

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6749

WEDNESDAY 17 JULY 2024

VOL CLIV No 39

CONTENTS

Notices

Calendar	778
Report of the Council on the term of office of the Chancellor and the High Steward: Notice in response to Discussion remarks	778
Report of the Council recommending the budget and allocations from the Chest for 2024–25: Notice in response to Discussion remarks	779
Report of the General Board on the outcomes of the Academic Career Pathways (Research and Teaching) and (Teaching and Scholarship) 2024 exercises: Notice in response to Discussion remarks	779
Office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor	779
CBELA policy and process for considering funding from fossil fuel companies	780
Initial recommendations of the Review of Teaching	782
Procedure for handling claims for the transfer of stewardship of human remains	782
Ballots of the Regent House: Voting open until Monday, 22 July 2024	785

Notices by the General Board

Academic Career Pathways, 1 October 2024 exercises: Appeals Committee Membership	786
Cambridge Zero	786
Charles Darwin Professorship of Animal Embryology	788
Faculty Board of Business and Management	788
Changes to the Professorial Pay Review scheme	788
Degree Committees	788

Graces

Graces submitted to the Regent House on 17 July 2024	789
Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation:	
on 18 July 2024	789
on 19 July 2024	790
on 20 July 2024	790

Acta

Approval of Grace submitted to the Regent House on 3 July 2024	790
--	-----

End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'

Report of Discussion: 9 July 2024

Forthcoming disposal of land at West Cambridge for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway	791
--	-----



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES

Calendar

18 July, *Thursday*. Congregation of the Regent House at **9.30** a.m. (see p. 789).

19 July, *Friday*. Congregation of the Regent House at **9.30** a.m. (see p. 790).

20 July, *Saturday*. Congregation of the Regent House at **9.30** a.m. (see p. 790).

22 July, *Monday*. Ballots of the Regent House, voting closes at 5 p.m. (see p. 785).

Ordinary issues of the *Reporter* for the remainder of the 2023–24 academic year will be published on 24 and 31 July 2024.

The first issue of the 2024–25 academic year is scheduled for publication on 25 September 2024.

Report of the Council on the term of office of the Chancellor and the High Steward: Notice in response to Discussion remarks

11 July 2024

The Council has received the remarks made at the Discussion on 25 June on the above Report (*Reporter*, 2023–24: 6744, p. 634; 6748, p. 760). Eleven members of the Senate commented, ten of whom were supportive of the proposal to adopt a fixed term for both the Chancellor and the High Steward.¹

The Council agrees with Professor Evans that those serving as Chancellor and High Steward have held the office for considerable periods. Professor Evans draws a comparison with membership of the Regent House, which has no age limit. The Council notes that officers are expected to carry out certain duties, whereas members of the Regent House voluntarily take part in University decision-making, therefore it does not consider the two to be analogous. The Council notes Professor Evans' comments on other offices referred to in Statute A I and will consider separately whether any changes should be proposed to the term of the Deputy High Steward and the Commissary.

The Council is proposing some additional changes to Statute A I:

- in response to comments, to confirm that the person elected would serve for one ten-year term only, which would not be renewable unless the Senate otherwise determined by Grace in an individual case;
- to ensure that the new term would not apply to the term of any incumbent Chancellor or High Steward on approval;
- to remove a reference to the High Steward's election that was overlooked.

Professor Evans states that the Council is proposing a return to a form of 'Nominating Committee' following the recent abolition of the Nomination Board. The Council can confirm that there are no plans to revise the existing nomination process, which remains focused on nominations made by 50 or more members of the Senate and does not involve any formal body putting forward its own candidate. Professor Evans also comments on what a role description for the Chancellor might contain. The Council has not finalised the details but will do so nearer the time of the next election.

The Council is submitting a Grace (Grace 2, p. 789) for the approval of this Report's recommendations, as amended by the changes annexed to this Notice.

DEBORAH PRENTICE,
Vice-Chancellor

ZOE ADAMS

SARAH ANDERSON

MADELEINE ATKINS

GAENOR BAGLEY

MILLY BODFISH

ANTHONY DAVENPORT

JOHN DIX

SHARON FLOOD

ALEX HALLIDAY

HEATHER HANCOCK

LOUISE JOY

ELLA MCPHERSON

SCOTT MANDELBROTE

SALLY MORGAN

RICHARD MORTIER

ALEX MYALL

SHARON PEACOCK

JASON SCOTT-WARREN

ANDREW WATHEY

MICHAEL SEWELL

PIETER VAN HOUTEN

¹ The University's alumni newsletter included information about the proposal and the Discussion, but also gave the option of giving feedback by email, which is how the Council received these comments.

ANNEX

Paragraph 5 of the Report, setting out its recommendations, has been amended to read as follows:

5. The Council recommends that the Statutes of the University be amended as follows, and that these amendments be submitted to His Majesty in Council for approval.

That, with effect from the next election to the offices of Chancellor and High Steward, in Statute A I (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 3) Sections 1 and 9 be amended to read as follows and in Section 14 the words 'High Steward,' be deleted:

1. The Chancellor of the University shall be elected by the members of the Senate and shall hold office, in accordance with the laws and customs of the University, for one period of ten years from the date of election unless prior to the expiry of that period the Chancellor voluntarily resigns or the Senate otherwise determines by Grace in an individual case.

9. The High Steward shall be elected by the members of the Senate. The arrangements prescribed by Statute and Ordinance for the election and term of the Chancellor shall apply also to the election and term of the High Steward.

Report of the Council recommending the budget and allocations from the Chest for 2024–25: Notice in response to Discussion remarks

11 July 2024

The Council has received the remarks made at the Discussion on 25 June on the above Report (*Reporter*, 2023–24: 6745, p. 670; 6748, p. 774).

The Council agrees with Dr Cowley that the required reductions in expenditure in 2024–25 and 2025–26 must not come at the expense of the University's education and research. Successive Reports have emphasised the potential savings of University-wide change and transformation programmes, which will allow greater investment in pay, and in education and research. Schools and non-School institutions are particularly encouraged to develop near-term plans for recurrent cost savings that are consistent with the long-term direction of those programmes, and which enhance – rather than diminish – the University's academic capability.

The Council agrees with Dr Cowley that the 'position is not rosy'. That the University Group as a whole (including Press & Assessment) continues to generate an annual cashflow surplus from its operations is not sufficient. The University needs to generate enough cash to maintain its physical and digital estate and continue to invest in academic activity. It would also be dangerous to rely on large transfers from Press & Assessment which is operating in increasingly competitive markets.

The Council notes Professor Evans' remarks on the lessons to be learnt from the implementation of CUFS.

The Council is submitting a Grace (Grace 3, p. 789) for the approval of this Report's recommendations.

Report of the General Board on the outcomes of the Academic Career Pathways (Research and Teaching) and (Teaching and Scholarship) 2024 exercises: Notice in response to Discussion remarks

11 July 2024

The Council has received the remarks made at the Discussion on 25 June on the above Report (*Reporter*, 2023–24: 6745, p. 685; 6748, p. 776). It has consulted with the General Board in preparing this response.

Dr Astle asks whether any of the offices that the Report proposes to establish will be held co-terminously with another role or will be for a fixed term, noting that the General Board previously committed to publishing this information in the future, in response to remarks on the Report of the 2023 exercise. The General Board apologises for this oversight and provides below the information that should have been published in this Report:

- Both of the Clinical Professorships proposed in this Report would be held co-terminously with an honorary clinical contract. This is in line with the expectations of the Report establishing the office of Clinical Professor (*Reporter*, 6646, 2021–22, p. 256). The reason for making the office co-terminous with the honorary clinical contract is because, without an honorary clinical contract, those officeholders cannot work as clinical academics at the University. Neither of those proposed Clinical Professorships will be supported by external funding, nor is either of them being established for a fixed period.
- Where an existing role is externally funded, that arrangement will continue, as the funding for the currently held role transfers to the new appointment on promotion. The Report already notes in Recommendation IV that for two people the period of appointment would be to the end of their current appointment.

The General Board will include similar information in Reports on the outcome of such exercises in the future.

The Council is publishing a Grace (Grace 4, p. 789) for the approval of the recommendations of this Report.

Office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor

15 July 2024

Following consultation with the General Board, the Council has agreed to make the following appointments to the office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor:

- Professor SIR JOHN ASTON, FRS, *CHU*, will be appointed as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) for a first term of three years from 1 September 2024; and
- Professor ANNA PHILPOTT, *CL*, will be appointed as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Resources and Operations) for a first term of three years from 1 October 2024.

The Council made the appointments on the recommendation of its Nominating Committee for the appointment and reappointment of Pro-Vice-Chancellors, comprising the Vice-Chancellor as Chair; Ms Gaenor Bagley, Baroness Morgan of Huyton and Professor Jason Scott-Warren (members of the Council); and Professor Tim Harper and Professor Nigel Peake (members of the General Board).

The Council has also approved an extension to the appointment of Professor David Cardwell, *F*, as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategy and Planning), in accordance with Statute C III 16. The reappointment is from 1 August to 30 September 2024. This short extension will enable Professor Cardwell to continue in the office until Professor Philpott takes up office.

CBELA policy and process for considering funding from fossil fuel companies

15 July 2024

The Council has agreed a new policy and process for considering funding from fossil fuel companies, as set out in the Annex below.

Decision-making on such funding will remain with the University's Committee on Benefactions and Legal and External Affairs (CBELA).

Under the new policy and process, the University will not accept research or philanthropic funding from fossil fuel companies whose business models do not align with net zero 2050 (NZ2050) targets, unless there are exceptional circumstances.

CBELA will adopt external benchmarks to determine whether a company is classified as a fossil fuel company, and whether its business model is aligned with NZ2050 targets. The exceptional circumstances under which CBELA might consider funding from a fossil fuel company are described in transparent criteria, deliberately designed to set a high bar (see below).

No fossil fuel company is currently understood to have a business model that aligns with NZ2050 targets.

Why has the Council taken this decision?

