

**North West Cambridge University's Development Community Group****Minutes of meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2010  
at Wolfson Court, Girton College, Cambridge****Those present:**

Rev Janet Bunker, The Parish of the Ascension (JB) CHAIR  
Cllr John Reynolds, Chairman and Leader of the Conservative Group (JR)  
Cllr Tania Zmura, Cambridge City Council (TZ)  
Morcom Lunt, Windsor Road Residents Association (ML)  
Cllr Thomas Bygott, South Cambridgeshire District Council (TB)  
Brian Walker, Castle Community Action Group/ WIRE (BW)  
Tania Craig, Cambridge Transport Forum (TC)  
Adrian Howell, North West Cambridge Project (AH)  
Heather Topel, AECOM (HT)  
Katie Fleming, Communications Team, North West Cambridge Project (KF)

1. Introductions were made and the minutes of the last meeting agreed.

2. HT gave a presentation on 'Community Cohesion.'

The group asked the following questions:

**Q** If there are to be 3,000 dwellings what is the approximate number of people who will live on the site? (JR)

**A** 6,500 (HT)

**Q** Of the 1,500 university dwellings what will be the breakdown of those living there – staff, visiting academics etc (TB)

**A** The University is still working on its allocations policy. To be eligible a person will have to have a contract with the University, a college or a partner organisation for a certain number of hours per week. Affordability is also being taken into consideration. There will be no particular distinction for visiting professors or particular colleges. (HT)

**Q** Is it likely to be a mix of ancillary and professional staff? (TB)

**A** Contract research staff on one to three year contracts – a high number will go to them, a small number will go to academics and about a quarter to ancillary staff. (HT)

**Q** What child yield is the school provision based on? (JR)

**A** We have been discussing this with officers from the county and are looking at 2.3. The key workers are more likely to have more children. Contract research staff are historically less likely to have children. There are plans for there to be 3 nurseries on site – one located with the primary school and the two others in other parts of the site. (HT)

**Q** You need to make sure that you are assessing performance over a number of years as the numbers may change. (JR)

**A** Occupation of the scheme will be monitored. (HT)

**Q** What space will be available in the community centre? (ML)

**A** The detail hasn't been worked up yet. The size is standard for a community centre serving this size of community. When the detail is worked up there may be some consultation with key groups who will use this facility. The area allowed is actually too big to for just a community hall but too small for a community hall and sports provision. We will be looking at other possible partnerships for the space to make it as multifunctional as possible. (HT)

There is also another area north of the Ridgeway where the nursery is outlined to be which may also have ancillary facilities like a cafe – we are allowing as much flexibility as possible. (HT)

**Q** Is there joined up thinking on the facilities provided by other operators, for example could the police be part of another facility. In the future it is likely that there will not be much money around so we need to make sure we are looking at economical solutions which work well. (JR)

**A** We want the facilities to be used to the best effect. There is still a need to resolve some of the mechanics. None of this is being fixed for planning – the ideas being presented today are for illustrative purposes. There is nothing to preclude discussions along the lines being suggested re co-location of complementary facilities. (HT)

LA officers are keen to engage in discussions about this but we need to remain focused on the outline for the timebeing. (AH)

**Q** There needs to be a long term delivery plan – we need facilities which can grow with need. (JR)

**A** This is true. However there is some concern about overprovision in the initial phases. (AH)

**Q** On your response to the consultation on the food store policy there are two points. Firstly is there a lot of surface level parking planned and secondly can we make sure that there are not huge monolithic walls which are very dominant? (TB)

**A** There is surface level parking but it is hidden from the street and it is split level, not facing onto the main route.

