

## North West Cambridge Community Forum

### Minutes of meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010 at Wolfson Court, Girton College, Cambridge

Those present:

Clare Macrae, Cambridge Transport Forum (CM)

John Chaplin, Storeys Way RA (JC)

Kate Paterson, CRONC (KP)

Carolyn Gohler, Cambridge PPF (CG)

Cllr Simon Kightley, Cambridge City Council (SK)

Rev Janet Bunker, Parish of the Ascension (JB)

Rev Steve Holland, Girton Baptist Church (SH)

Alison Jones, Cambridgeshire Constabulary (AJ)

Cllr Tania Zmura, Cambridge City Council (TZ)

Cllr Thomas Bygott, SCDC (TB)

Cllr John Hipkin, Cambridge City Council (JH)

Lawrence Greene, NAFRA (LG)

Roger Taylor, Director, North West Cambridge Project (RT)

Sarah Peasley, Communications Team, North West Cambridge Project (SP)

1 Introductions were made and a welcome given to the first meeting of the North West Cambridge Community Forum. SP outlined the aims and objectives of the Forum – to allow the University and its neighbours to exchange information and views about the project. All those invited to take part in the Forum (and those who may want to join in future) have been asked to do so because they represent a constituent group within the local area of the University's site.

SP reported that the local authorities would be holding their own Forum to discuss issues pertaining to the wider North West Cambridge area later in the year and, as a result the University's Forum may well become redundant in due course. In the meantime it has been suggested that a new name might be chosen to indicate the site specific interests of this group. All to consider.

2 RT gave an update on the University's North West Cambridge scheme. The University is currently working on the updated masterplan for the site, moving towards the preparation of the outline planning application. The masterplan will be subjected to University

scrutiny over the next couple of months, with the intention that the planning application will be submitted in late November/early December.

It is hoped that a start on site could be made mid to late 2012 but much depends on the state of the housing market over the next year or so. The first phase will involve building the infrastructure for the site, the first units of accommodation are likely to be built in late 2013 – this accords with the AAP.

Using the presentation boards, RT outlined the key elements of the site. This included

- The parameters for development – purely outline blocks at the moment
- Access points and principal routes for traffic, cyclists and pedestrians.
- Key nodes such as the local centre
- Green spaces including the green ‘fingers’ through the scheme and their function in relation to drainage.

RT also outlined the how the management of the site would work particularly in relation to the green spaces and the parking – that developers would be granted 999 year leases and service charges would be levied for upkeep.

The first phase would include the road through the scheme from Madingley to Huntingdon Roads. A bus gate would be included in the central section and other design features eg surface treatments; narrowing and a 20mph speed limit would discourage rat-running.

Other elements of the first phase would include the circuitous road and Ridgeway route, as well as the building out of the supermarket, local shops, community facilities and key worker housing above, market square, hotel and the market housing behind Huntingdon Road, plus as much University housing as feasible at this stage.

RT explained why the University housing needed to be situated in contiguous areas in order to make use of the CHP plant which will service the University accommodation only.

**3** Questions were asked and responses given by RT.

**Q** Is the water ‘run-off’ strategy for the M11 side of the site proven to work? (CM)

**A** Yes – looked at many different examples of similar water attenuation internationally. The engineers are currently working on extreme storm conditions to make sure that the system is effective.

**Q** Concern about the drainage in Girton re Washpit Brook in light of problems in the past. What studies have been done? (SH)

**A** On-going work as part of the planning application. Intend to ensure maximum permeable drainage at upper levels. Want to re-use grey water as part of the

sustainability proposals. The A14 proposals are obviously a factor and this issue will no doubt be examined as part of that public hearing.

**Q** Will the playing fields maintain the Girton Gap separation? (TB)

**A** In terms of the Green Belt allocation, playing fields are a compatible use and the view from the Huntingdon Road will essentially remain the same.

**Q** Will the first 'line' of buildings help deflect noise from the M11? (SK)

**A** Yes, we believe that this will help. Noise modelling is currently being done. The southern section of the site is fine and the northern section readings will improve as the buildings are built out.

**Q** Could resurfacing on the M11 with specialist materials help reduce noise? (JC)

**A** Yes, potentially, but obviously a very expensive solution for the highways authorities.

**Q** Who would own the 'tertiary' roads? (LG)

**A** For each development plot, the developer would provide the roads and the service charge levied would pay for the upkeep. The University as freeholder would have oversight of the whole. We will provide design guidelines for the developers in creating these local roads and development within the serviced sites.