The new process is a response to a key recommendation in a report commissioned to consider the impact on the University if it were to end sponsorship and collaboration with fossil fuel companies. The Topping Study,¹ led by Nigel Topping, UN Climate Change High Level Champion for COP26, said that the University should:

- Clarify the current CBELA process, maintaining discretion but largely relying on simpler tests and third-party analysis, and
- Adopt the Science Based Targets initiative definition of 'fossil fuel company' to cover companies substantially involved in fossil fuel extraction (but not wholly or partially owned subsidiaries focused on clean technology solutions) and use clearer external benchmarks to guide its decision-making.

For CBELA to consider whether accepting funding from a fossil fuel company on an exceptional basis is in the best interests of the University, the proposal will need to meet both of the following two criteria:

- It is for a large gift, or equivalent value for a research collaboration (usually several million pounds), which could not be obtained elsewhere;
- and
- The proposal advances the University's overall academic and institutional aims (for instance the visions of the Schools).

In assessing whether the proposal advances the University's overall academic and institutional aims, CBELA will (where appropriate) continue to be supported by the Advisory Group on Research Purpose² on issues such as whether the proposed purpose of a project is to aid the energy transition and whether the proposal has no material risk of dual use in relation to fossil fuel extraction.

Other considerations

The Council is aware that some staff and students wish the University to place a blanket ban on funding from all fossil fuel companies. However, a blanket ban may cause tension in relation to academic freedom and freedom of speech. It may also give rise to questions concerning the University's obligations under charity law. Charity law governs the circumstances under which universities and other charities can reject funding and, as the Topping Study¹ makes clear, charity trustees may only refuse a donation exceptionally.

Under the new policy and process, there are no restrictions on academics' non-funded collaborations with fossil fuel companies.

¹ The Topping Study is available at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/documents/reports/FossilFuelStudy2023.pdf>.

² The Advisory Group's membership and terms of reference are available on the CBELA website at: <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/cbela/Pages/The-Advisory-Group-on-Research-Purpose.aspx>.

ANNEX

Policy on donations and research funding from fossil fuel companies

Introduction

This Policy and process outlines how the University, through its Committee on Benefactions and External and Legal Affairs (CBELA), will consider donation or research funding opportunities from fossil fuel companies. It is informed by the Topping Study,¹ which made recommendations about how the University should mitigate the risks of engaging with fossil fuel companies, and how it could pursue opportunities consistent with its charitable mission.

Fossil fuel combustion and industrial processes represent the single largest source of carbon dioxide and overall greenhouse gas emissions worldwide. In addition, the oil and gas industry is one of the largest contributors of methane emissions. The University has recognised the urgency of the climate emergency and has taken action to demonstrate leadership in this area.

Policy statement

The University will not accept research or philanthropic funding from fossil fuel companies which have business models that do not align with net zero 2050, unless there are exceptional circumstances.

The University will not restrict academics' non-funded collaborations to avoid the risks of impinging on academic freedom and freedom of speech or of impeding academics' access to data and expertise required for education, learning and research, such as into the transition to clean energy technologies. For the same reason, the University will remain open to minority (under 25%) membership of multi-company technical collaborations, even if this collaboration requires a small amount of funding (maximum £300,000) from all participants.

¹ The Topping Study is available at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/documents/reports/FossilFuelStudy2023.pdf>.

Process

1st Step: Definition of what is a fossil fuel company

1. In this policy, the University uses the Science Based Targets initiative's (SBTi) definition² of fossil fuel companies, that is:

Companies with any level of direct involvement in exploration, extraction, mining and/or production of oil, natural gas, coal or other fossil fuels, irrespective of percentage revenue generated by these activities, i.e. including, but not limited to, integrated oil and gas companies, integrated gas companies, exploration and production pure players, refining and marketing pure players, oil products distributors, gas distributors and retailers and traditional oil and gas service companies.
2. SBTi makes the following exceptions from its definition:
 - 2.1. Companies that derive less than 50% of revenue from (a) sale, transmission and distribution of fossil fuels, or (b) providing equipment or services to fossil fuel companies (see above).
 - 2.2. Companies with less than 5% revenue from fossil fuel assets (e.g. coal mine, lignite mine, etc.) for extraction activities with commercial purposes.
 - 2.3. Electric utilities that mine coal for their own power generation.
 - 2.4. Wholly or partly owned subsidiaries of fossil fuel companies if the subsidiary itself is not considered a fossil fuel company.
3. For clarity, and as recommended in the Topping Study, the definition therefore does not cover subsidiaries that are focused on clean-tech acceleration.

2nd Step: Tests to determine alignment of a fossil fuel company with net zero 2050

4. To qualify as having a business model aligned with net zero 2050 under this Policy, a fossil fuel company must meet all three of the following tests, where data is available:
 - 4.1. *Short-term targets aligned with scientific pathways to net zero 2050*: meaning a company is green-rated for short-term alignment using the Transition Pathway Initiative's carbon performance rating;³
 - 4.2. *Short-term capital expenditure (CapEx) plans aligned with net zero 2050*: meaning a company is green-rated for Capital Allocation Alignment on Climate Action 100+ using data provided by the Carbon Tracker Initiative;⁴
 - 4.3. *Policy influence activities reasonably aligned with net zero 2050*: meaning the company has a C+ rating for climate policy engagement on Influence Map.⁵
5. At present, the University is not aware of any fossil fuel company, as defined by SBTi, that meets all of these tests for alignment with net zero 2050. If a fossil fuel company were to meet those tests in future, any funding opportunities would be considered in line with normal CBELA processes for standard opportunities.

Exceptional circumstances for considering funding on a case by case basis

6. The University will only consider accepting funding from fossil fuel companies whose business models do not align with net zero 2050 in exceptional circumstances.
7. The following two criteria enable CBELA to interrogate and understand the specific opportunities and risks of a proposal and to determine whether accepting such funding is in the best interests of the University. The two criteria must be met by all proposals for CBELA to consider making an exception. When assessing a funding proposal, CBELA will need to be satisfied that the positive impact of the proposal means that the benefit of the funding would outweigh any reputational harm to the University and its mission.
 - 7.1. Criterion 1: The proposal is for a large gift, or equivalent value for a research collaboration (usually several million pounds), which could not be obtained elsewhere.
 - 7.2. Criterion 2: The proposal advances the University's overall academic and institutional aims as articulated in School Visions or equivalent, including for NSIs.
8. In assessing whether the proposal advances the University's overall academic and institutional aims, CBELA will (where appropriate) continue to be supported by the Advisory Group on Research Purposes on issues such as whether the proposed purpose of a project is to aid the energy transition and whether the proposal has no material risk of dual use in relation to fossil fuel extraction. For work in relation to developing policy on fossil fuels, the economics and/or challenges of the energy transition, CBELA may also seek assurances that explicit safeguards are in place to ensure that the association with the source of funds does not compromise the academic outputs.
9. In the context of the circumstances as set out in the Introduction, and given the level of reputational risk associated with University accepting funding from fossil fuel companies, the criteria intentionally set a high bar.

² <https://sciencebasedtargets.org/sectors/oil-and-gas/what-is-the-sb-tis-policy-on-fossil-fuel-companies>.

³ The Transition Pathway Initiative's Carbon Performance rating (<https://www.transitionpathwayinitiative.org/publications/uploads/2021-methodology-report-management-quality-and-carbon-performance-version-4-0>) compares the company's emissions pathway against different climate scenarios consistent with the UN Paris Agreement, for example the aim to limit global warming to 1.5°C above the pre-industrial level.

⁴ The Carbon Tracker Initiative (CTI) (<https://carbontracker.org/>) analyses the impact of the energy transition on capital markets. It provides data on capital allocation alignment for Climate Action 100+'s company assessments (<https://www.climateaction100.org/whos-involved/companies/>) and company profiles for oil and gas.

⁵ Influence Map (<https://ca100.influencemap.org/index.html>) measures a company's climate policy engagement, accounting for both its own engagement and that of its industry associations. There are 16 Performance Bands from A+ (representing a total score from 95–100%), with scores below 25% falling in the red 'F' band.

Ownership, implementation and review of the Policy

10. This Policy was adopted by the Council on 15 July 2024, following discussion at CBELA and the General Board. It is owned by the Council and implemented by CBELA.
11. The Policy does not apply retrospectively.
12. The Policy will normally be reviewed by Council every three years.

Initial recommendations of the Review of Teaching*15 July 2024*

The Task and Finish Group overseeing the University's Review of Teaching (*Reporter*, 6722, 2023–24, p. 197) has produced its initial recommendations (available at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/cam-only/reporter/2023-24/weekly/6749/TeachingReview2024-InitialRecommendations.pdf>, University account required). These initial recommendations serve as a first step towards addressing the underlying issues affecting undergraduate student workload, and sustainability of the supervision system. There is further work to be done throughout the Michaelmas Term 2024, prior to development of the final recommendations which will be considered by the Colleges' Committee, the General Board, and the Council in the Lent Term 2025.

Alongside the initial recommendations, the Task and Finish Group has identified a number of statements setting out problems and aims (see <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/cam-only/reporter/2023-24/weekly/6749/TeachingReview2024-Statements.pdf>, University account required), which seek to clarify the underlying issues, how they are experienced, and what the desired future state may be. Tripos teams will be asked to consider how closely these statements capture the issues in their local context during the Michaelmas Term 2024, to feed into the final recommendations.

Procedure for handling claims for the transfer of stewardship of human remains*15 July 2024*

In December 2008, the Council approved a procedure to handle claims for the transfer of stewardship of human remains in the University's collections (*Reporter*, 6131, 2008–09, p. 270). The Procedure established a Human Remains Advisory Panel to give advice and make recommendations to the Council in relation to those claims.

The Council, on the recommendation of the Human Remains Advisory Panel, has made some minor changes to the Procedure, primarily to the language used (for example, replacing references to requests with references to claims). The revised Procedure is set out in the Annex below and will replace the version reproduced in the Appendix to the *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 1114.

ANNEX**Procedure for handling claims for the transfer of stewardship of human remains****1. Making a claim or enquiry**

1.1 Claims or enquiries relating to the transfer of stewardship of human remains in the University's collections should be submitted in writing by email to registry@admin.cam.ac.uk.

