

## FeCRA AGM 2022 via Zoom 15.11 22 - copy of chat.

From **Tony Booth** to Everyone 07:14 PM

It was an excellent opening talk Wendy.

From **david yandell** to Everyone 07:47 PM

The pressure we find ourselves resisting in Cambridge may be being caused not only by a property developers' feeding frenzy and the desire of Cambridge colleges and the university to maximise the value of their assets but also by international , mainly Chinese pressure to stimulate this expansion for ulterior motives .

From **John Walsh** to Everyone 07:49 PM

My question to Ian would be: as we've seen recently with businesses getting out of Russia (of a sort anyway!) and Qatar (with respect to the World Cup), there has arguably been a shift in the moral high ground with respect to how we tolerate foreign investment and support in the UK (despite the financial 'hit' that it brings). So why, what with the overlap of Chinese influence (and money) on a city like Cambridge, is there seemingly little serious chatter going on amongst our politicians when it comes to the what's happening in Xinjiang, or the undoing of work by Hu Jintao that General Secretary Xi has undertaken? Is it simply because they are bringing so much more money to the table?

From **David Rogers** to Everyone 07:52 PM

Chinese influence in UK Freeports?

From **Tony Booth** to Everyone 07:52 PM

Brilliant posing of the issues. Thank you.

From **Peter Blythe** to Everyone 07:56 PM

Ian Were you able to discuss these issues with Cambridge academics taking these decisions and if so do you feel that there is an acceptance of the risks involved and any willingness to be more open and more cautious about Chinese involvement ?

From **Martin (Member of PACT)** to Everyone 08:10 PM

Everyone (I think) agrees, the current structure of Local Government and all the bodies are a total mess, as that diagram showed. How is this going to change? Personally I believe we should have a Cambridge Unitary + South Cambs Unitary. This would basically matches the town/rural cultural difference, as shown so clearly in the county election result. Is that view shared widely? What can be done to get consensus between the three main councils as to what should change, so that can be taken to government as a collective view?

"Young, Transient, In rented accommodation, International". To what extent is that demographic represented at this meeting? What do groups need to do to be become far more representative and diverse? How are the interests of non- house owners represented here?

From **Sam Davies** to Everyone 08:12 PM

University announces funding of planning officers: <https://www.varsity.co.uk/news/9516>

Article by Professor Gavin Parker on how the pre-app process could be remodelled to be more transparent: [https://www.jlgc.org.uk/en/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/2019\\_Feb\\_article.pdf](https://www.jlgc.org.uk/en/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/2019_Feb_article.pdf)

From **John Lawton** to Everyone 08:12 PM

Interesting

From **Tony Booth** to Everyone 08:13 PM

taking money from China without due diligence mirrors the taking of investment from fossil fuel companies. The opening of CISL was attended by representatives of fossil fuel, arms and airline companies. We are greenwash central.

From **John Lawton** to Everyone 08:14 PM

At least we can understand the fossil fuel industry funding?

From **kpreston21@phonecoop.coop** to Everyone 08:15 PM

Ian and Sam, (and everyone!) how do you suggest we challenge all this?

From **Tony Booth** to Everyone 08:16 PM

be good if Sam can say more about pre-application money. How much? How - brown envelopes?

From **anita lewis** to Everyone 08:19 PM

Re Tony's question. Any developer with deepish pockets can pay for pre-application advice to iron out the issues with their development proposals. There is a set scale of fees, or these are agreed with the planning service. Ironically, many aspects of the advice given is subsequently ignored.

From **David Rogers** to Everyone 08:21 PM

Some UK Universities have far more than 12% Chinese students

From **David Plank** to Everyone 08:24 PM

The lack of local power and control is writ large everywhere and no more so than in control of planning - which is controlled nationally. The most powerful force in Cambridge's destructive growth is national government. Failure to grow is not allowed by the Government - through the National Planning Policy Framework, Local Plan approval mechanisms including Inspectors and public inquiries. Business interests are important and are of course embedded in national government. But the prime mover of growth in our area and elsewhere is national government. Look, for example, no further than the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and its exceptional status as the only site on the edge of Cambridge being allowed to carve another 18 hectares out of the Green Belt having already taken 77. Will our local objections to this count for anything against the Government's imperative that it should be allowed to grow? We are trying...