**Q** What about maintenance of these areas over time? (LG)

**A** The developer would set up a management company and appoint a managing agent. There would then be a multi-tier service charge whereby the University would collect and manage the whole site, and the managing company would collect its own service charge for elements within its control

**Q** How many management companies would there be? (LG)

**A** Possibly 8 or 9 (i.e. assuming one for each phase, although there are likely to be fewer in practice).

**Q** Within the district some developers have built roads to be adopted by the County and not surfaced them properly? How will this be avoided? (TB)

**A** All adoptable roads within the scheme will be built by the University. Small roads within the individual development 'packages' will be private and non-adoptable.

**Q** Concern about the impact of the development on Huntingdon Road – in particular will the incoming traffic be able to use the radial route to get the Madingley Park and Ride? (JH)

**A** Yes, they could come through that way but it won't be a straightforward route, as engineering design will provide traffic calming.

**Q** As the wider Cambridge area grows, including the development at Northstowe, more workers will be travelling into the city looking for parking and the road will be permanently congested with people looking for Park and Ride spaces. (JH)

**A** We understand that Northstowe will have its own Park and Ride and there will be new bus routes in place. However, we are aware that this is a key issue for local people. Our own traffic assessments are being prepared at the moment, and I suggest that we arrange for our transport consultants to attend a Forum meeting to answer your detailed highways questions.

**Q** How do we know the bus gate will operate effectively – eg at the extended Science Park this is not the case? (CM)

**A** The operation of the bus gate will be part of the Section 106 agreement, within an adopted road.

**Q** Potentially the greatest traffic impact will be on Storeys Way, a Park and Ride like the one at Bar Hill is needed (SK)

**A** The wider impact on traffic in the whole northern sector is obviously outwith our control – we are a modest part of the overall growth – the predicted figure in the AAP is that by 2025 we will have added no more than 1% of traffic to the road network.

**Q** What about the supermarket? (SK)

**A** The supermarket will be slightly smaller than the Waitrose in Trumpington Road. A store of this size will stop people getting in cars and travelling out of the area to do their shopping. A smaller store would not carry sufficient choice to prevent this from happening.

**Q** Where will the supermarket car park be located ? (JH)

**A** The supermarket car park will be accessed off the circuitous road.

**Q** How will the community facilities be shared between the University site and NIAB? Could the University speak to the NIAB developers about this? (JH)

**A** The University meets with David Wilson Homes to discuss areas of common interest. There will be a number of shared community facilities for eg primary school to be provided at NWC together with up to 4 nurseries to cater for likely demographic profile at NWC in addition to a similar sized primary school on the NIAB site. NWC will make financial contribution to secondary school on NIAB site and will also make a contribution to enhanced facilities eg swimming pool, on the basis that this can be used by the general public. There will be other links such as NWC may contribute to library provision at NIAB and NIAB to police touchdown provision at NWC.

**Q** Will the streets be tree-lined? What is the planned lifetime for the buildings? (TB)

**A** There are few existing mature trees on the site and we will protect what is there. The green 'fingers' will be planted at an early stage so that they can mature as the rest of the site is built out. Landscaping plans are still being drawn up but the intention is that the site will feel very green.

In terms of the buildings we are still at masterplan stage so no detail yet on types of buildings but they will of course be built in line with the sustainability requirements.

**Q** When will the work be completed? (JC)

**A** The University will seek to work within the parameters set out in the AAP. We would like to deliver the key worker housing asap but the market will dictate the speed at which the private housing is built.

**Q** Who will qualify for the key worker housing? Will it be restricted to academic staff? Will the small units be sufficient for their needs? (JH)

**A** The AAP is clear that the land has been released to meet the needs of the University and the key worker housing will meet some of the needs of the University both now and in the future. No undue weighting will be given to academic or non-academic staff. The point of the housing is to provide accommodation for many of those who will be working on the site. There is a huge proportion of research and support staff within the university – over 50% of whom come from outside of Cambridge. They are essential to the healthy growth and economic success of the University.

- 4 SP asked for a Chair to be elected from within the group to run the next meeting. It was discussed and decided that a revolving Chair might be a good way forward – John Chaplin agreed to Chair the next meeting.
- 5 Discussion topics for the next meeting were raised and it was agreed that 'Transport Issues' was the most favoured. This would include looking at: sustainable forms of transport, cycle parking and routes, footpaths, nature of the 20mph limit, design plan for vehicular routes. RT agreed to ask the University's transport consultants, Peter Brett Associates, to speak at the next meeting.
- 6 It was agreed that the next meeting should be held in the last week of May before the next round of public consultation in June. Dates will be circulated.

ENDS