1.2 The Registry shall take responsibility for dealing with the claim or enquiry and shall act as the point of contact in respect of such claim or enquiry. The Registry may appoint a delegate to act in their place under this procedure, and any reference to the Registry in this procedure shall be deemed to include a reference to any such delegate.

1.3 The Registry will openly engage and enter into constructive dialogue with anyone making a claim or enquiry.

2. The process of making a claim

2.1 A claim for the transfer of stewardship of human remains should include as much supporting information as possible, including information about:

- the identity of the individual(s) or community making the claim and any intermediary or representative;
- the specific human remains being claimed;
- the connection between the claimant(s) and the human remains in question;
- the basis for the claim and the reason for making it;
- the wishes of the claimant(s) for the future of the remains; and
- any information in the possession of the claimant(s) regarding other potential claims in respect of the same human remains.

2.2 The Registry will formally acknowledge the claim in writing and provide an indication of how long it is likely to take for a decision to be made.

2.3 The Registry will consider the information provided by the claimant(s) and may gather further information as necessary, either from the claimants, or from other sources, including from the national government of the country from which the claimant(s) originate. The Registry shall also invite those with responsibility for the University collection in which the human remains are located to provide a response to the claim, together with any material which they consider to be relevant to the claim, including expert evidence.

2.4 The Registry may take such steps as may be deemed necessary to advertise or give notice of any claim for the transfer of stewardship of human remains with a view to ensuring that any competing claims to the same remains are brought to the attention of the University.

3. Human Remains Advisory Panel

3.1 The information provided by the claimant(s) and by those responsible for the relevant University collection, as well as any other information gathered by the Registry shall be presented to a Human Remains Advisory Panel, which shall be established in accordance with Annex I.

3.2 The Panel shall consider the information presented to it and, taking into account the criteria set out in Annex II, which are derived from the Department for Culture, Media and Sport's *Guidance for the Care of Human Remains in Museums*, the Panel shall give advice and make recommendations to the University Council regarding the claim. The Panel shall submit its advice and recommendations to the Council in the form of a full written report of all the relevant facts, factors, and evidence.

3.3 The Panel may itself seek additional information or evidence as appropriate from any persons in order to assist it in determining its advice and recommendations to the University Council, including independent advice from experts on ethical, scientific, legal and political issues.

4. Decision

4.1 Based upon the advice and recommendations contained in the Panel's report, the University Council shall make a decision regarding the claim.

4.2 Once a decision has been made it shall be formally minuted. The Registry shall promptly inform the claimant(s) of the decision and the reasons for it.

4.3 The claimant(s) shall be allowed time to respond. It is possible that further discussions may continue. If a claim for the transfer of stewardship of human remains is declined, this shall not preclude future dialogue or communication between parties.

5. Costs

The costs of administrative support for the Panel, together with any approved costs of any independent expert or third party who is commissioned to provide evidence at the reasonable request of the Panel, shall be met out of central University funds.

6. Review

The efficacy of this procedure shall be regularly reviewed by the University Council and this procedure shall be revised as deemed necessary or appropriate in the light of feedback and comment from interested parties.

ANNEX I

1. A Human Remains Advisory Panel shall be established to give advice and make recommendations to the University Council regarding claims for the transfer of stewardship of human remains held in the University's collections.

2. There shall be three members of the Panel.

3. The members of the Panel will be appointed by the University Council on the recommendation of the Nominations Committee. One member of the Panel shall be appointed as Chair of the Panel. The Panel shall have a sufficient and appropriate range of expertise amongst its members to enable it properly and fairly to perform its functions.

4. Members of the Panel shall be appointed in their own right, not as representatives of any interests or institutions.

5. Members will be appointed for an initial term of up to five years. Terms of appointment may be renewed.

6. The Registry shall appoint the Secretary of the Panel.

7. The Panel may set procedures regulating its own activities, including procedures for the summary resolution of a claim by one or more members of the Panel. The Panel may at its discretion hear oral evidence or submissions from the parties involved and may at its discretion allow the parties to be represented at such a hearing.

8. The activities of the Panel shall be reviewed by the University Council every three years.

ANNEX II

A. The status of those making the claim and continuity with remains

Genealogical descendants: If individuals can demonstrate a direct and close genealogical link to the human remains, their wishes would generally be given very strong weight. However, consideration should be given as to whether they are the only people in this category and if they are not, whether there was any risk of harm to others in this category if the claim being made were granted.

There may be exceptional cases where remains would not be returned to genealogical descendants. However, it is expected that in the majority of cases they would be, or that consent would be required from the descendants for any further use by the University.

In practice, individuals who died more than 100 years ago may have many descendants from more than one community, so genealogical descent alone may not be the only criteria considered. In such cases, the University will need to assess the range of potential claimants and gauge how the interests of these individuals might be balanced with any other relevant considerations. The ethical principles will help to guide the University through these cases. The principles of avoiding harm (to the particular individuals concerned) and solidarity (seeking co-operation and consensus) are likely to be particularly important here.

Cultural community of origin: The concept of a community can be a difficult one to define. The assumption is that human society is characterised by the creation of communities that individuals feel a part of and which take on a collective set of values, often identified by particular cultural behaviour. It is often far less easy to identify which particular cultural community, or part of a community, has the greatest authority in any particular instance.

When considering claims based on cultural links, the University will need to take care to verify that the group it is dealing with is the only potential claimant, or that, if it is not, the other potential claimants support them. For overseas claims, where there may be doubt on this, advice should generally be sought from the national government concerned. It might also be normal to look for precedents for how a community has acted in the past.

For a community to be recognised and their claim considered it would generally be expected that continuity of belief, customs or language could be demonstrated between the claimants and the community from which the remains originate. Cultures evolve and change through time but these changes can normally be recorded and demonstrated. The relationship between the location of the claimant community and the origin of the remains might also be a consideration.

It would be unusual to accept a claim for return from a group who did not either occupy the land from which the remains came, practice the same religious beliefs, share the same culture or language, or could not demonstrate why this was no longer the case.

The University will need to be assured that a sufficient link does exist and that the group they are dealing with has sufficient authority to make a community claim.

A clear demonstration of a continuity of association between the claimant and the remains will be of great importance in dealing with any claim.

The country of origin: In some cases a nation may make a claim for remains, either on behalf of a particular community or for all of its nationals. Such a claim would be considered along similar lines to claims based on cultural community.

B. The cultural, spiritual and religious significance of the remains

Where claims are made it would be expected, but not essential, for the claimant group to show that human remains and their treatment have a cultural, spiritual or religious significance to their community. The claimant group may show that remains were removed without the permission of their community, or at least outside its laws and normal practices. Further, the claim may be being made purely on cultural, spiritual or religious grounds. The claimant may show that the correct treatment of the remains is of religious or spiritual importance.

The remains might also be of a particular cultural significance to a community, for example as being from an important family or representing war dead, or victims of a particular event, such as a massacre.

Demonstration through some or all of the ways above, of strong continuous cultural, spiritual or religious significance of particular human remains, will add weight to a claim. This is particularly so in cases where there is clearly a risk of harm to the individuals or communities concerned, for example, where the continued holding of the remains by the University perpetuates a strong feeling of grief amongst claimants.

C. The age of the remains

The vast majority of claims that have been made for return have concerned the remains of overseas people who died within the last 100 to 300 years. This corresponds most closely to the period when expansion took place by European powers with its subsequent effect on Indigenous peoples – a period that does not go back further than 500 years. It is also the period in which it is more likely for a close genealogical link to be made between the living and the dead.

Archaeological and historical study has shown that it is very difficult to demonstrate clear genealogical, cultural or ethnic continuity far into the past, although there are exceptions to this. For these reasons it is considered that claims are unlikely to be successful for any remains over 300 years old, and are unlikely to be considered for remains over 500 years old, except where a very close and continuous geographical, religious, spiritual, and cultural link can be demonstrated. Some cultures put more emphasis on association with land that has a cultural, spiritual or religious importance and less on relative age. In such cases, the chronological age of the remains may be less significant.

D. How the remains were originally removed and acquired

There are many cases of human remains being removed and studied without dispute. There are other instances, particularly during the 19th and early 20th century, of remains being removed against the will of individuals, families, and communities.

E. The status of the remains within the University/legal status of institution

The University should be sure of the exact legal status of the remains within its collections and that it has the right to make decisions over their fate.

The University should identify the remains being claimed and then ascertain why they are being curated and how they have been, and are likely to be, studied:

1. Are the remains fully documented and the information about them publicly available?
2. Do they have continued, reasonably foreseeable, research potential?
3. Do they form part of a documented access strategy?
4. Are they curated according to the very highest standards?
5. Are they curated in such a way as their long-term preservation is assured?
6. Can the long-term security of the remains be guaranteed within the University?

F. The scientific, educational and historical value of the remains to the University and the public

Many human remains have undoubted potential to further the knowledge and understanding of humanity through research, study and display. In considering a claim for return of human remains, the University should carefully assess their value and reasonably foreseeable potential for research, teaching and display and should ensure that specialists with appropriate knowledge and experience have assessed this.

If the remains do have value for research, teaching and display, the University should decide whether this can override other factors, particularly such as the wishes and feelings of genealogical descendants or cultural communities.

G. How the remains have been studied in the past

Consideration may be given to previous studies of the remains. Evidence of extensive previous research would normally support an argument for scientific value.

H. The future of the remains if returned

The care of remains, if returned, also requires consideration. Some claims might require re-burial or removal from the public arena, whereas some claimants may be prepared to keep the remains in such a way that future research, teaching or even display is possible.

I. Records of the remains

Whether a record of the remains exists, or can be made before return, might be a factor in making a decision.

J. Other options

There may be more than two options when a claim is made. The University should explore further alternatives if this helps in reaching a consensus. For example, it may be possible that remains would stay in the relevant University collection, but a claimant group would gain a level of control over their future use.

