

# BURNSIDE LAKES & PARCEL B (LAND SOUTH OF COLDHAM'S LANE)-20240708\_100208-Meeting Recording

July 8, 2024, 9:02AM

1h 18m 6s

● **Cuma Ahmet** started transcription



**Toby Williams** 0:05

Great. OK.

Thank you.



**Cllr Mark Ashton (Cambridge City - Cherry Hinton)** 0:06

Correct.



**Toby Williams** 0:07

So good morning everyone.

My name is Toby Williams.

I'm the development manager for the East team, part of the Joint Planning Service.

I'm the chair of this meeting and I'd like to welcome you all to today's briefing.

The briefing allows councillors to see and understand and emerging long term management and governance proposal for the Burnside Lakes at Coldhams Lane, part of the proposed delivery of an urban Country Park and part of a live planning application for our Edu uses on land allocated adjacent nodes known as land South of Coldhams Lane.

The briefing will be led by Mission St Stantec and their appointed consultants in this field of expertise, Community stewardship solutions, and it will be structured as is typically the case with a 20 to 30 minute slot for a presentation followed by a 20 to 30 minute slot.

For questions, we can go slightly over if necessary.

In a moment, I will ask the developer team to introduce themselves, but first some housekeeping.

This meeting is being recorded and councillors to treat the meeting as a public meeting.

The meeting is specifically for councillors, albeit members of the public are entitled to listen into the briefing.

The details of the meeting can be subject to a Freedom of Information request or similar, and the video recording of the meeting will be posted on the Council's YouTube channel and can I ask all participants to keep themselves muted and to keep your backgrounds blurred unless you are invited to speak?

 **Cllr Mark Ashton (Cambridge City - Cherry Hinton)** 1:45

It.

Rest I think like.



**Toby Williams** 1:50

If I think there is, there is some interference from someone at the moment I can hear and if councillors would like to ask a question or get the attention of chair, please raise your virtual hand in teams, we will deal with questions after the presentation has finished.

Members of Planning committee should not express a firm opinion upon any aspect of today's presentation, which might give rise to a view that you have a closed mind to the proposal.

However, please don't feel stifled and raising issues and concerns that you foresee arising from the proposal to aid discussion at the recording of the meeting will be available for six months from today's date.

OK, so if Members and officers could turn off their cameras and I'll ask the developer team to introduce yourselves, please and begin your presentation, Stuart, that could hand over to you.

That would be great.

Thank you.



**Stewart Kain** 2:54

Ask Skype.

Thank you very much, Toby.

Hi, everybody.

Good morning.

My name.

Stuart Kane, I am development director of Mission Street.

I'm we're excited.

Excited to be here today.

To to talk you through our thoughts on on bringing forward what I think is one of the most exciting parts of of the application and that's the the creation of the Urban Country Park in particular with reference to parcels.

B&C obviously I've as developer and landowner of Parcel A, you know, we're we're the lead for the application, but you know, as a slightly unusual position in terms of we have 3 parcels of land and obviously parcel B is wholly owned by Andersons and then (Parcel C is owned Andersons and the local authority.

So the nature of how we tried to pull this together and look at strategies for management and future funding or are more complex than usual.

But I think actually do provide lots of exciting opportunities and without just want to hand over to Tim to introduce from ancient have to you, Tim.

**TC** **Timothy Chilvers** 4:00

Thanks, Stuart.

Hi everyone.

Good to see some familiar faces and names.

My name is Tim Chilvers.

I'm the operations director at Anderson and as Stuart says, we are the sole owner of Parcel B and part owner of of the Lakes.

So yeah, very pleased to be here and I look forward to the discussion I think with that I'll hand over to Richard on me.

**MR** **Maung, Richard** 4:22

Morning, everyone.

Richard Maung, associate director in the planning team at Stantec.

I'm the planning advisor to Mission Street on the project.

I'll hand over to Andrew.

**AF** **Andrew Fisher** 4:38

Morning, everybody.

Andy Fisher, I'm a planning partner at David Lock Associates assisting on the planning side on this project with with Stuart and others.

Uh, Dan, do you wanna?

**DR** Daniel Rea 4:55

Yep, uh morning everybody.

Daniel redirector.

Periscope and we are working on behalf of Mission Street on the landscape and public realm design and coordinating the landscape design across all three parcels. And I'm gonna hand over to Colin.

**CN** Colin Noble 5:12

Morning all.

My name's Colin Rowell from chess engage.

We work with Mission Street on engaging with the community and some of the stakeholders around the lakes.

**MP** Mark Patchett 5:23

Alright, and Unmark Patchett, specialist consultant in stewardship and placemaking and working for both Mission Street's and for Anderson.

 **Toby Williams** 5:36

Great.

OK, Mark.

So I think you've got a presentation for us if you want to start that presentation that would be fantastic.

**MP** Mark Patchett 5:45

Right, so fine.

People see that.

 **Toby Williams** 5:58

Yeah, that's that's up.

**SK** Stewart Kain 5:58

All good.



**Toby Williams** 5:59

Thanks. Yeah.



**Mark Patchett** 6:01

Good.

OK, so right, so so over to me is Yep, we ready for me to go.

Stuart, is that OK?

Fine.

OK.

Well, thank you everybody.

Obviously for this opportunity and to to talk about, I particular focus is the management and funding framework.

So what I want to do over the next 20 minutes or so is to set out the introduction to this.

I'll hand over to Dan, who will cover off site context and the ambition for parcels B&C, and then I'll pick up on the key areas that we've engaged on this, which is about the roles and responsibilities with regard to stewardship, the costs, the funding solution and the long-term governance arrangements around responsibility and participation.

And then touch a a couple of thoughts around next steps.

So just a quick way of introduction to this.

I'm here today.

My other colleagues, I'm afraid, are unavailable today, but just to let you know, we've been working on the project.

So say I've I've been leading a company called Community Stewardship Solutions around 35 years experience, but two of my colleagues working on this particular assignment.

So Mark Dodson, his background is financial management.

He's recently come from Otter Paul.

Some of you might know is 10,000 unit scheme down at Folkestone.

He was the finance director down there and Luke is Sweeney.

His specialism is landscape management and particularly on the costing side of it and implementing landscape solutions.

And he's done all the preparation around the cost side, which we'll share with you

shortly, just a little bit more background, just so you understand a bit about our experience and said round, we've been doing this sort of work for for 35 years and our specialism is actually on major stewardship solution or or stewardship sponsorship solutions on major development sites.

Most of our work is for units and sizes of 2000 upwards.

The biggest and most comparable site probably is around Ebbsfleet.

Some of you might know Esgate Development Corporation.

There's 15,000 units they're building out there, but the reason it's comparable is because there are various lakes there, 3 already now live in an operation at the what we call a major open park area, but also been involved just recently with another called Blue Lake, a very deep lake, a quarry lake.

So quite a lot of experience already in bringing forward Julie solutions around that that context, but also we've done a range of other projects particularly around also stewardships for parks and nature reserves, more local one you might be familiar with.

So we were advising why was advising particularly grovenor and working with the Wildlife Trust that Trumpington meadows and also just done another one fairly recently at Faversham Lakes over for Anderson.

So a range of experiences which we're happy to draw on, if it's helpful to you as we get into the meat of this.

So the aims of what we were asked to do by the clients essentially is to bring forward the practical arrangements to make this work for the long-term around particularly significant new recreational resource that addresses the lack of publicly accessible open space at local level in this community.

We wanted to ensure the landscape of COLDHAM'S LANE) develops in a manner that's commensurate with the original design intentions.

And Dan will pick up those in a few moments for you to explain a bit more.

