy of the options for comments rather than hold a meeting at this stage of the process.

The Infrastructure and Projects Officer explained it had been intended that the County Council Youth Development Co-ordinator would assist with consultation with young people in Burwell. However, it had not been possible to contact the Youth Development Co-ordinator. Both Councillors Brown and Williams MBE in their capacity as County Councillors would try to resolve this issue.

The Focus Groups had proved very popular and the Infrastructure and Projects Officer enquired whether the Focus Group approach should be repeated at this stage. The aim of a Focus Group was to explore issues in further depth, and the Working Party were asked to consider whether this was still relevant and useful at this options stage of the work. Councillor Williams MBE stated that further Focus Groups were not necessary as there were a number of other ways for people to feed into the consultation process.

To publicise and raise awareness of both the questionnaire and the drop-in event posters would be put up around the village and press releases submitted to the local newspapers. Councillor Williams MBE reminded officers to also publicise the public consultation of the Burwell Masterplan options stage on the Burwell website.

The Chairman allowed members of the public to speak. It was suggested that those that deliver 'Clunch' could be used to deliver the questionnaires and it was also suggested that the questionnaire be circulated with the free newspaper. The Infrastructure and Projects Officer explained that not every household in Burwell received the free newspaper.

It was resolved:

The Burwell Masterplan Working Party agrees with the consultation approaches being proposed for the public consultation work, with the exception of the questionnaire being delivered to every household and additional Focus Groups.

### 37. **BURWELL MASTERPLAN WORK PROGRAMME**

The Burwell Masterplan Working Party received a report, L212 previously circulated, detailing the work programme for the development of the Burwell Masterplan.

The Principal Sustainable Development Officer noted that public consultation of the Burwell Masterplan options stage was initially scheduled during January 2012.

However, given the discussions at the meeting regarding the ideas and emerging options following the presentation from Huntingdonshire District Council's Urban Design Team, the Principal Sustainable Development Officer explained that further work was required and therefore the public consultation of the Burwell Masterplan options stage would need to be scheduled at a later date. The Principal Sustainable Development Officer noted that a further Burwell Masterplan Working Party meeting would also need to be arranged.

On 3 and 4 March 2012 the Principal Sustainable Development Officer noted that a 'Burwell at Large' exhibition was scheduled which officers hoped to utilise as an opportunity to promote the Burwell Masterplan.

It was resolved:

That the work programme be noted.

The meeting concluded at 8.31pm.

### **CONCLUDING REMARKS**

The Chairman allowed a member of the public to make a final comment on the discussion of the meeting. A member of the public noted that the suggestion offered by Huntingdonshire District Council's Urban Design Team regarding development of the lode was an interesting idea, particularly for small business units and urged officers not to lose sight of this idea.