K. Policy of the country of origin

Some nation states have developed domestic legislation or policy to govern claims for the return of remains. The University would normally expect to be aware of any policies of the national government from which a claim originated. It is worth considering how a claim would be resolved if made in the country from which the claimants originate, as well as the expectations of the claimant based on the practice in their country of origin.

L. Precedent

Claims will generally be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. However, it would be expected that the University would review past cases of claims made to it, or claims of a similar kind made to other collections and their outcomes, as well as giving some thought to the impact of any decision on future claims.

Version history

Version 1 approved by the Council on 1 December 2008.

This version approved by the Council on 15 July 2024.

Ballots of the Regent House: Voting open until Monday, 22 July 2024

The following ballots are currently open for voting by members of the Regent House:

- Ballot on Grace 2 of 12 June 2024 (Employer Justified Retirement Age)
- Election to the Board of Scrutiny in class (c)(ii)

Voting closes at 5 p.m. on Monday, 22 July 2024 and members listed on the Roll of the Regent House promulgated on 6 November 2023¹ are eligible to vote. Voting services are provided by Civica Election Services, who will send a reminder shortly before voting closes to members of the Regent House who have not voted.²

Information about the ballot and election, including fly-sheets, candidate statements and access to the online voting portal, is available on the ballots site at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/ballots/voting/> (University account required).

¹ See https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/regent_house_roll/section1.shtml.

² The names and choices of individual voters cannot be identified by the University.

NOTICES BY THE GENERAL BOARD

Academic Career Pathways, 1 October 2024 exercises: Appeals Committee Membership

5 July 2024

The procedure for the Academic Career Pathways scheme provides for applicants to have the right to lodge an appeal against the decision of the Vice-Chancellor's Committee not to promote.

In accordance with the practice that Committee membership for the Academic Career Pathways exercise be published, the members of the Appeals Committee for the 1 October 2024 exercise agreed by the General Board are as follows:

Professor Beverley Glover (*Chair*)
 Professor Brian Cheffins
 Professor Katarzyna Jaszczołt
 Professor Paul Midgley
 Professor Rodolphe Sepulchre

Cambridge Zero

5 July 2024

With effect from 1 August 2024

The General Board has approved the establishment of Cambridge Zero as an institution in the School of the Physical Sciences.

Cambridge Zero was launched in November 2019 as the University's ambitious climate initiative. The overarching aim of Cambridge Zero is to advance the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence, in the context of climate change.

During the past eighteen months, the development of Cambridge Zero over the next five years has been widely discussed and a Working Group on the administrative model for Cambridge Zero recommended that Cambridge Zero should be embedded within a School. The Schools were consulted on this proposal and the School of the Physical Sciences (SPS) agreed that Cambridge Zero should become an institution within SPS.

On 29 November 2023, the General Board approved the proposal that Cambridge Zero be embedded in the School of the Physical Sciences, subject to approval of a funding uplift for Cambridge Zero by the Planning and Resources Committee. The financial arrangements have now been agreed and the General Board has accordingly approved the Regulations below.

CAMBRIDGE ZERO

Constitution

Cambridge Zero shall be an institution independent of any Faculty or Department but under the supervision of the General Board and shall be within the School of the Physical Sciences.

Management Committee

1. The purpose of the Cambridge Zero Management Committee is to ensure that Cambridge Zero's planning, administration and finances support its aim of maximising the University's contribution towards achieving a resilient and sustainable zero-carbon world.

2. The responsibilities of the Committee are:

- (a) to agree the annual plan and longer-term strategy for Cambridge Zero;
- (b) to monitor progress against the budget and objectives as set out in the annual plan;
- (c) to monitor and advise on any aspect of the management of the resources and operation of Cambridge Zero, receiving regular reports on the review of risks and such other matters as the Committee determines;
- (d) to approve the establishment of sub-committees and working groups, make appointments to them, and receive their recommendations for approval or comment on their reports.

3. The members of the Committee are:

- (a) a member of the Regent House appointed by the General Board as Chair;
- (b) the Head of the School of the Physical Sciences;
- (c) the Head of another School appointed by the General Board;
- (d) a Head of a College appointed by the Colleges Committee;
- (e) the Executive Director of Development and Alumni Relations or a deputy;
- (f) a registered student or sabbatical officer of the University of Cambridge Students' Union appointed by the Committee on the nomination of the University of Cambridge Students' Union;
- (g) between two and six members appointed by the General Board, at least two of whom shall be external members.

Members in classes (c), (f) and (g) shall be appointed to serve for three years from 1 October and may be reappointed.

4. The Director of Cambridge Zero shall be invited to attend meetings. The Committee or its Chair may invite other persons to attend for the whole of meetings of the Committee or for particular items of business.

5. A person appointed by the Director of Cambridge Zero shall serve as Secretary of the Committee.

6. The Committee shall normally meet at least once each term. No business may be transacted unless a quorum of at least half of the members is present, including the Chair. Conflicts of interest shall be handled in line with the University's Conflict of Interest Policy.

7. The Committee shall report to the Council of the School of the Physical Sciences and the General Board through annual reports and/or by such other means as the Council of the School or the General Board determines.

Academic Advisory Board

1. The purpose of the Academic Advisory Board is to advise the Director of Cambridge Zero on all aspects of the academic work and academic policy of Cambridge Zero to ensure that the views of the University and the Colleges are considered.

2. The members of the Academic Advisory Board are:

(a) the Director of Cambridge Zero;

(b) up to thirty members appointed by the Cambridge Zero Management Committee from across the University and the Colleges to reflect the research diversity and need for expertise across the work of Cambridge Zero, after consulting with the Heads of the Schools.

Members shall be appointed for three years from 1 October and may be reappointed.

3. The Chair of the Board shall be appointed by the Cambridge Zero Management Committee from among the members in class (b). The Chair shall be appointed for a period of not more than one year and shall be eligible for reappointment for a period or periods of not more than one year at a time.

4. A person appointed by the Director of Cambridge Zero shall serve as Secretary of the Board.

5. The Board shall meet at least once each year. No business may be transacted unless a quorum of at least half of the members is present, including the Chair. Conflicts of interest shall be handled in line with the University's Conflict of Interest Policy.

Staff of Cambridge Zero

1. There shall be a Director of Cambridge Zero, an office which may be held concurrently with another University office.

2. The Director shall be appointed by the General Board on the advice of the Management Committee and for such period as the General Board shall determine. The stipend of the Director shall be determined by the General Board on the advice of the Management Committee, taking into account the stipend of any other University office the Director may hold.

3. The Director shall be the Head of institution for Cambridge Zero, and shall be responsible for the leadership, strategic direction and operation of Cambridge Zero, subject to the advice of the Academic Advisory Board and the approval of the Management Committee.

Fellowships

1. The Management Committee shall have power to grant the title of Cambridge Zero Fellow to any member of the University associated with Cambridge Zero (other than a member of the staff of Cambridge Zero) who has made or is making important contributions to research associated with or facilitated by Cambridge Zero.

2. A person to whom the title of Cambridge Zero Fellow has been granted shall hold that title for not more than five years at a time. At the end of any such period the title may again be granted for a further period of not more than five years on each occasion.

Senior Associates

1. The Management Committee shall have power to grant the title of Cambridge Zero Senior Associate to any person (be they a member of the University or otherwise) associated with Cambridge Zero (other than a member of the staff of Cambridge Zero) who has made or is making important contributions to the work of Cambridge Zero.

2. A person to whom the title of Cambridge Zero Senior Associate has been granted shall hold that title for not more than five years at a time. At the end of any such period the title may again be granted for a further period of not more than five years on each occasion.

Charles Darwin Professorship of Animal Embryology

5 July 2024

The General Board has been informed by the Board of Electors to the Charles Darwin Professorship of Animal Embryology that they have been unable to make an election to this Professorship. Under the provisions of Special Ordinance C (vii) B. 20(a)(ii) the Board has discontinued the Professorship until 24 July 2024.

Faculty Board of Business and Management

5 July 2024

The General Board has approved changes to the membership of the Faculty Board of Business and Management in class (e) by removing the Director of the M.B.A. course as the holder of a specified office. There is no longer a need for the officeholder to be present at Faculty Board meetings, with other members able to cover matters relating to the M.B.A. and other courses offered by the Faculty. Schedules I and III of the General Board Regulations for Classes of Faculty Board Membership, Elections and Periods of Office (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 609) have been updated accordingly.

Changes to the Professorial Pay Review scheme

10 July 2024

The General Board has approved changes to the arrangements for the biennial contribution-based review of Professorial salaries. The Human Resources Committee (HRC) commissioned an academic-led working group to identify improvements to the current Professorial Pay Review (PPR) scheme in 2021. The group developed a set of proposals that were consulted on with Schools and the wider academic community. The General Board approved these changes in Easter Term 2022, and also agreed that implementation would be in two phases. Phase one changes included removing the need for references for within-band progression applications and an expectation of progression for those in the first three points of Band 1, on application, as long as employees can demonstrate they have maintained the expected level of performance at the time of promotion to Grade 12. These changes were implemented in the 2022 round of the PPR scheme.

The General Board has subsequently approved the details of the phase two changes, together with some additional updates, to take effect from the 2024 round. These include the development of a Teaching and Scholarship (T&S) pathway, renaming the scheme Academic Career Pathways (Grade 12) (ACP (12)), revised scheme criteria, future-dating awards to align to other pay and progression schemes, and minor amendments to the committee structure for the consideration of awards. The overall changes to the scheme provide a more efficient and effective application and assessment process for all parties involved in the process.

Degree Committees

With effect from 1 October 2025

The General Board has agreed to amend the General Board Regulations for Degree Committees (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 611) to enable the establishment of Interdisciplinary Education Committees to oversee interdisciplinary courses not falling within the remit of one Faculty, by adding new Regulation 7 as follows:

7. For interdisciplinary courses not falling within the remit of one Faculty, the School or Schools responsible shall establish and appoint the members of an Interdisciplinary Education Committee reporting to the General Board to serve as the comparable authority for the purposes of Regulation 1 and with the responsibilities set out in Regulation 6.