And also particularly, we're keen to support the objectives of Cambridge, Cambridge's Nature Recovery network by securing the public open space through this corridor and creating a safe and clean environment, providing a high quality landscape.

And then that last one, but equally importantly, ensuring the long term management of the proposed landscape and environmentally and financially sustainable and appropriate way.

And that's a really important part of this, and I'll pick up on that in a few moments.

So Dan, if I could hand over to you and just just say next slide and I'll pass on the next slide when you're ready.

**DR** Daniel Rea 9:55

Sure.

Thanks, mark.

Hi again everybody.

I hope you can all hear me.

Please stick your virtual hands up if you can't.

I'm just gonna spend perhaps two or three minutes rehearsing the policy context in this strategic design ambitions, just to set the scene before we get into some of the detail that Mark will take you through later on.

So I think always important to start with policy and just to remind ourselves that policy 16 of the Cambridge local plan requires the creation of a new urban Country Park.

Our proposals across the three parcels B&C we believe are fully compliant with that and that involves the opening of the areas marked a for public access, which you can see on the plan on the right where the cursors hovering it requires ecological enhancements and passive recreational access to be, which is you can see on the plan on the right and then the opening of the lakes themselves, the passive recreational use.

So that's the policy position and that's what we are looking to deliver.

Next slide, please.

So I think probably important to remind ourselves that, UM, uh, within the Cambridge Nature recovery strategy, this site sits within something that's emerging as the aast (Cambridge Ecological corridor.

And that runs one container off the South or South to north from COLDHAM'S Common, which is to the north of our site as the big.

BLOB to the north if you like.

And then through the the lakes and down towards Cherry Hinton) chalk pits, which is a protected ecological site.

So the lakes themselves, and indeed all three parcels form us kind of critical connection in that necklace of ecological connections that run through E Cambridge. And so it's really important that we deliver these and that they are maintained and stewarded in the best way possible to establish that ecological network.

Next slide please.

So just to rehearse the wider master plan, so I'll start in the top of the slide.

So parcel B is ecologically protected, very limited access, looking to protect a particularly fauna in there.

Both kind of slow worms and and some of the and some of the butterfly population and then parcel C is, is the lakes and that's obviously for recreation.

Protecting the ecology of the lakes as far as possible, or balancing that with a human activity and providing safe actors, and then parcel A.

That's the site that is being brought forward for development, but we also view that as part of this ecological network.

So we're looking for significant biodiversity, net gain and and landscape.

It's on that site as part of these three sites in a tripartite proposal.

Next slide please.

And so Parcel see just to talk about what's happening there.

Recreation.

So significant EUR of public space.

And areas for groups, local groups who are interested in ecology and the controlled access to parts of the site to avoid.

And uh public access?

Damaging sensitive ecologies on sites for new access points one on Burnside and three on the tins.

And then establishment of chalk grassland.

That's a nationally significant vegetation type.

It's important that we recreate that as much as possible and enhance dense scrub for foraging foreigner and then particular interventions that relate to bats and reptiles across the uh, the site.

And you can see some images of that on the right and the next slide please.

It hasn't moved on.

**MP** **Mark Patchett** 14:04

Sorry, trying to get it to move.

Not sure why it won't.

Sorry about that.

Not sure why I'm going to stop showing and start again if I need to do apologise.

Pretty sorry.



OK, let's do it again.

So sorry.

**DR** Daniel Rea 14:42

But I have at least one Teams issue in these meetings where we are.

**MP** Mark Patchett 14:47

OK, let's go back and start again.

So next one is the way there now is that that's not OK.

**DR** Daniel Rea 15:21

It says there we are great, brilliant.

**MP** Mark Patchett 15:23

Sorry about that.

OK.

Thank you.

**DR** Daniel Rea 15:24

And then just quickly conscious of time, so Parcel be is about safeguarding ecological enhancement, so creation of as much open mode mosaic habitat as possible.

That's effectively a patchwork of different ecological conditions.

Support as much biodiversity as possible, so including speech species rich while flag, grassland, scrub and they're and recognizing ground.

There's been developed in concert with them.

Uh, Mission Street's consulting ecologists, and also through preap with and uh offices.

And so the idea is that the selective access will be allowed here to look at the ecology, but generally speaking, it's not public access.

Think that's it for me?

**MP** Mark Patchett 16:08

Right.

Thanks Dan.

But the same issue again.

What's happening here?

So sorry, I think what's happening every time I'm touching.

**MR** **Maung, Richard** 16:22

Mark, should I?

Do you want me to share and see if that?

**MP** **Mark Patchett** 16:25

If you can, you do that, I tell you what's happening.

I'm touching my mic on and off.

It's then interfering with the sharing process.

I don't know why, so I happened to come out and come back in again.

So yes, if you could.

Thank you.

Thank you very much.

OK, so thanks.

Thanks very much Dan.

So well, I want to get into now.

He's talking about the the management framework, which is the particular piece of work that we were asked to do.

This is for parcels B&C, and I've gotta pick this off under 3 headings.

So first of all, roles and responsibilities, because that must be the starting point to any management framework about the long term management and maintenance of both parcels B&C and maintaining the rights of public access to parcel C and also supporting learning and on site practical opportunities to wildlife restoration and harassment and management.

Then I'm gonna pick up around the funding and appropriate funding mechanism to provide security for successor management bodies.

And then I'm going to pick up on the governance and participation and particularly about a management body to oversee and implement the stewardship strategy around an Advisory Board and making sure that in the event of failure, we've enabled continued management of both parcels.

Next slide please.

So starting with the roles and responsibilities, as we said, we're picking up on parcels

B&C.

Now those fall into three headings.

So first of all is what we've been discussing.

It's the public open space management and maintenance, so the maintenance and management of those open spaces and the associated grounds maintenance, which we'll talk a little bit more in a second about some of the details.

The second key role and responsibility required is around the financial management about managing income and expenditure, maximizing any income from the endowment and reserves, maintaining those reserves, including long-term sinking funds, and then of course, you've also got the roll around the Community participation and labeling the Community access and associated volunteering opportunities to build that sense of local ownership and also supporting the sustained use by the fishing club.

Next slide please.

Luke Aswini, our cost consultant, used his experience to draw up a cost base to the long-term annual maintenance and sinking fund arrangements.

I won't go into these line by line or any details, but just to show you this is really here just to demonstrate the thinking that's gone into this.

So we looked at the various aspects around literally the maintenance of those spaces, looking at fencing and gates and paths to make sure that they're maintained and there are sinking funds for their replacement.

Also, litter picking and ecology maintenance, and particularly the monitoring of that over the 30 year lifetime required and that's for parcel B, but also then parcel C as well.

Again, looking at the hard landscaping, soft landscaping maintenance, those physical assets and again the litter picking the material point I wanted to raise here is that we're looking at just under £30,000 per annum required to maintain those spaces to maintain the standards that we're all looking forward and expecting going forward.

Next slide please.

I won't pick off all these details, but just to say this is the background just to show that this is not just my QS looking at it from his own perspective.

What we've also done is drawn experience from other related sites.

There's often published tender costs from local authorities who are picking up on.

There's also recommended advice and costs from authority to organizations such as Woodland Trust or Sports England.

We've got data on grounds maintenance from other companies that we've been using and also we benchmark unit costs to reflect the changes in the markets and these have been uplifted particularly for example and the recent cost changes due to minimum wage rises which have been had quite a bit that bearing on the on landscape management.

Next slide please.

The when it comes to the funding side of it, really what we need to look at is about those potential sources of income against the long-term cost headings.

There are five long-term cost headings on the left hand side.

We're looking at there the first three.