From **Monica** to Everyone 08:25 PM

The Times ran a story about Chinese people living in Scotland being harassed, intimidated and attacked on a daily basis by operatives working out of state funded secret bases (31.10.22)

From **Sam Davies** to Everyone 08:30 PM

Re Tony B's question, no I'm not saying anything about brown envelopes! But pre-app advice does contribute a valuable revenue stream. You can see the fees here:

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/pre-application-advice>

From **david yandell** to Everyone 08:32 PM

A key reason why the moving of the Cambridge Sewage Works is proposed is because that move is seen as being in the national interest and hence attracts central funding . How real is this need for expansion, which the relocation is said to facilitate , when as has been laid bare this evening the process which is going on here is to do either with property investment or with our international enemies' infiltration of our higher education and research organisations?

From **jeanglasberg** to Everyone 08:32 PM

Queens College has had 4 pre app meetings with the council about their development of student accommodation at Owlstone Croft next to Paradise Nature Reserve. At the 3rd pre app meeting only one area was 'green' - meaning no issues, yet when the application was submitted a short while later all the officers declared it to be completely acceptable. The public are not allowed to see the 4th pre app - this lack of transparency does lead people to question the potential conflict of interests when the University is funding the Planning Service.

From **John Lawton** to Everyone 08:33 PM

He who pays the piper calls the tune

From **John Walsh** to Everyone 08:34 PM

It's interesting to see whether legitimate discussions can take place to seek a drawing of lines (and whether it's simply xenophobic!) to, say, limit the number of students coming for a temporary stay versus the numbers of private individuals being allowed to come to the city to buy up £1 million+ properties in Trumpington Meadows (that no local can afford anyway!). I mean, I doubt these new residents are ex-Cambridge graduates. At least... recent ones anyway!

From **Tony Booth** to Everyone 08:34 PM

thanks Sam - the brown envelope reference was a joke - but connections are made of other kinds.

From **Martin (Member of PACT)** to Everyone 08:36 PM

Not sure that the parties would now disagree - if you look at the county council result map, it basically matches the city council. There is a clear line where to divide into two unitaries now, surely. [https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/b/b7/Cambridgeshire\\_local\\_election\\_2021\\_map.svg](https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/b/b7/Cambridgeshire_local_election_2021_map.svg)

From **Tony Booth** to Everyone 08:36 PM

they had learnt from the connections they made from the fossil fuel industry to have no qualms about where their money came from

From **Sam Davies** to Everyone 08:37 PM

Tony, I have heard the brown envelope argument made totally seriously, so it's always worth being clear on my view!

From **Tony Booth** to Everyone 08:38 PM

Of course. It is clear why people think that when they see developers having undue influence - the mechanism is more complex!

From **jeanglasberg** to Everyone 08:38 PM

Officers get drawn into working with the developer, and proposing mitigation rather than considering in an impartial way what is in line with the Council's planning policies - and they sometimes fail to apply proper scrutiny of information provided by developers which is not always accurate.

From **Charles Jones (FDPC)** to Everyone 08:44 PM

Sam;

Sam - Govt pays AW 0.2Billiojn to move, AW then gains a similar amount from redeveloping the existing site. National priorities are irrelevant. Do you think Biomed expansion and housing at NE Cambridge are in the same category?

From **Terry Macalister** to Everyone 08:46 PM

Thank you so much for great presentations from Ian and Sam - and for organising this Wendy. Fascinating, disturbing but valuable brain food!

From **David Stoughton** to Everyone 08:46 PM

Thank you both. That's a lot of food for thought.

From **David Rogers** to Everyone 08:47 PM

Yes, great talks and discussions. Thank you!

From **kpreston21@phonecoop.coop** to Everyone 08:47 PM

Thank you so much from us too, to all involved