The Board has also agreed, on the recommendation of the Council of the School of Arts and Humanities, to add the Arts and Humanities Interdisciplinary Education Committee to Schedule I.

GRACES

Graces submitted to the Regent House on 17 July 2024

The Council submits the following Graces to the Regent House. These Graces, unless they are withdrawn or a ballot is requested in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 112), will be deemed to have been approved at **4 p.m. on Friday, 26 July 2024**. Further information on requests for a ballot or the amendment of Graces is available to members of the Regent House on the Regent House Petitions site.[§]

1. That the recommendations in paragraph 5 of the Report of the Council, dated 21 May 2024, on the demolition of derelict buildings on the North West Cambridge Estate (*Reporter*, 6742, 2023–24, p. 598) be approved.
2. That the recommendations in paragraph 5 of the Report of the Council, dated 4 June 2024, on the term of office of the Chancellor and the High Steward (*Reporter*, 6744, 2023–24, p. 634) be approved.¹
3. That the recommendations in paragraph 36 of the Report of the Council, dated 7 June 2024, recommending the budget and allocations from the Chest for 2024–25 (*Reporter*, 6745, 2023–24, p. 670) be approved.²
4. That the recommendations in paragraph 8 of the Report of the General Board, dated 7 June 2024, on the outcomes of the Academic Career Pathways (Research and Teaching) and (Teaching and Scholarship) 2024 exercises (*Reporter*, 6745, 2023–24, p. 685) be approved.³

¹ See the Council's Notice, p. 778.

² See the Council's Notice, p. 779.

³ See the Council's Notice, p. 779.

[§] See <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/governance/key-bodies/RH-Senate/Pages/RH-Petitions.aspx> for details.

Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 18 July 2024

The Council has sanctioned the submission of the following Graces to the Regent House at a Congregation to be held on Thursday, 18 July 2024.

That the following person be admitted to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by incorporation:

1. GONÇALO JOSÉ LOPES BERNARDES, Fellow of Trinity Hall, Professor of Chemical Biology in the Yusuf Hamied Department of Chemistry, and Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Oxford (2010).

That the following persons be admitted to the degree of Master of Arts under the provisions of Statute B II 2:

2. ANDREW DAVID BAINBRIDGE, Fellow of Queens' College.
3. TIAGO VANDERLEI DE VASCONCELOS CAVALCANTI, Fellow of Trinity College and Reader in the Faculty of Economics.
4. JOANNA KATARZYNA KUSIAK, Fellow of King's College.
5. ADRIAN LISTON, Fellow of St Catharine's College and Professor of Pathology in the Department of Pathology.
6. LEILA MUKHIDA, Fellow of Trinity Hall and University Assistant Professor in the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics.
7. CHRISTOPHER RAPHAEL RAUH, Fellow of Trinity College and Professor (Grade 11) in the Faculty of Economics.

Grace to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 19 July 2024

The Council has sanctioned the submission of the following Grace to the Regent House at a Congregation to be held on Friday, 19 July 2024.

That the following person be admitted to the degree of Master of Arts under the provisions of Statute B II 2:

1. JOSHUA JACOB FITZGERALD, Fellow of Churchill College.

Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 20 July 2024

The Council has sanctioned the submission of the following Graces to the Regent House at a Congregation to be held on Saturday, 20 July 2024.

That the following persons be admitted to the degree of Master of Arts under the provisions of Statute B II 2:

1. JULIANA FERRAZ GUIMARÃES CAVALCANTI, Fellow of Homerton College.
2. STUART JAMES HOGARTH, Fellow of Robinson College and University Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology.
3. KATIE KELLER, Fellow of Lucy Cavendish College.
4. RICHARD GEORGE COSMO LLOYD, Fellow of Lucy Cavendish College.
5. KENNY MONROSE, Fellow of Wolfson College.
6. RACHEL MARIE ROWE, Administrative Officer in the Governance and Compliance Division of the University offices.

ACTA**Approval of Grace submitted to the Regent House on 3 July 2024**

The Grace submitted to the Regent House on 3 July 2024 (*Reporter*, 6748, 2023–24, p. 738) was approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 12 July 2024.

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registrar*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Tuesday, 9 July 2024

A Discussion was convened by videoconference with Deputy Vice-Chancellor Dr Jessica Gardner, *SE*, presiding and the Registry's deputy, the Senior Proctor and the Junior Proctor as the attending officers.

Remarks were received as follows:

Forthcoming disposal of land at West Cambridge for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway

(*Reporter*, 2023–24: 6744, p. 626 and 6747, p. 705).

CCC	Cambridgeshire County Council
CPO	Compulsory Purchase Order
GCP	Greater Cambridge Partnership
TWAO	Transport and Works Act Order

Dr A. GANNON (Department of History of Art and St Edmund's College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I would like to register my environmental concerns, both regarding the carbon footprint of the project and the impact on the Orchard at Coton.

Might this linking project, on a much reduced scale, be a cycleable route instead?

Dr D. O'BRIEN (Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Innovation and Emmanuel College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the disposal of land outlined in the Notice is intended to facilitate the construction and operation of the section of the Greater Cambridge Partnership's Cambourne to Cambridge Busway scheme that is proposed to travel through the Cambridge West Innovation District, previously known as the West Cambridge site.

The Notice was an explanatory note inviting comments on an upcoming Grace which will seek approval of the permanent land disposal once negotiations for the lease conclude.

Concerns have been raised by objectors to the Busway proposals, in particular relating to the potential environmental impacts at Coton and to alternative route options.

I observe that any concerns of that nature will be addressed by the statutory process set out in the Transport and Works Act 1992 and are beyond the University's remit and control.

Cambridgeshire County Council intend to submit a Transport and Works Act Order for the Cambourne to Cambridge Busway to the Secretary of State in due course. If there are numerous objections, the Secretary of State is likely to arrange for a public inquiry to be held by a planning inspector. This is a structured way to allow objectors and supporters to present their case in person.

If the TWAO is made by the Secretary of State following inquiry, then the land in question at Cambridge West, which is currently owned freehold by the University, will be needed to build and operate the busway. This will be facilitated by either (a) a Compulsory Purchase Order in favour of Cambridgeshire County Council, which if successful will result in CCC obtaining the freehold interest in the land in question, plus permanent rights along Charles Babbage Road, or (b) the grant of a negotiated 125-year lease, as per the proposal submitted for the University's approval. The latter is in my opinion, the most favourable of the two options available to the University. It has been negotiated and structured in order to, as far as possible,

protect the University's long-term ownership position at Cambridge West and avoid loss of control and fragmentation of certain areas of this important land holding.

Therefore, the decision at hand is for the University to consider the recommendation to grant a 125-year lease to CCC, in order to avoid the far less favourable outcome of being subject to a CPO, with all the risks and detrimental impact on the University's land interests that could flow from this. The University's position overall on the proposed busway has been well documented throughout the public consultation process which commenced in 2017.

The route for objectors to raise concerns about the impact of the scheme in other locations along the proposed route is via the public inquiry, and will be a matter for consideration by the Secretary of State and their appointed planning inspector.

It is crucial to distinguish between these separate issues.

Dr C. M. HILLS (Newnham College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, before agreeing to this disposal of land the University should first consider whether this is a project which should be supported. One point which has not been discussed so much as the damage to Coton Orchard is the unsuitability of Grange Road as the proposed route of the bus as it arrives in Cambridge.

This use of Grange Road has negative implications for several University Colleges and other institutions which exist along the road. This is a fairly narrow road, for some parts of it two buses pass each other only by going into the cycle path. Currently it has the bad surface of most local roads including large potholes. There is no scope for widening it without demolition of some of the substantial buildings along the road, for example Selwyn College's new library or the main building of Robinson College. There are four Colleges and two schools along the road, plus other institutions. The road is much frequented by cyclists, many on cargo bikes with children, also students. In rush hour there is considerable traffic in cars, on bicycles and on foot, and traffic jams at both ends of the road, especially the Maddingley Road end. At those times the existing Universal bus, otherwise fairly successfully absorbed, aggravates the traffic jams. Adding further frequent buses arriving in the middle of Grange Road and turning in either direction, or proceeding down West Road to join Queens Road – also prone to traffic jams and often occupied by tourist buses – would create a situation with enormous potential for accidents, delayed journeys and gridlock.

The buses should stay on the existing appropriate road, Maddingley Road, no new busway is needed.

Dr S. J. LUCY (Newnham College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the proposed disposal of land at West Cambridge, effectively gives (or strongly gives the impression of giving – perhaps more importantly) the University seal of approval to the destructive planned course of the Cambourne to Cambridge Busway, which in fact terminates at Grange Road.

I would like to register my objection to the implicit support being given to the proposed busway route; as a long-term resident of Coton, the University's apparent complicity in enabling the destruction of ancient habitat in the form of Coton Orchard, through which the proposed route would run, the disregard for stated institutional aims of environmental sustainability and, quite simply, acting as a bad neighbour when there is a viable and far more cost-effective on-road route which would also serve the West Cambridge site, is disappointing to say the least.

I understand that this is a strategy to avoid the compulsory purchase of the land by offering a 125-year lease ahead of the Transport and Works Order, and that the University is a non-voting member of the Greater Cambridge Partnership, at which the decision to press ahead with this scheme will be made. However, I have seen nowhere the University taking any stand against the resultant destruction that it would involve. Instead, the initial *Reporter* Notice contains the following statement:

The busway will provide a much-needed and desired public transport option to Cambridge West, alleviating traffic congestion on the A1303 and providing sustainable transport options, which aligns with the University's vision for the site. Therefore steps have been taken to actively promote the route through the site. The Finance Committee supports the negotiations with the GCP, which are being monitored by the Estates Committee and the Property Board.

As the report from Cambridge Past Present & Future amply highlights,¹ there is a viable on-road route, at far less cost and with a much lower environmental impact, that the University could loudly champion; I hope that it starts to do so.

¹ See *Cambourne to Cambridge: In-Highway Proposals for High Quality Public Transport Scheme*, a report by Edward Leigh (February 2021), available for download from the Cambridge Past Present & Future website at <https://www.cambridgeppf.org/cambourne-cambridge-busway>.