We've already touched on the maintenance of the public space, the maintenance and replacement of the hard landscaping and furniture and signage, and the ecological monitoring for the BNG over the 30 years, and also on top of that, we must look at the costs of communicating and Community participation to support that, and of course the overall management coordination, including the commissioning of the landscape contractors and the sources of income, can come from 5 different sources. So initial startup funding income from any endowment income that's endowed to the organization, Cambridge City Council, if they feel appropriate to contribute into this given obviously they own part of the land as well or that the lakes as well any charitable grants and any in kind or practical support from the user and volunteer groups.

And I mentioned that last one particularly because a key way of course to ensure that sense of ownership is through in kind of practical support and that's actually been the case up to now, very much from the fishing club who very much taken that sense of ownership and contributed a lot of in kind support.

But of course the other side, from your perspective as Members, you need to make sure that this is maintained and looked after in the long run, there's adequate resources there to ensure that that can be done properly and appropriately.

Next slide, please.

So essentially, the funding approach we've taken there is picked up the direct cost that we referred to earlier on for parcel B and parcel C, so that's just a said, there's two numbers.

There are nearly £30,000 added then 20% management fee which allows for treasury management as well.

Nearly another 6000.

And then it contingency figure of 5%.

So giving us a total of 37 thousand, 794 nearly 38,000 is the baseline annual operating cost that we're anticipating here for for these two spaces.

And what we're then allowed for is said, well, OK, if you take that over a 30 year period, that's for a for, for for the sites that will require an endowment of about £900,000, which will then deliver the revenue stream required for that.

But if one goes longer than that and we so we so 30 years obviously required on parcel B, but if one goes for parcel C for 50 or 75 years then this gives an endowment figure required at 1.1 million for 50 years or up to 1.3 million for 75 years.

Next slide please.

And just to show you the Sumption we've made here, so we've assumed a long term annual inflation of 2 1/2% uh current interest rates of 4.4 and instead the ecologist mentioned for the 1st 30 years having to do this for one to 510152025 and 30 years on parcel B management fees, we've mentioned contingency as discussed, but also allowing here as well for startup costs, which we're suggesting could be up to £50,000 for that's the legal advice to get this all set up and the corporate support and other things really incessantly support to get this all going.

In the first place.

So that's what's been allowed in these numbers, which from our experience we believe should be adequate for for what's required here.

Next slide please.

So, so far we've talked about roles and responsibilities, the funding requirements and how that's gonna be met.

I just want to talk now about governance, which is obviously equally important to this.

It's about who's responsible, who takes ownership, who takes the decisions, and how do we ensure good Community participation.

So what we're after achieving here is, first of all, there are key requirements about fulfilling the ecological recreational maintenance and monitoring functions in the long term and managing off any risk for non delivery to those standards expected.

The second one equally important is around the finance and organizational capacity for both long term owners and that day to day management, particularly with regard to managing what could be quite considerable sums here of circa million pounds or million pound plus in terms of the endowment.

And thirdly, the must be credible and acceptable to not just the City Council, but also

there's other local key stakeholders, particular local residents and the fishing club.

Next slide please.

And just on picking that a bit further, there are sort of eight requirements here that we're looking at.

So safeguarding the asset and associated endowments meeting the BNG ecological requirements, ensuring effective, appropriate long term use by the fishing club, ensuring that public access and promoting the whole health and well being for those people using the site, stakeholder participation, efficient day to day management and underpinning all of that must be accountability and of course sustainability, particularly the economic sustainability for, for for this going forward, next slide, please.

Now I won't go into these in detail, but just to say the approach we take is to say, OK, what are the options?

How could this be managed?

How does that work?

And I just wanna set these out before we go into the recommendations.

So first of all the the usual solution in the past has been about the adoption, but that's not a brief we've been given here and we believe that Cambridge City Council don't want to take full ownership or adopt this site.

Therefore, we're looking then potentially a bespoke new local organization, and those could be a private company or they could be a local trust model and I'll come back to that in a second or third option.

Main category is otherwise through outsource it to the likes of the Land Trust or the Wildlife Trust or the Fishing Club or other local body, who essentially then take ownership and control.

We here at the next slide, I want to summarise our recommended strategy in the light of that though all of you is and of course this is I stress subject to testing and consultation not just with yourselves as Members, but the local authority partners and of course Community representatives.

So we would like to have further discussion around this, but I suggestion and my recommendation to the client is that we should establish a standalone trust.

The name can be changed obviously, but the assume COLDHAM'S laned trust.

It's a charitable body and that would have key stakeholders participating, fishing club, stakeholder volunteers and of course, landscape management underpinning that, which is why it's a sort of green box underneath that, but with stakeholder

advisory group feeding into that.

If you go next slide, please, we think it would start off as relatively small scale.

So core group of trustees from Anderson from Mission Street and Cambridge City Council, and then over time evolving to then include community representation and the fishing club that can be adapted and flexed, of course.

But we think the idea is not to create a big body of people, but a small group of people able just to take decisions, oversee.

There's probably meeting.

Maybe a couple of times a year just to make sure it's doing what it should do and make appropriate appointments.

Next slide please.

And therefore next steps is, uh, a series of steps here.

So, uh, stage one essentially is agreed.

The section one is 6.

Consult with the key stakeholders and prepare and implement that management strategy and preparing the financial model and annual budget through that process.

Then we can be establishing a shadow board.

Once all that's agreed, preparing those articles of Association, register the Trust and make those first appointments and get it all set up properly.

And then do that process developer community engagement strategy and in the meantime take on the operational responsibility and prepare and agree the financial procedures, open the bank account, etcetera and then essentially take on full ownership and responsibility, updating the budget, producing the accounts and so on.

But if you go to the next slide, you just want to set in place the final reflection, then actually my recommendation would be that actually given some of the challenges around this site that actually we have a two year pilot scheme which I think could help to manage some of these risks out in that early period.

So we know already.

Anderson, of course, had been managing this site for some time, but under these new arrangements, once it's all prepared and enhanced, we think in the works completed it will be probably best for the developers to manage the site on a day to day basis and put those management arrangements you just discuss into effect.

That way we can then check and compare the budgets we've set out with the revenue funding required and just to make sure that those budgets are meeting

according to the parameters that we've set out and those can be then double checked and reviewed through that process.

So thank you, Stuart and Tim, that's what I wanted to share as part of this proposal.

Happy to take any questions or comments, but that was the background and reflection here, so I'll hand over to you guys.

Thank you.



**Toby Williams** 28:48

That's great.

Thanks, Mark.

So if it's OK, Stuart, we'll, we'll, we'll now ask are members of C councillor Baigent Scott his hand up.

That you're on a I think you're on mute.

If you want to unmute.



**Cllr Dave Baigent - (Cambridge City - Romsey)** 29:11

Sorry, got that one wrong and I'm debating.



**Toby Williams** 29:12

There we go.



**Cllr Dave Baigent - (Cambridge City - Romsey)** 29:16

I'm one of the local councillors for Romsey been involved in trying to get these legs out for 10 years, ohm under the right circumstances.

I've got a couple of questions right at the beginning, there's a lot of concern about the people on Burnside.

They're concerned about how their life is going to be changed by this.

There's a lot of concern by the residents of Romsey, which in vast numbers of visited on the three occasions that I opened the Lakes for the day in their thousands they there would be a majority feeling that these Lakes should be open.

There's concern about the the bio stuff, the about the nature, how much it's gonna be affected.

I have some concerns about this fishing club, the prominence that this is given.

I'd like to know the membership of the fishing club.

How many people were they come from?



Because I understand it was kept very exclusive and people were not allowed to join. And I think that the one thing that we must not forget, all the other things, maybe we'll get pushed to one side to a certain extent, but we must work out how we're going to allow for people to swim in these lakes.