We want to make sure that the approach to the facade of the supermarket does not have monolithic walls facing onto open spaces or the market square – we want a facade onto the market square which shows activity and generates a buzz. (HT)

Our aspiration for a supermarket is that we want one which matches our green credentials. (AH)

**Q** On parking although underground can be more expensive it is important to consider the value of the surface parking land (TB)

**A** There has been a detailed analysis conducted on this and there is some underground parking elsewhere on the scheme. (AH)

**Q** Will there be flood lighting which impinges on the M11? (BW)

**A** This is not an issue – there are no specific proposals for this but if they do come forward we would need to look at impact on M11. (HT)

**Q** Are the sports fields replacing other college ones? (ML)

**A** No – these are purely for this community.

**Q** Will they be set up as playing fields but not fenced off? (TB)

**A** They will need to be made as open as possible. The school fencing will be screened by hedges.

**Q** Where there are facilities on the north side of Huntingdon Road, I am not convinced that there is enough safety for crossing Huntingdon Road? (JR)

**A** We will need to make sure that this happens. A staggered junction has been agreed and these facilities won't work without a safe crossing. The University will need to talk to the County and will also be looking at public transport. (HT)

Our biggest concern is cyclists and safety audits will pick up on this issue around both Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road. (AH)

**Q** We need to consider convenience as well as safety (TC)

**A** A single stage system is probably best. (HT)

**Q** This is a massive development which will impact heavily. Are there any plans to talk to Girton?

**A** There is ongoing communication with Girton Parish Council (KF)

3. AH then gave a project update on the following issues:

#### **A14**

The cancellation of the scheme has been disappointing to the project, especially since there is no clear plan B at the moment. This is obviously also wider than just the North West Cambridge Project.

There have been meetings with the County Council and the Highways Agency and everyone is being very constructive in trying to find a way forward.

Our transport specialists have also been meeting with those from the County and the Highways Agency regarding rerunning the modelling to account for the present situation. It is hoped that an agreed way forward can be found on this before Christmas and that all agencies can buy into a methodology for remodelling to take place in January and mitigation to be considered in February. This is a very tight timescale but it is positive that everyone is actively trying to find a solution.

#### **Timetable**

The project is keen to limit any delay. The University's internal processes can be time consuming therefore the approval process needs to begin in March.

The team are finalising first drafts of some key documents in December and submitting them in mid January. The aim is to get as much consensus as possible before formal submission. This is important as the University wants to keep delays to a minimum and is aiming to get a determination by the end of 2011.

#### **Noise and air quality**

Meetings are taking place with officers before Christmas on noise, cycling and drainage to take the discussion on these areas forward.

There will be lots happening over the next few months to share information with local authority officers.

The group asked the following questions:

**Q** Looking at both NIAB and NWC – I thought that the Highways Agency had put a cap on the amount of development allowed because of the A14 situation. (JB)

**A** We are different to NIAB because they have the decision to grant for 350 units. The section 106 is still under discussion because of the limit before the A14 goes ahead. NIAB's concern is about the future if it can't complete.

We are very different and our traffic profiling is very different, as many of the dwellings on our site will not generate traffic. The key workers will either work within our site or else at the University where there is no parking available at the other end. Students are also constrained and very low traffic generators.

Real issue is employment use and as part of our travel plan we measure trip generation. It looks at peak time and also at the A14 and our impact on the A14 was already minimal. However this obviously needs to be as little as possible.

There is also a reasonable chance that something will have happened around the A14 by the time our site is ready to go up. (AH)

**Q** There needs to be more analysis done around the arrangements on Huntingdon Road at peak time. (JR)

**A** Huntingdon Road is key and there are other issues to consider like the Park and Ride and the nuances of how this will all work. There are lots of subtleties. If the A14 is not expanded there will need to be a close look at the other routes people take to avoid congestion.

**Q** This land has been in the green belt for 50 years to protect the city and I am upset that there is a nibble here and a nibble there being taken out of it meaning there is no coherent green belt around Cambridge. I understand that it is beneficial for the economy but it is nibbling away at the quality of life.

**A** The AAP has been adopted so this has been discussed. The public currently have no access to that area and this scheme should give lots more access. We understand and respect the view being expressed but there will be lots of open space for the public and the University is committed to high quality implementation to ensure that the quality of the environment is maintained. (AH)

**Q** How do we get in touch if we have questions?

**A** KF to circulate the relevant details.

#### **6. Topics for future discussion**

JB suggested that as many of the group had had to leave before the end of the meeting that suggestions were invited by email when the minutes were circulated.

#### **7. Next meeting**

JB suggested again that dates should be proposed in the email with the minutes and a decision made that way.

ENDS