Dr A. G. SANGER (Faculty of Law and Corpus Christi College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the proposal to dispose of land at West Cambridge for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway as announced in the Notice effectively amounts to approval by the University of the construction of a busway through the green belt and a 100-year-old Orchard in Coton village (known as the 'off-road' route for the Cambourne to Cambridge project) at great expense to the public, notwithstanding that there is a more financially responsible and less environmentally destructive alternative involving the use of existing roads. The business and environmental case for the off-road route is hugely problematic for reasons that have been well publicised, while the on-road route has the potential not only to prevent the eradication of invaluable habitats but will be cheaper, quicker to implement and emit less carbon (e.g., by not concreting miles of green belt land).

I would like to register my strong objection to the University's proposal for the disposal of land at West Cambridge for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway, and to the GCP-proposed off-road busway route that appears to be supported by the University. The University's complicity in a course of action that would be destructive ecologically (if the busway enters the West Cambridge site via the GCP proposed off-road route it would all but destroy the 100-year-old Orchard in Coton) and disproportionately expensive is incredibly disappointing and raises concerns over how such decisions are being made. This is exacerbated by the fact that support for this proposal – directly or through complicity or a lack of objection – runs counter to the University's stated aims of environmental sustainability and a commitment towards increasing the use of public transport with efficient investment (e.g., the University's Transport Strategy).

Professor D. A. CARDWELL (Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Strategy and Planning, Department of Engineering and Fitzwilliam College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I speak as an attendee of the Property Board and Chair of the Estates Committee, and as the University's Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Strategy and Planning. The Notice referred to a forthcoming Grace seeking approval for two sections of land disposal at the Cambridge West site to enable the construction of part of the Cambourne to Cambridge busway (one of the four transport corridors proposed by the Greater Cambridge Partnership).

I note a number of comments have been made in relation to the Notice by colleagues concerned about the impact of the off-road sections of the bus route on the local environment and communities, with particular reference to the Coton Orchard. Since 2017 there have been a number of detailed consultations and options appraisals carried out by the GCP. In December 2018 the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board put the proposed off-road option as the solution that best met strategic and policy objectives. Cambridgeshire County Council (the authority acting with the GCP) intend to submit a Transport and Works Act Order for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway to the Secretary of State this summer. There is a statutory process that will follow the submission of the TWAO enabling objections to the busway or its route to be lodged and brought to the attention of the Secretary of State.

In the meantime, as the GCP have taken this option forward, the land loss at the Cambridge West site becomes inevitable, and how we deal with the loss is the subject of the forthcoming Grace. The Section 106 agreement accompanying our outline permission for Cambridge West requires the University to provide contributions to enhance sustainable transport options to and from the site, including an obligation for payments towards the busway. In direct relation to the busway, the University has covenanted with Cambridgeshire County Council to safeguard land for the busway. The defined route requires two parcels of land at Cambridge West and this is the subject matter of the Grace. A negotiated deal with GCP is the preferred means by which the University would like to relinquish the land to the GCP/CCC. This is more beneficial to the University in terms of land take and its ability to maintain control of the site, rather than losing the parcels of land through the alternative compulsory purchase route.

In support of the bus route, I would like to add some further thoughts about the future of Cambridge. Cambridge is an area identified for growth by Michael Gove when he was Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. He made the 'Case for Cambridge' which set out a vision to make the most of Cambridge's position as 'Europe's science capital' and he created the Cambridge Delivery Group to deliver this growth. As a responsible developer, it is our duty to minimise environmental impacts and one way we can do this is with appropriate green transport options to bring people in.

The busway brings a direct transport link for University colleagues travelling in from the North/West of the city, to Cambridge West and the centre and we gain a much needed bus stop in the centre of the site. This is a significant and welcome benefit to the University.

Ms H. S. NASH (Director of the Cambridge West Innovation District):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I would like to take this opportunity to provide clarification relating to the Grace to dispose of land at the Cambridge West Innovation District, for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway, which will cross our site.

In my role as Director for the Innovation District, I am responsible for leading the development of the site in accordance with the University's vision to evolve it into an extraordinary innovation district for academic and commercial occupiers, together with the local community. Implementation of the vision is expected to bring significant benefits to the economy including job creation, funding and research opportunities for the University, plus an ecosystem for generating greater impact to society from our innovation. We can expect our population on the site to triple within the next ten years and we need to secure sustainable transport options for bringing our community to and from the site.

As part of the broader transport infrastructure provision for Cambridge, the GCP has proposed the new Cambourne to Cambridge busway and the University has previously requested that it is routed to service our site.

The University has two options for engaging with the scheme: we can do nothing, in which case the University will become subject to a compulsory purchase order for the land affected, which loses our freehold interest and rights; alternatively, we can enter into a negotiated long-term lease which enables us to reduce the land take significantly and put controls on how the scheme will be built and operated.

The Grace is requesting permission from the University to dispose of land to enable us to enter into a long-term lease for the busway. The terms of that lease have been negotiated to secure the most favourable position for the University. A compulsory purchase order would be a much more detrimental position for the University in terms of land area, control and onward development of the site.

I am aware that there are differing views to the concept of the Cambridge to Cambourne scheme. There will be further opportunity to formally raise any objection to the scheme when the Traffic and Works Act order for the scheme is published this summer, via their consultation mechanism. Objection to the scheme should not be conflated with the subject of this Grace, in seeking to achieve the University's best outcome from the GCP's requirements. That could inadvertently place the University in a more detrimental position for controlling their interests on the site.

Colleagues on the Property Board, Estates Committee and Council have taken advice and agreed it is in the interests of the University to dispose of the land parcels by a negotiated agreement with GCP/CCC. I would ask the Regent House to approve the Grace when it is presented.

Professor G. R. EVANS (Emeritus Professor of Medieval Theology and Intellectual History):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the Notice recognises that 'the original vision for the site as a destination for both academic and commercial occupiers was conceived more than ten years ago, with the concept of an innovation district emerging in recent years'. A Report of 15 May 2015 on the future development of the West Cambridge site already mentioned 'additional bus routes', but concerns were raised about 'pavement cyclists' causing risks to pedestrians from misplaced bus stops.¹

The Notice in response explains that:

the City Deal includes options for bus prioritization on the A428/Madingley Road corridor, as well as an orbital route that could link West Cambridge with the Guided Busway and Science Park station to the north and the Addenbrooke's site to the south. A package of stand-alone improvements is being developed; however, if the City Deal proposals are agreed, then the West Cambridge development would be designed to link to them.²

The Notice we are discussing ten years later says that the further decisions to be taken now need to reflect 'the government's identification of Cambridge as an Innovation City', implying that the deal to be done now will look to government approval in the light of that policy. With inexperienced MPs in a government shuffling itself into shape after a General Election less than a week ago, that approval cannot be a certainty. The new Labour government may not favour the plan for massive expansion of Cambridge. How will its policy affect the Greater Cambridge Partnership which the Report identifies as 'the local delivery body for the City Deal with central government'.

The Regent House's direct control of the proposed demolition is clear under Statute F II 3 but the retention of 'overall control' of the site itself will be subject to the option of a 125-year lease and a 'works licence' involving the CCC. The Notice merely 'wishes to update the Regent House on its own 'negotiations with the GCP'. A Grace is promised requesting approval of 'disposal' but should not details of the reported negotiations be published first?

Great Crested Newts featured at intervals in Discussion on proposals for West and North-West Cambridge developments from 1999. The relevant Estates Syndicate included a reminder in its Report of July 2013 that the newts had made it necessary 'to obtain a licence from Natural England before undertaking any works in the area where there is historic evidence of presence on site'. That had taken some time. Have the newts been consulted about this busway? Or Natural England?

¹ *Reporter*, 6391, 2014–15, p. 646.

² *Reporter*, 6392, 2014–15, p. 653.

Ms K. EDGCOMBE (Newnham College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I welcome the opportunity to comment on this proposal and to draw the attention of the Regent House to the wider context.

The tone of the Notice in the *Reporter* of 6 June might lead the innocent reader to suppose that the busway as currently proposed by the GCP can be regarded as an unmitigated good and the only solution to the perceived problems; this is disputable to say the least. It is deeply troubling that the University is seen to be giving tacit approval to the off-road option for the busway scheme, which has, for good reasons, attracted substantial and serious local and national opposition all along. A better bus service is agreed to be desirable for everybody, but this is not the way to achieve it; there are cost-effective alternatives which the GCP has repeatedly declined to evaluate properly. The project has a ludicrously low Benefit–Cost Ratio, and provides a doubtful and minimal improvement to journey times.

Even more importantly, this project works against every principle of the University's admirable Environmental Sustainability policy, with an enormous carbon cost, laying swathes of concrete across the landscape, substantially destroying Coton Orchard – a site of great ecological significance – and causing major environmental and ecological damage.

Of course, an agreement in principle by the University to cede the necessary land does not cause the plan to go ahead, but it amounts to an endorsement of a profoundly damaging project. I do not expect the University to be greatly concerned about a gross waste of taxpayers' money, but I do expect it to care about unnecessary and irreversible environmental damage. The University, which currently seems to be not merely a consenting party to but an enthusiastic collaborator in this disaster, has a great deal of influence within the GCP, even as a non-voting member; I urge it to use this power responsibly in its own interests and those of the wider community.

Dr J. T. GREEN (Queens' College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I agree that, as the Notice states, a 'busway will provide a much-needed and desired public transport option to Cambridge West' and that as such it 'aligns with the University's vision for the site'. The main three options for the route of a busway have been discussed for many years: one off-road, one on-road (dual bound), and another on-road (inbound only) option added later (alongside several variants of these which were dismissed over time). The off-road option requires the use of this land for which approval for disposal is sought.

All options are well known to the University through the work of the Strategic Projects group within the Estates Division and through the University's (non-voting) membership of the Greater Cambridge Partnership over many years. There is a huge amount of information in the public domain which has been accumulated by the GCP¹ and others over the ten or so years that this project has been under consideration. This includes much credible information and data supporting the inbound on-road option as a simpler, cheaper and environmentally more sustainable solution, including reports from Cambridge Past Present & Future (CPPF) in 2021² and from Mott MacDonald (MM) in 2019.³ Either of the extant on-road options can provide access to the University's West Cambridge site for bus passengers (as can the off-road) by utilising current routes through the site as does the U bus.