Case they're gonna swim in and there's nothing to stop that.

So we need some really careful thought made about where would be a good site for people to swim and how can we try and keep that as safe as possible.

So that's a good start.

I think thank you.



**Toby Williams** 30:52

OK.

Thanks, Dave.

I'm Mark.

I'll and and Stuart and Tim, I'll hand over you to kind of deal with those questions in whichever order you you want to take them.

Thank you.



**Stewart Kain** 31:07

I'm Tim.

Tim, do you wanna start off with partly about the fishing club?

So I know you're the ones that's been dealing with them and probably got the the best place to sort of know about how they work etcetera and membership is that OK based in the first instance?



**Timothy Chilvers** 31:20

Yeah, of course. This should.

Hi, councillor, patient, thank thanks for the questions.

I'm on the fishing club.

I think it's it's a.

It's a fine balancing act because on the one hand you do have what is a relatively exclusive club, so I appreciate their sort of a Democratic point to be had there.

But at the same time, the club two date had proved themselves to be pretty good custodians of the lakes and the facilities.

So I think there's probably a middle ground to be struck where they, you know,

continue to operate perhaps in slightly different terms because they are going to, I think be the the natural kind of you know, day to day people on the ground making sure that the, the, the, the places functioning properly in terms of nature.

I think again, there's a fine.

You know, we've struck the sensible balance here between having elements of the like the most sensitive parts, where you'd is shallow enough for emergent vegetation. That is kind of sheltered from, umm, sort of the western lake, where there will be more recreational walking and activity going on.

Also within the mix, we obviously have the measures going on and parcel B to safeguard biodiversity.

Umm, there are sort of wider measures that I think could be brought to the forward to better protect the residents of, you know, Burnside and and Romsey more generally, yeah, there is always been long concern about, you know, parking and so on and so forth.

But I think the the key thing in that regard is to make sure that what this is quite a passive urban Country Park as opposed to something that has loads of attractors to have kind of lots of prime time movements of families coming in and out.

So you know what's being provided for and planned for through the plans.

I think that sort of should take care of itself and then in relation to allowing people to swim, I would say that's probably the the the type of day to day operational decision that the the trust or the management body would be empowered to take and it could take it having regard to all the feedback from the local residents and taking soundings from the, the the likely demand from people for that type of activity.

I thought my initial feedback on those four four Elements Council version.

**CB** **Cllr Dave Baigent - (Cambridge City - Romsey)** 33:42

Thank you.

I I I won't come back.

I just wanna make the point though that that that this needs to be democratically controlled.

We don't wanna give the fishing club absolute veto on anything here.

They've they've done a great job, but they've kept it exclusively for the members of the fishing club and nobody else has been allowed to go there.

So it's that is a real difficulty but and I think the Burnside and the swimming somebody needs to make a decision about the swimming at this level because

people will swim in these lakes.

There will be probably hardly anybody who's got any interest in these Lakes, whether they're against them or for them who haven't swum in them already.

And so people will continue to swim.

So this needs to be taken at this level, a policy decision.

Thank you for answering the question.

MP

**Mark Patchett** 34:33

I I could just, I can just quickly pick up on on that.

That first one actually, you'll notice that they my proposal around the governance structure is that the Vision Club had one of of potentially five or six places.

Whatever we can determine the precise numbers, but absolutely agree a whole key feature for me if this is what I call multi state code aboard.

So you never have one group actually having majority control, so that's the whole point of a stakeholder group here.

And I totally agree with Tim as well.

The idea then of having this representative group could actually take a view, then about the nature of the activities taking place and then set up sociated policies and, of course, making sure the appropriate ensured as well.

I mean, that's part of the public liability insurance and these other responsibilities.

So it does need proper governance and proper planning and then risk assessments put in place for whatever activities are taking place and work through.

But thank you for the questions.

CB

**Cllr Dave Baigent - (Cambridge City - Romsey)** 35:20

Thank you.



**Toby Williams** 35:21

Great.

OK.

I'm councillor Ashton.

CA

**Cllr Mark Ashton (Cambridge City - Cherry Hinton)** 35:26

That.

That.

You I don't expect answers, it's just observations and then people can think about.

Umm.

What they're gonna do about these things?

First off is is the timeline.

Obviously this has been going on for so many years now.

I think it'd be interested to know when we think what could we started when they would be open to the public.

The second one is on ownership because we're all the way.

It's not just Andersons.

Council City Council have part of the those Lakes as well, and Peter House have some scrub land at the back which has caused major problems for trespassing.

That leads me onto the ASP on the site.

Tim knows very well we've been blighted in Cherry Hinton) for years with trespassing damage to the stream, cutting the fences, allotments being wrecked, and so this is gonna carry on till we get this sorted out.

So what plans are we putting in place?

And finally access as well.

You've mentioned access points that tins and Burnside, but Snakey path is already a very dangerous path.

We've got problems with limited width, so increase pedestrians.

Uh cycles.

Scooters are more PEDs.

We've already had people that were forced into the stream by the volumes of traffic going down, so these are concerns I have and and again, you know Dave mentioned problems with Burnside people, you know Cherry Hinton) dollars lane and say Beach Gardens, the Parkins, there have been unbelievable inflatable bridges.

But across to get access as well.

So we still have a major concern with a S beyond that site, and I'd like to know how that's going to be dealt with.

What we get this sorted out.

Thank you.

**SK** Stewart Kain 37:10

OK.

Can I pick up the timing bit first?

Then perhaps and you go over to Tim.

So as far as the as far as the timing goes, kind of slash and I mean where we're keen to get on with it basically and and and and I I know for a fact Tim Tim will talk about from his perspective when I hand over in a minute but but I mean broadly speaking the the idea is is that you know once you know once we've gone to committee and hopefully got resolution to grant and and have a consent we then have a series of pre commencement conditions that we've got a clear and we'll work.

Through those and we would, we would be looking to start start the actual works to deliver both the parcel C and to commence their habitat creation to align with when we actually start the development on parcel A.

Now obviously in terms of time frames, you know the parcel C works would take a lot less time to actually deliver than even our first phase on parcel A.

So we would see that the the actual parcel C would be would be an operating facility and open way ahead of actually as occupying and even the first phase buildings on parcel A because we're quite keen to just be just be moving on with it and trying to deliver the facility as quickly as possible.

I I know Tim has feelings about actually how in terms of management terms, it's easier to manage once it's open.

But I'll with that.

I'll, I'll Tim.

We'll talk more articulately than I on that if I could hand over to you, Tim.

**TC** **Timothy Chilvers** 38:37

Yeah, yeah, sure.

Absolutely right.

I mean, Council, Ashton, the sooner the better from, you know, our perspective as a business and no doubt organization for Cambridge City councillors.

Kind of a Co landowner, we've both got sort of a joint interest in getting this resolved.

You know, there's two drivers, really.

One, it's an amazing space and I think it's it warrants everybody having access.

I mean, you walk onto that site and I have walked every inch of the lakes and it's just phenomenal and I think people will really buy into having that on their doorsteps as a place that they can enjoy it and take care of.

But the second driver is that you know the moment it's open, the antisocial

behaviour incentive forms away.

And you know, from an insurance point of view, just from a safety point of view, we want to get this resolved as quickly as possible because we know what happens when the weather gets warmer and in the type of activity that goes on without that kind of passive surveillance going on that you get when you, you have more people able to access freely.

So yeah, as soon as possible, as Stuart says, I was completely echo that the moment we are able to get on with the works, we will get on with the works we have already as you may be aware already tail end of last year put up fencing along the whole of the southern edge 2 snakey path.