The University has supported the off-road option for many years and, as mentioned in this Notice, taken steps 'to actively promote the route through the site'. For example, at a meeting of the GCP Executive back in July 2021, the University's member stated that the University supported the off-road solution rather than the on-road solution and spoke to justify the resultant transection of the green belt.⁴ At that meeting the GCP decided to approve (only) the off-road solution⁵ and accordingly submitted their report⁶ to a meeting of the Cambridgeshire County Council in March 2023 recommending that the GCP's proposal for the off-road option be agreed (and taken forward for an order authorising its construction). The CCC after a long debate agreed the GCP's proposal, despite an amendment being tabled even as late as this in process, which repeated hitherto ignored requests for an impartial evaluation of the inbound on-road and the off-road option.⁷ This decision by the CCC was far from evidence-based.

The GCP Chair put the GCP's proposal to the CCC beginning 'you have been lied to'⁸ and later, in summarising the debate, stated that she had become 'intolerant of falsehoods being uttered'.⁹ Yet the GCP Chair repeated the GCP 'mantra'¹⁰ that the GCP had properly assessed the alternatives citing the GCP commissioned audit of May 2021 by Amey Consulting.¹¹ In the meeting, the Chair of the GCP repeats the claim that it is 'false' to say that 'no-one has ever directly compared the on-road route to the proposed off-road route'.¹² At the end of the debate one Councillor states that 'the on-road route has been thoroughly examined over many years and would itself have a significant impact on trees'.¹³ Some on-road options have been examined but not the inbound on-road option which the CPPF proposed.

Tangled up within these discussions has been the effect on Madingley Wood, a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and on the American Cemetery which has been referred to many times as a reason why 'an on-road solution' would not work. [*]

An independent *report* (an examination of facts leading to conclusions or recommendations) is very different to an *audit* (an examination of whether or not due process has been followed by an organisation). The Amey audit does *not* evaluate the inbound on-road option but audits the GCP's governance of the process, as indeed the audit states: 'the remit of this audit is not to evaluate the merits or otherwise of specific route alignments';¹⁴ the University's member similarly explained its purpose to the GCP Executive as so.¹⁵ No GCP report has concluded that the inbound on-road option would 'result in the removal of any trees'.

Why does the GCP continue to refuse to commission an independent *report* to evaluate the off-road together with the inbound on-road (as they have done for dual bound on-road and off-road)? Instead the Chair claimed (as noted above)¹⁶ that the Amey *audit* is sufficient to justify their rejection of the inbound on-road option (whilst the audit report itself states within it, that it didn't evaluate that option at all).

[*] Over many years there have been endless reports, confusing terminology and ambiguous use of the term 'on-road busway' thereby obfuscating which option is being addressed at any time. How could Councillors be expected to distil the truth from the mountain of ambiguous evidence? One Councillor felt compelled to speak because: 'there is so much misinformation going on'.¹⁷

And why does this matter to the University? Because the Notice and decision before us comes as the result of the above flawed processes within other bodies (the GCP and CCC), one of which the University has Board membership of.

The University now has to make a decision on a matter consequent upon all this. The University must not be complicit and similarly misled; it must take an evidence-based decision using our well-established principles and processes of good governance.

How can the University continue to ‘actively promote’ and facilitate an option which will lead to the destruction of acres of land with a colossal, well-evidenced environmental impact, which is opposed by a large number of the University’s external stakeholders¹⁸ and do so without first seeking an independent analysis to evaluate all the factors between the off-road and inbound on-road options? The inbound on-road option leaves the green belt untouched, is environmentally sustainable and delivers the University’s desired aim of access to West Cambridge (and is also cheaper).

The University’s Environmental Policy¹⁹ published in 2023 ‘applies to all aspects of the University’s estate ... and to a range of stakeholders’. It commits to ensuring that the University:

- ‘protects and enhances the natural environment’ ... ‘by having positive direct and indirect impacts on biodiversity and natural ecosystems’;
- ‘reduces the environmental sustainability impacts of its construction and refurbishment projects’; and
- ‘provides ... sustainable travel options’.

In summary, over many years the University has relentlessly pursued the off-road option, dismissing and ignoring options put forward by other credible stakeholders who have sought for an independent enquiry into the relative merits of each of the off-road and on-road inbound options. One of the underlying principles of a university is to be an organisation whose decisions and outputs are based upon evidence-based principles – why not so here?

I urge the University to pause before proceeding and

- to reflect hard on their current approach of promoting and facilitating one option without an evidence base, the provenance of which option is questionable, one which is contrary to their published values, and one which ignores the views of many stakeholders;
- to take serious note of the huge amount of environmental data cautioning against an off-road busway;
- to commission, contrary to its position to date and with or without the agreement of the Greater Cambridge Partnership, an independent report which assesses the off-road and the inbound on-road options for a busway including in terms of relative costs and environmental impact;
- and for the University to abide by its principles (as exemplified in its Environmental Policy) and grasp this opportunity to demonstrate that we practise what we preach.

¹ <https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/sustainable-transport-programme/public-transport-schemes/cambourne-to-cambridge>.

² <https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Public-Transport/Cambourne-to-Cambridge/Independent-Audit/Submissions/First-Batch/250221-Cambridge-PPF.pdf>.

³ <https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Public-Transport/Cambourne-to-Cambridge/C2C-LLF/C2C-LLF-Technical-Note-Madingley-Road-Quick-Wins-14-05-2019.pdf>.

⁴ See the video recording of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board meeting of 1 July 2021, on the GCP YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4nPewwgf7Lk>, at 4:21:00.

⁵ See the Decision Summary for the meeting of 1 July 2021 of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board, available on the Cambridgeshire County Council’s CMIS site, https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccc_live/Home.aspx.

⁶ See pages 19–46 of the Agenda document for the County Council meeting of 21 March 2023, available on the Cambridgeshire County Council’s CMIS site, https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccc_live/Home.aspx.

⁷ See the Minutes of the County Council meeting of 21 March 2023, available on the Cambridgeshire County Council’s CMIS site, https://cambridgeshire.cmis.uk.com/ccc_live/Home.aspx.

⁸ See the videorecording of the Cambridgeshire County Council meeting of 21 March 2023, on the CCC’s YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iwbAi8Q9e5Q>, at 1:40:45.

⁹ *Ibid* at 2:27:48.

¹⁰ *Ibid* at 43:09, 43:28, 36:20, 47:20 and 52:57, etc.

¹¹ *Independent Audit of Key Assumptions and Constraints: Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport Project*, dated 25 May 2021, by Amey Consulting, available from the GCP website at <https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Public-Transport/Cambourne-to-Cambridge/Independent-Audit/C2C-Independent-Audit-Final.pdf>.

¹² See the videorecording of the Cambridgeshire County Council meeting of 21 March 2023, on the CCC’s YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iwbAi8Q9e5Q>, at 2:27:55.

¹³ *Ibid* at 2:25:55.

¹⁴ See the Amey Consulting audit report (footnote 11 above), at section 6.1.

¹⁵ See the video recording of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board meeting of 1 July 2021, on the GCP YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4nPewwgf7Lk>, at 4:21:48.

¹⁶ See the videorecording of the Cambridgeshire County Council meeting of 21 March 2023, on the CCC’s YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iwbAi8Q9e5Q>, at 43:09.

¹⁷ *Ibid* at 1:20:00.

¹⁸ See for example the Cambridge Past, Present & Future campaign pages at <https://www.cambridgeppf.org/Pages/Category/campaigns>.

¹⁹ Available at https://www.environment.admin.cam.ac.uk/files/environmental_policy_2023_2024_logo.pdf.

The Registry, as editor of the *Reporter*, has omitted the last two sentences of paragraph 5 of Dr Green’s remarks, in accordance with Regulation 7 of the Ordinance for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 111). Two sentences were also omitted from the beginning of paragraph 8 on publication of these remarks on 17 July 2024, also in accordance with Regulation 7. The original location of the omitted sentences is marked with an asterisk in square brackets.

Professor L. C. HIRST (Department of Materials Science and Metallurgy, Department of Physics and Peterhouse):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the communities we serve care deeply about climate change. The proposed disposal of land at West Cambridge is effective endorsement by the University to release thousands of tonnes of CO₂ into the atmosphere on the construction of the deeply flawed off-road busway between Cambourne and Cambridge, when an on-road alternative route could be implemented faster, at lower cost and with a fraction of the CO₂ budget.

The environmental impact statement¹ estimates 29,130 tCO₂e infrastructure carbon associated with the off-road route (not including the loss of carbon sequestration in the soil and vegetation or end-of-life), with a forecast reduction in private vehicle use of 1.25m km annually, amounting to 516 tCO₂e. On this basis, the off-road route would take 57 years to break even on carbon. The use of a 60-year assessment period, in an apparent attempt to make this highly polluting scheme appear carbon favourable, and the inclusion of tree planting to offset emissions, can be dismissed as obvious greenwash. Climate change is now and it is simply not plausible to proceed with this maximum emissions policy justified by an unsecured projection of payback over so many decades.

These proposals make a mockery of efforts of departments and individuals within the University to limit CO₂ emissions. The construction carves up the scenic cycle route on the West Cambridge campus, and given the unconscionable CO₂ profile of this scheme it may well become a flashpoint for climate change protest as the bulldozers roll in. By supporting the off-road route the University is sleepwalking into a damaging and highly visible blunder on climate change. We must instead support on-road alternatives alongside investment in cycle greenways (supported by unbiased, evidence-based CO₂ emissions analysis) to serve Cambridgeshire village communities.

¹ *Cambourne to Cambridge Environmental Statement*, by WSP, August 2023, <https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/asset-library/Sustainable-Transport/Public-Transport/Cambourne-to-Cambridge/C2C-TWAO/Draft-documents/8-ES/C2C-ES.pdf>.