You know that's actually gone in really well.

It looks attractive.

It's acting as a better deterrent than the wire mesh fencing before it's easy to replace and you know along the whole eastern boundary as well.

We've reinforced security there, so we do take it very, very seriously and you know we're on standby to respond to instances going forward.

But the yeah, the quicker we can get this put into a long term sustainable position, we will get on with that and I and I expect the triggers that Toby and colleagues and your sales will put in place will reflect that as well.

**SK** **Stewart Kain** 40:38

I think the last point then was about was about the stewardship and the ownerships.

 **Toby Williams** 40:39

Great.

**SK** **Stewart Kain** 40:42

Obviously the local authority and do do own you know, sections of the lakes as well. I mean, if before we do that or he'll end up to market can talk a bit about that in the structure.

As far as Peter House, I'm that you know it.

With whatever we're looking at doing here.

Never clue doesn't preclude Peter has been involved and and all of the Lakes being opened up so that that would be welcome up until now it has been passive on that.

I don't understand.

You know Tim, Tim has worked on this person like 10 years, except that that has always been the case.

Having said that, you know, if ever that was to change, then you know the structures that will put in place are very flexible that we we we we could open up further and they they could be part of the custodianship as well.

Is there anything Mark that you wanted to sort of say about the structure and how the local authority in could engage in that cause it's there's all sorts of options there as well, isn't it?

 **Mark Patchett** 41:31

Yeah.

So that's to be explored further.

The ideal situation is no doubt is is that all of the ownership sits with one body, but there's not always as easy to secure.

So whether there is sort of formal legal agreements for one party puts the ownership in, but another one has gives the lease arrangements or whatever.

So it's to be worked through the end of the day.

The most important thing, of course, is that this consistent management and it's one management solution that everybody signing up to that a party to it and therefore ideally like to be part of that, that governance body and but the other side of it I didn't mention properly, I talked about that state called Advisory Group.

That's the other key party.

So other people and other wider why they're interest can actually participating, give advice and support, and from my experience that usually what happens actually most people wanna have a say in these things but don't really want to take the responsibility.

So actually having the ability for wider groups of people and residents and other representatives and other stakeholders to have a say and could feed into that small board to make the decisions is the ideal situation.

But those details need to be still work through Stuart.

 **Toby Williams** 42:30

Great.

Thanks, mark.

I I think we've got some other questions.

I see Councillor Baigent also has kind of posted a comment saying that the opening of the Lakes will need planning permission, but sign off by the politician.

So just to be clear to Members, the lakes and the works within the lakes are within the red line of the application.

So that is what's gonna come together with the.

Our indeed to committee at some point in the future.

We are currently targeting the 4th of September as the Planning Committee when this application is is going to come for committees consideration, right?

Councillor thornbrough.

**CT** **Cllr Katie Thornburrow (Cambridge City - Petersfield)** 43:15

Yeah.

Thank you very much.

I've got three sort of points and questions.

One is BNG on this site.

Umm, I know that we've got our the mandatory increase in BNG and we've got a, an aspiration to do more, but that may still leave the sites quite below what their full potential is for BNG.

So would this be an opportunity to be a BNG site for other developers to invest in BNG?

I don't know what whether that would help the the the the reaching the maximum BNG or you know optimum nature on the sites or and whether that might help funding.

That's one question.

Another is how much of what is being presented today.

It will be material considerations at the planning application, Umm, third, one Third Point or question is bit.

It follows on a bit from Councillor Ashton and and uh beijin is really how many, what type of real engagement has already been carried out with residents and local businesses and organizations.

For example, the local schools?

Umm, that interesting and finally it's if this is achieved, would it be possible to learn from this process because there are two more Lakes?

There's Barnwell Lake and there's an adjacent lake, and there's a bit of there's still a bit of there's some land next to parcel B that maybe could be the the the green area



for parcel B, maybe that could be included to extend in include that in the future. So if this this process, if it's successful could be considered an exemplar. Thank you.

SK

**Stewart Kain** 45:21

OK, so try and take some of those in turn.

Uh, I probably would look look to Richard Stantec to correct me if I've got this wrong.

But in terms of the way that the BNG assessment has been has been put together that we've looked at all three sites and coming together and done the assessments with all three coming together, including the off site contributions, etcetera.

And five remembered this correctly.

I think we're somewhere in the region of an uplift of 23%.

I think it's something like that.

Richard is is, is that a, is that about right?

I think the current policy is a minimum of 10.

There's an aspiration of 20, so we are we're we're we're the current segment is we're looking to hit that.

Of course, we've got to assess that over the 30 year period etcetera and work with officers to make sure we actually achieve that.

I'm but, but we think we think we're in.

We're in a good place and and obviously the habitat creation that we're doing on parcel B is really, really key to that.

So I think we're, you know it's it's it's a good baseline and a good starting point.

We just need to sort of be able to deliver that over the 30 year period.

It's an interesting point you make about the possibility for other developers to contribute.

I haven't actually considered that.

Well, definitely go away and think about that.

And because I think, I think they're, if we could identify opportunities there that that would be great.

But I have to take that one away.

Council at the moment just good idea that when it's never occurred to me.

So thank you for that.

As far as consultation and engagement, we've done lots and lots and lots of and I

won't bore you too much about that, but we've I think we've had three public exhibitions, but we've had countless various meetings with with all of the key stakeholders.

We've actually got more programmed in between now and committee, but we, you know, to talk about the particularly the funding and management streams, the, the we'll be having.

So we're going back to the fisherman again.

We have already spoken to the fishing club to sort of because whilst they're not the only show in town as, as has been, it's been clear now, I think they are have been important custodian and we would like them to be involved.

But Disso friends of Cherry, Hinton Brook, et cetera, et cetera.

So we will be going back out then because we think it's important and we'll be doing all of that again before committee.

And in terms of school engagement, and we worked closely with Bonnie Kwok and her team in terms of the school engagement.

We were down at the spinney.

We, we, we, we did lots of stuff there.

We went down and visited the school and there was lots of competitions for the design for furniture that can actually be incorporated and bird boxes and badger boxes etcetera.

We did a site visit where the children sort of got a chance to understand what we're trying to do in ecological terms and engage with that.

And they've done lots of really cool stuff that will be sort of manufacturing and placing within both the Lakes area, but also in terms of the parcel B and bird boxes and the like as well.

So I'm I could go on there.

It's probably probably the best fun bit of my job actually.

Over the last year and the engagement with Bonnie and her team was was fantastic, but yes, we've done lots and will continue to do more.

Have I missed anything there?

I think the example of it I think would be a great opportunity actually.

I mean, if we do get this right, we'd be more than happy to, to, to, to roll that out.

I'm not sure quite how that would work, but I'd sort of seek seek advice from officers, perhaps of where they've done this sort of thing before.

Where they've got exemplar schemes.

But yeah, we'd be more than happy to try and contribute to that.

I mean, I'll go.

Tim, have you got any more thoughts on any of that?

**TC** **Timothy Chilvers** 48:46

Yeah.

Well, yeah.

I was just gonna come in on that final point, Stuart, cause I I totally agree.

Reputationally for the three main parties here today, which is myself, Stuart and and Mark as well.

And his organization, you know Mark wouldn't have taken this instruction if in any way he didn't have, you know, total faith in our ability to deliver because, you know, ultimately delivering on this is, is what he does.

And he wants to be able to showcase this, as you know, proof of the structures that he recommends advocates and puts in place.

So yes, it's a massive opportunity for for the three of us and for the councillors as a as very much a partner within this.

So yeah, very, very optimistic about it for sure.

And becoming an exemplar.

And I used to fish pond all Lakes as a kid, so it was funny hearing that one.

I can I I can see it rolling out to there as well.

So yeah.

**MP** **Mark Patchett** 49:38

And I could just quickly add to that.

Actually, I think a couple of things to actually the the I was first involved I think I can't how many years ago it was Tim, but there was a original consultation about some early scheme and we had a whole weekend some of you might remember that when actually we had all sorts of stakeholders and were involved over a couple of days.

And so the idea about a local trust and actually the representatives of various different stakeholders as part of that and I certainly was part of some of those discussions originally when we looked at that and the other point is that in terms of what I call quality stewardship and you might be familiar with other schemes across Cambridge area actually where you've got partnership arrangements, but actually some form of endowment going in, not just residents making contributions or

relying just on Council tax otherwise is a key means by which you can actually, if you like, not just.

Take the asset itself, but actually put capital in to say this is going to going to fund this in the long term.

And of course, that's over and above any capital of developers are going to be putting into actually build the things in the 1st place, which obviously we have to be done to meet the standards and be fully fit for purpose.

 **Timothy Chilvers** 50:35  
Yeah.

 **Mark Patchett** 50:37

So I think this is a great example of what and I really hope, but I'm really glad he was a touched on, not just the outcome, but actually the process Council, Thorne wrote. That's really important.

Get the process right.

That's equally important to getting this the right solution, but also in terms of best practice as well.

So yeah, thanks for recognizing that.

 **Toby Williams** 50:54

Thanks mark.

And on on process, I would say we're and we've just been, I'm kind of given the kind of draft management framework which is going to be subject to some kind of last round of consultation in July.

Councillor Thornbrough, that is going to inform the planning report.

The actual kind of final detailed sign off will be through the section 106 process and you heard Mark talk about a two year and pilot.

I think that's quite important so that we can kind of kind of with the knowledge of how much it's cost kind of settle some of those finances to make sure that it's a sustainable and management model that is actually implemented in the long term.

I will now turn to Councillor Bennett.

 **Cllr Naomi Bennett (Cambridge City - Abbey)** 51:56

Thank you.

Before I start, Katie, have you happy with that or do you need to follow anything up?

Thank you.

I've got three points.

The first one is a councillor.

Ashton has already briefed me some time ago on the ASB issues in that particular area.

We have very similar problems in Riverside in Abbey and I'd like to put in the please if you to consider a CCTV scheme on the lines of 1 adopted in Central Park Peterborough, uh.

It's unrealistic to expect the police to be able to put in resource that's needed for such a large rural area to keep it safe, considering the other demands on their time, you need to basically invest in some Central Park style CC TV, solar powered, disguised and that money is gonna have to come from developers because we haven't been able to get it for any of our rural areas from the PC.

Ohm.

I'm sure that if you do that, it will pay for itself in terms of reduced ASB and catching up on issues quickly before they take root.

The second thing is management body.

It's considering how long term these arrangements are going to need to be.

It's usually best practice to try and partner with an existing body such as a Wildlife Trust, because there's a better chance that it will stay in existence during the long period, and I just wondered why you hadn't considered the alternative other a sub fund with a nonexclusive license and a subcommittee.

Often established body like the Wildlife Trust, that would also speed things up.

It can take over a year to get a bank account for a new charity.

So that's question too.

Question three is unaware of the historic contamination in the lakes and I just like to ask, is it your considered view that the best thing is to leave that in place?

And is that a totally safe issue or should there be an active plan to remedy for historic contamination from unauthorized and unrecorded dumping?

Thank you.

That's the most requestion, so I'm not expecting answers immediately necessarily, given how many other counters awaiting and I'd be happy for an answer afterwards.

OK.

Thanks guys.

I'll I think we can pick up all of those, but as as you say, bearing in mind time, perhaps if we will drop drop you a line on all those.

**TC** **Timothy Chilvers** 54:49

OK.

**SK** **Stewart Kain** 54:54

I think we've got good answers for all those.

Maybe take the other questions if if if that's OK with you, Toby, have.

**TC** **Timothy Chilvers** 54:59

It was Stuart.

I certainly would just on the first one say you know there's no reason why provision couldn't be made for CCTV, whether that's implemented in day one or it comes on stream later.

It's not a massively expensive endeavor, and so I think that would be, you know, appropriate and right to make sure that that's embedded within the startup costs.

**MP** **Mark Patchett** 55:21

And and I'd just like to quickly comment actually on on on that second point actually and and we did consider that and I have to say it's a judgment call we've made, but I hope and believe it's the right one that actually there's a lot of local interest here, not just from the obviously the resident site, but also the fishing club side that actually I believe that a local management arrangement is the right solution in this instance through the two year period, we've obviously allowed for factors like yes, you write it does take a while to get.

Chat with status and open a bank account, but we're allowed for that in that period and having this sort of dual process, I'm, I and I would just counter to say that I've got experience on the other side where sometimes it does work to put it to a regional or national body, but I have one particular site where that's been pushed back from local people saying, look, we really want to have a proper stake in this one and we can't because it's already been gifted or our passed over to a wider body which has wider objectives.

And actually doesn't have that local parochial interest.

So yes, it's a judgment call and so often developers do that because it's easier and cleaner to put it to a bigger body and a safer body.

But actually I think it believe it in this instance it is worth the effort to actually invest in that, to get local ownership given particularly the strength of the local stakeholders participating and indeed yourselves.

And I think demonstrated even by the number of Members on this call.

So I think it's the right answer, but we can discuss that further if there's a real belief is not the right solution.



**Toby Williams** 56:42

That's great.

Thanks, mark.

And I think it goes about the same.

I think we've got a representative from Cambridge, past, present, future in this meeting listening in.

I have asked Mission St also to engage with the CPF and also the Wildlife Trust for some feedback on the draft frame.

Think it's an important to gain their insights as well in this in this process and for the time being, Councillor Bennett does that.

I'm satisfy your questions.

I know there was a A the third question around contamination is a bit more detailed in terms of the expertise we might not have that in the meeting today.



**Cllr Naomi Bennett (Cambridge City - Abbey)** 57:23

I'm quite happy.



**Toby Williams** 57:24

But the developers.

Yeah, yeah.

OK, fine.

Great.

OK, councillor smart.



**Cllr Martin Smart** 57:31

Yep.

Thanks, Toby.

So yeah, my name is Martin.

I'm I'm a city Councilor.

I'm on planning committee so I'm not so familiar with the site as maybe Councillor, Bayesian or Councillor Ashton or others.

Maybe.

Umm, I mean, my memory of the site, for what it's worth, is cycling along about 15 or 20 years ago from the end of Mill Rd to butchers who sell warehouse shopping with a trailer bike and that sort of Peek through the fence and see the lakes.

And that led to sort of being familiar with them.

And then coming to meetings or remembering the Guildhall that councillor Baigent organised about these the site, so I've limited understanding and I found your presentation useful but I thought it could have been better actually.

Uh, this The thing is, is these online meetings mean that we're looking at very small screens looking at parcels AB and C is of limited use when I can't really see them very well and the parcels didn't seem to be outlined.

So I couldn't really see where the extent of the parcel was.

I think this meeting would have been better in person, so just to get so, I mean, I'm gonna speak for a couple of minutes and there will be a question there.

So the, the, the, the sort of substantive of my question or or point really is that you seem to be putting forward some wonderful proposals for development, but you want somebody else to bear the cost, responsibility and liability for those things.

Now I wonder if strategically this seems to be an error of judgment there in terms of us all considering that in on that basis and are probably other ways forward that may be a question for Toby rather than you because obviously you have skin in the game in terms of that question, I'm in.

Uh.

Also, not even sure that they are wonderful proposals.

I've I've not heard a great deal in terms of resident demand for this.

I've heard a fair bit in terms of some councillors demanding it, and clearly you are in terms of putting this forward, the sort of adjunct to that point really is that you've talked a lot about money in this presentation and that was quite interesting.

We don't normally talk about money and planning.

It's not normally a planning matter, and that may be a matter for Toby as well.



So you've presented one side of the balance sheet.

So the costs, not the income, you're gonna get income.

So that's a consideration, but it probably won't be a consideration.

And when we consider a planning item in planning committee and I presume it will come to committee.

So and just on that, just on the detail of that, I wasn't quite clear on the endowment proposals, whether they, whether there's any suggestion that would be in perpetuity or just for fixed periods of time, and if so, what happens at the end of that period of time.

So was it intended that the endowments would be spent over that period, or was it intended that they would continue on?

Umm, I think finally just to pick up on Councillor Baigent's point about swimming in the lakes, which is I know you know something he's talked about before and sort of a I think as an example it's a part of things that people might like to do with the Lakes I think and you never answer that question.

So I'm presuming the answer is no, they can't swim in the lakes because I know that there's a clash there between people's swimming and people fishing, and this will this whole question of the fishing club is the elephant in the room that you're not really answering.

So we can't be part of a scheme that is allowing a certain small section of the the of the populace to take take control of this land, so to the exclusion of others.

So that others can't get benefit from it.

So it needs to be, umm, born in mind that there are several contributing factors here and the fishing club can't have everything.

Uh, and I said that was finally, but there was one final point.

The the idea of the Wildlife Trust was suggested so the the other thing perhaps, and and again, I don't really know too much about it, but to be born in mind that we have the Cam, I think conservatives of the River Cam that seemed to me from my experience and knowledge of what they do to be a similar sort of organization.


So I don't if they might play a part in all of this as well, but I do think again, finally, that the the suggestion of the Wildlife Trust might be useful in terms of getting away from that provincial provocateur, umm, feeling about the the Fisher people being in charge here?


That's not.


That's not gonna be the case, is it?

That can't be the case.  
It has to be for everyone.  
Not if you know for the many not the few.  
OK.  
Thanks Toby.

 **Toby Williams** 1:02:59  
Don't Stuart.

 **MP** **Mark Patchett** 1:02:59  
I wish she like pick up on this and start with.

 **Toby Williams** 1:03:00  
Timothy old Mark, do you want to try and address those questions? Yeah.

 **MP** **Mark Patchett** 1:03:04  
Let me let me just make a initial response.  
So, first of all, Council Smart, apologies if I wasn't clear at all here.  
The reason that I'm involved is say we're working all the time with developers and local authorities on what are called long Term stewardship solutions and it must be in perpetuity and a key feature always for whenever I'm briefing local members and planning committees and others is they want to make sure this is sustainable.  
That means, as you say, the process I went through setting out roles, responsibilities, setting out what the costs are, but also then where does that money come from?  
And so again, policy wasn't clear.  
The endowment figures that we've come up with are in in perpetuity.  
Solution designed to deliver the revenues required to meet those costs that we've outlined and that down what we provided by the developers.  
So it's not then passing it off and getting money in from someone else.  
No, it's them putting the capital in not only to build those Lakes out to the standards, but also to make sure the revenues are there in the long term.  
And so we had a someone with experience of treasury management.  
Look at that.  
So we factored in the inflation, the returns you get and that is an endowment that will make that work.

So that's the first point.

Apologies, I wasn't clear about that.

So there's definitely isn't in perpetuity solution, and at a cost to the developers.

And the second point is we're absolutely clear that course, the fishing club are an important user here, but they will not be in control.

This is about a shared multi stakeholder group to meet the needs of of a range of users and particularly by volume numbers.

Of course it will be the local residents that are using it to walk, cycle, enjoy and so on.

And we didn't rule out the swimming what we said was this needs to be looked at properly and carefully because there are clearly other safety and insurance risks associated with it.

Must be done properly and therefore designed in by that group, so maybe a couple of other points that others want to pick up on, but those are the key things and policies.

I wasn't clear in the first place.



**Toby Williams** 1:05:01

Good.

Stuart.

Timothy, were there any other points you wanted to come back to Martin on?



**Timothy Chilvers** 1:05:09

No thanks.

So thank Mark, Mark covered it.

Yeah, absolutely.



**Toby Williams** 1:05:12

Yeah.





**Timothy Chilvers** 1:05:12

It's a developer funded solution as opposed to requiring any other sources of income.

Obviously, if there are other sources of income and income kind contributions, then so much the better.

It just reinforces the robustness of the solution and so forth.  
But yeah, not not looking for anything further.

 **Stewart Kain** 1:05:33  
Yeah. Thanks.

 **Toby Williams** 1:05:34  
Right.  
OK.

Thanks Tim.

Martin, does that satisfy you for now in terms of the answers, the generality of the answers.

 **Cllr Martin Smart** 1:05:47  
Yeah.

I mean thanks for that and you don't need to apologize, by the way.  
It's fine.

I think The thing is that these sorts of meats are high level meetings.

I think you need to be absolutely clear what you are and aren't putting on the table rather than beating around the Bush.

So these questions are swimming those sorts of difficult questions need to be bottomed out at this stage because there's no point trying to pretend they're not problems because they are, and we need to be clear what's on offer and and Toby, about the money side of things.

So where where is Planning and all of that?

Normally we don't talk about the costs of things in planning.

So do you want to say anything about that?

 **Toby Williams** 1:06:32  
Yeah.

I mean, it's very much material, Martin.

And in this case the there's a specific policy within the allocation that talks about the developer having to put forward a kind of draft management plan for the Lakes and for the authority to feel confident that it can grant and planning permission.

It needs to be absolutely sure that the the new kind of Country Park has got the

necessary funding and management and regime in place for it to be a success, because if it fails then you know we're we're we're left with the development and know kind of public benefit in terms of the access to the lake.

So it's got, it's got to be absolutely right and that does involve an analysis with colleagues.

We've been talking to Alistair Wilson and you know external external.

Review of what's being put forward by the developer.

We don't want to be left with the situation where for whatever reason and the management of the Lakes has not been properly accounted for and and you know, public access stops after a few years it it's got this big sustainable.

So it is.

It is really, really important for the Council to be kind of confident in this space.

 **Cllr Martin Smart** 1:08:04

OK.

Thanks, Toby.

But just to follow up on that then, I mean, obviously money isn't everything.

It is the bottom line, but it isn't everything, but just in terms of the money.

Then will we get some kind of input into the planning meeting when this?

I guess this item comes.

You know, we talk about viability studies for, say, housing developments and so and so on.

Will we get some financial input on that?

Because if that's so critical, then you know, we're just amateurs, aren't we in that game?

And if we don't get some sort of serious input about the the robustness of these uh, calculations and and projections for financial viability going forward, then we're we're lost, aren't we?

 **Toby Williams** 1:08:48

Well, absolutely.

So you know, before this meeting, we've already met with Alistair Wilson, who heads up the management of the City Council's open spaces, and he and his team have a good understanding of how much that costs.

You've heard Mark talk about the kind of comparative sites that his firm have been

working on.

We've also been talking to property colleagues and as I said, I think we'll be getting some, I feedback also from Cambridge, past, present, future, the Wildlife Trust and possibly also the RSPB.

I'm not too sure about the Cam conservative, so there will be kind of multi stakeholder feedback into those costs.

As I said, the suggestion is that there will be a kind of two year pilot and processor. We can sure that when those costs are are more fully known on a kind of a year by year basis, they can then be kind of baked into the final financial and model.

So I'm that's.

That's where we. That's where we're.


That's where we're headed.


Martin, I'd like like to think that when we land at committee, members can feel confident with developers and also the officers that we've got are really kind of good framework to work from.

 **Cllr Martin Smart** 1:10:15  
Yeah.

 **Toby Williams** 1:10:15  
I'm.

 **Cllr Martin Smart** 1:10:15  
OK, Toby.

 **Toby Williams** 1:10:15  
I'm yeah.

 **Cllr Martin Smart** 1:10:16  
Toby, I know.  
I know you wanna go on the side Accounts.

 **Toby Williams** 1:10:18  
Yeah.

Yeah.

Yeah.

 **Cllr Martin Smart** 1:10:30

Don't worry, that was totally getting out.  
But thanks very much.

 **Toby Williams** 1:10:33

OK.  
Thanks, Martin.  
Right, councillor Dryden.

 **Cllr Robert Dryden (Cambridge City - Cherry Hinton)** 1:10:38

OK.  
Thanks.  
Most of my questions are probably been answered now is that.  
But there's one thing I'm gonna say in defense of the the fishing club, they've been running the club there for many years, and I know quite a few of them in the past because they all live in the in the Cherry Hinton) area and they're not exclusive.  
The reasons that they can't have so many Members because you can't have over too many people fishing the small lake, and that's the reason why some people tried to join as the waiting this to join so it's not exclusive and I don't think fishing and the swimmers already been said I think we would if we allow that to be a swimming area there's gonna be a lot of health and safety issues here.  
That's why they don't allow any other places where there's Lakes in the Cambridgeshire area.  
So that's it.  
Thank you.  
Not a question, just a comment, sorry.

 **Toby Williams** 1:11:26

Right.  
OK.  
Thanks.  
Thanks, rob.

And so think we've got a think we've got Dave Baigent with his hand up and I think we'll we'll draw it to a close date.

**CB** **Cllr Dave Baigent - (Cambridge City - Romsey)** 1:11:41

Sorry, I I'm gonna just speak a bit more about what I said earlier and what Martin was saying.

The swimming needs to be solved before it comes to planning committee.

I think that I can't tell you what my decision would be at planning committee, but it appears to me as a politician to be a red line.

People will swim in the lakes.

We have antisocial behaviour breaking into the lakes because people want to swim, not for most other many other reasons.

You need to understand this.

It's no good telling us that you're putting it off because you might find that is a real pitfall.

I would emphasize that we will, we would like to see lots of cycle parking.

We need lots of cycle parking and we need an answer to what happens when people turn up in cars that needs to be taken into account as regards to the fishing club and and Rob Dryden's thing.

You can see there's some sort of conflict here.

A small exclusive group of looked after the Lakes for a number of years, they've done a fantastic job at that, but they all know the arbitrators here and there may well be some resistance.

Fishing is not universally unacceptable behavior.

It's a cruel sport.

It's controversial people stocking up somewhere and then sticking hooks in in fishes mouths is not altogether and acceptable behaviour by a lot of people.

So I think that you need to look at amongst everything else what local support will be for this.

There's people on Burnside who've got a really, really clear idea.

They're very into nature.

They're very fact that they live there, makes them into nature.

But then there's 2000 people that visited on the three days that I opened this up, and there's one a few said it has to be seen to be believed.

This is an area of leisure that should be open to the people of (Cambridge arriving by



active transport at this site, so I've just hope you can hear what I'm trying to the red lines, perhaps that I'm even drawing for you.

I'm pushing at the edge of my responsibility as a planner, but I'm also talking as a politician for the area that currently has access to is the only area with legal access to the likes.

Thank you.



**Toby Williams** 1:14:26

Thanks Councillor Baigent and Stuart.

Mark.

Tim, did you want to kind of comment anymore over this kind of swimming question in in in particular?



**Stewart Kain** 1:14:39

I'm I I think the the baseline.

For the start of the management of of the facility is that that swimming wouldn't be encouraged.

However, however, that is, you know and and it and it's large, it's largely it's largely a health and safety issue.

I think now that's not to say that that that needs to be the case in perpetuity.

And I and I think you know, part of the two year trial and part is it's you know part of that is that's really good because it helps us do our own due diligence with the Council in terms of how much things are gonna cost.

But it also helps us to understand through stakeholders what the demand is, how people want to use it, how people are using it.

And and I think I think it's something that can be sort of taken take taken on advisement as as we see how the actual facility is utilized going forward.

But I think as the starting the starting point, I think the assumption is that that, that swimming it wouldn't wouldn't be something that is that that is acceptable.

But, but it's something that would be that would be could be considered in, in, in the future but and if it was, we'd have to, we'd have to, would have to take proper accounts and make sure that it was perfectly safe for for all concerned.




**Cllr Dave Baigent - (Cambridge City - Romsey)** 1:15:44


Now you.


You need to have an answer for that before it comes to Planning you.  
Do you really do?

 **Stewart Kain** 1:15:58  
OK.

 **Toby Williams** 1:16:00  
OK.

 **Timothy Chilvers** 1:16:01  
I would just add transformation.  
One of the comments asking about Milton Country Park, I think Council?  
Ashton asked that.  
I think it is, but it's kind of done very in a controlled manner of, you know, formal sessions overseen by, you know, instructors and the and the rest of it.  
So, you know, maybe Stuart, there's something in that regard.  
We could, we could take on board, yeah.

 **Stewart Kain** 1:16:21  
Yeah, no managed flying.  
Yeah, yeah.

 **Toby Williams** 1:16:27  
It's OK.  
I'm I think that's the end of the questions that we we've run out of time.  
There are some other comments in there that you might want to think about a addressing later down the line, particularly one around Snakey path and the ability to kind of in improve.  
I think it's it's width, but that's, you know, Stuart, Mark, Tim and rest of the team.  
Thank you so much for presenting it.  
It is a really, really important kind of I'm a plant of this planning application that you need to get right and Members need to feel confident with.

 **Timothy Chilvers** 1:16:56  
OK.



**Toby Williams** 1:17:08

There's a suggestion that there there needs to be a site visit and before planning committee, I'll make sure that we are date is settled for that one and advance of committee.

Some Members can understand and contextually kind of how big this space is. It is the the the the lakes and the spaces around them are are, are significant.



**Cllr Dave Baigent - (Cambridge City - Romsey)** 1:17:30

What done with the other cats go?



**Toby Williams** 1:17:32

So that's really important.

OK, great.

Unless anyone got any other questions, then I'll call the meeting to a close.

Thanks to everyone that's attended and particularly the councillors I know it's early Monday morning after a long weekend, but thank you for attending good attendance.



**Timothy Chilvers** 1:17:46

That.



**Toby Williams** 1:17:51

Really good questions and we'll see.

Will soon.



**Cllr Dave Baigent - (Cambridge City - Romsey)** 1:17:54

Thank you very much indeed.



**Mark Patchett** 1:17:54

Just right.



**Cllr Dave Baigent - (Cambridge City - Romsey)** 1:17:55

Thank you.



**Toby Williams** 1:17:55

Thank you.



**Timothy Chilvers** 1:17:56

Thanks all just.



**Mark Patchett** 1:17:56

Thank you.



**Stewart Kain** 1:17:56

Thank you everybody.



**Daniel Rea** 1:17:57

Thank you.

Bye bye.



**Cllr Naomi Bennett (Cambridge City - Abbey)** 1:17:59

Thank you for briefing us.



**Stewart Kain** 1:18:02

The pleasure.

Thanks.

Thanks for all the comments everybody.

● **Cuma Ahmet** stopped transcription