Dr D. M. PULLINGER (Wolfson College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I wish to register my objection to the University's proposal to lease land to Cambridgeshire County Council for the purpose of constructing a section of the Cambourne to Cambridge busway.

The off-road scheme chosen by the GCP (though not by the public in any of their consultations) is unnecessarily environmentally destructive in several aspects.

As the route leaves the Madingley Road, it bisects green corridors that the Cambridge Nature Network is striving to protect and develop.

As it cuts through the village of Coton, it will essentially destroy the county's largest traditional orchard, which is a County Wildlife Site and a designated Priority Habitat, the loss of which cannot be compensated for by the proposed mitigation measures.

Its unavoidable crossing over the M11 then necessitates the construction of a motorway bridge, making it a massive, carbon-intensive project that is completely unjustifiable if we are to take our responsibility for reducing carbon emissions seriously.

Under any circumstances, the potential environmental damage from the off-road scheme should demand the most rigorous examination and debate before any decision is reached. It is, however, the case that – although the GCP

have never produced a proper evaluation of it – there is a viable on-road alternative which would result in minimal environmental impact, at a small fraction of the off-road-scheme cost. To 'actively promote the route through the site'¹ – to actively promote the off-road scheme – is therefore in direct conflict with the University's commitment to environmental sustainability.

¹ *Reporter*, 6744, 2023–24, p. 626.

Dr A. P. CAINES (Department of Computer Science and Technology and Sidney Sussex College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, as a resident of Coton, I fully agree with the comments submitted by Dr Sanger (p. 792 above). As an employee of the University based on the West Cambridge site, I would like to additionally comment on the disruption to and negative impact on the site that will be caused by the disposal of land for the busway.

The proposed route, where it goes south of Charles Babbage Road and across the Cambridge West Canal will break up a part of the site which is currently traffic free and heavily used by cyclists and pedestrians accessing the West Cambridge site, as well as pedestrians, dog-walkers and families who make use of the space for exercise away from traffic and its dangers, noise and pollution. There has been no apparent attempt to engage with or consult users of the West Cambridge site and the path which runs between Adams Road and Coton. The busway will bisect it, causing great disruption during construction, and slowing down journey times once in operation.

At a time when the University on the one hand places great emphasis on supporting its employees wellbeing, mental health and physical health, it seems illogical to so negatively impact pathways which are so widely used by people both commuting and seeking exercise. The paths are also used by senior and junior running clubs in the evening, as well as large numbers of students going to the University Sports Centre for training, exercise classes and examinations.

My remarks have so far related to the adverse impact on people. There would of course be a negative impact on the environment which does not seem justified by the busway scheme. Not only are those impacts to be felt on the Coton side of the University's proposed disposal of land, but also as it crosses the West Cambridge site and proceeds across the fields to the west of the Wilberforce sports ground, and along the current footpaths between Clare Hall and the rugby ground out onto Grange Road.

Ms S. E. FLOOD (External Member, University Council):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I submit these remarks as a University Council and Finance Committee member and a member of the Property Board. The Council Notice alerted the Regent House to a forthcoming Grace seeking permission to dispose of two sections of land on the Cambridge West site to enable the Cambourne to Cambridge busway to transect the site. It has long been known that public transport options into the city of Cambridge have been a problem for University staff. Queuing for up to an hour to drive down Madingley Road is not a rare occurrence. The GCP acting through the County Council has responsibility for tackling this problem and the Cambourne to Cambridge busway is a proposed solution.

As with any new busway some land take will unfortunately be required. We recognise that during construction, there will be some impact on adjacent communities, through noise and construction traffic.

To counter this, a finished bus route leads to fewer private cars on the public roads, alleviating congestion and minimising greenhouse gas emissions. There are significant concerns nationally about a housing shortage and the need to build more affordable homes. Regionally there is a need for housing to support the growth of Cambridge. As there are few sites immediately surrounding Cambridge or within Cambridge that are available for housing at the scale required, housing growth is leap-frogging the green belt to areas such as Bourn and Cambourne. Without sufficient transport infrastructure these locations become isolated, generate significant private car use and reduce quality of life. Allowing the improved public transport infrastructure via the Cambridge to Cambourne scheme reduces pressure to release green belt for housing. Without suitable infrastructure to enable access between homes and jobs/education and other services, quality of life is diminished and life chances are limited. This is especially relevant for young people entering FE/HE and the jobs market but also for those needing access to healthcare. The GCP have a commitment to at least 10% BNG (biodiversity net gain) for the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme. So whilst some locations along the route will see a reduction in biodiversity there will be an overall increase.

As the Notice states,

The route of the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme includes part of the University's land. Normally compulsory acquisition powers would be sought in the order authorising the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme. However, the GCP has agreed not to seek such powers provided an agreement can be reached between the parties.

My membership of the Property Board has meant I have been privy to the detail of the deal struck with the GCP and have scrutinised it carefully along with my fellow Board members. I know equal consideration has been given by the Estates Committee and Finance Committee who both support the disposal of land by the means put forward.

If the proposed Cambourne to Cambridge bus route is approved, a matter outside of the hands of the University, the land in question will be lost to the University to enable the route's construction. This is not something the University can, or in my opinion, should be blocking, as the advantages of a bus route to the local community as well as to the University are noted above. As the land loss is inevitable, it is imperative on the University to secure the best deal it can, minimising land loss, securing advantageous bus services and retaining as much control over the entirety of the Cambridge West site as it can. The deal that has been painstakingly negotiated with the GCP over many previous years allows the University to do this.

Under the lease option, land loss is minimised, there is control over the bus access down Charles Babbage Road, and we protect the University's long-term ownership position at Cambridge West. The issue for us to consider is clear. Do we enter into a deal with GCP to secure a lease for this route, or do we wait for the inevitable Compulsory Purchase Order to take the land (and more of it, without the benefits secured in the deal)? There is not an option that does not include the disposal of this land. I would urge my fellow members of the Regent House to support the Grace to dispose of the land through a deal with the GCP when the Grace is presented to them.

Professor C. A. SHORT (President of Clare Hall and Emeritus Professor of Architecture):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Clare Hall has no objections to sustainable city design and transportation. A number of its Fellows, postdocs and graduate students do important work in this area.

- The preferred route from West Cambridge to the city centre was changed silently to swing across open fields to take over Rifle Range Road and avoid the most straightforward route. It will skim the entire length of Clare Hall and the University Rugby Club opposite with a major piece of new infrastructure. It is bizarre indeed that a natural Greenway would become a busway and a fully metalled roadway become a Greenway.
- The need to cross the Bin Brook well above its flood level requires a raised causeway to be built along the whole length of the route climbing to 2.5 metres above current ground level, retained by steep banks which will impinge physically on Clare Hall. This will destroy the outlook and peaceful environment for the many Fellows, visiting Fellows, graduate students and their families, many with young children who will live and work within a few metres of the proposed busway. Many fine trees will be at risk.
- The nature of the proposed vehicles is not specified but whatever type is employed there will be considerable noise disturbance.
- The Ralph Erskine buildings at the heart of the College are listed Grade 2* and Listed Building Consent would normally be required to build within their curtilage. Adjacent is the very fine listed Arts and Crafts villa, Elmside, by E. S. Prior which will also be adversely affected. The proposed junction with Grange Road is very compromised by the narrowing of Grange Road and will have to be a blind right hand turn only, unless land is also sequestered from the Elmside site, infeasibly close to the listed building.
- The College has retained a well-known traffic engineering consultancy and a national quantity surveying practice to develop the authority's hitherto undeveloped proposals to determine their true implications and cost them. They estimate that the proposed Rifle Range Road route will cost an additional £8 million, possibly more. It will destroy the peaceful environment of Clare Hall, a prospering graduate research institute with eight Nobel prizes to its name, pursuing precisely the world class research activities that the city and regional masterplans are particularly intended to support. We ask the University to suspend this transfer of land until the full implications of the two routes it enables are thoroughly investigated, along with the other alternatives available. Others are lobbying for those.

Professor SIR PARTHA DASGUPTA (St John's College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I make these remarks in protest at the proposed destruction of Coton Orchard in favour of a new bus route. The proposal has the same insidious logic that has shaped biodiversity loss throughout the world. We tend to think of human induced species extinction in terms of large-scale changes in land use: forests being transformed into crop land, animal farms and plantations; grasslands transformed into pastures; mines and quarries ripping apart dense jungles. But there is a more insidious process at work, which is perhaps even more powerful: the bit-by-bit fragmentation of ecosystems that accompanies growth in our demand for Nature's goods and services. Fragmentation leads to disproportionately greater losses in biodiversity. Persistent, incremental encroachment into Nature is also insidious because each move seems near harmless: a new bus lane cutting through an ancient orchard here, a mangrove forest sliced to make way for a luxury hotel there, a bat habitat, destroyed to make way for additional housing in an urban sprawl elsewhere. The orchard will not return, the mangrove forest won't have space to recover its previous glory, and the bat population will die because it has nowhere to go. If at each move human demand is allowed to trump ecological integrity, the landscape that evolves becomes denuded of biodiversity. The proposed destruction of Coton Orchard is built on the same logic. If the University of Cambridge is unable to appreciate the underlying destructive logic in this, we should all despair.

© 2024 The Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Cambridge.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of the University of Cambridge, or as expressly permitted by law.

The University is the owner or the licensee of all intellectual property rights in the site and in the material published on it.

Those works are protected by copyright laws and treaties around the world. All such rights are reserved.

Material prepared for the primary purpose of providing information about the University of Cambridge, its teaching and research activities, its subsidiary companies and organisations with which it is associated or affiliated has been placed on the site by the University ('University Material').

Subject to statutory allowances, extracts of University Material may be accessed, downloaded, and printed for your personal and non-commercial use and you may draw the attention of others within your organization to University Material posted on the site.

Notices for publication in the *Reporter*, or queries concerning content, should be sent by email to **reporter.editor@admin.cam.ac.uk**; messages may also be left by telephone to 01223 332298.

Advice and information is available on the *Reporter* website at <https://www.reporter.admin.cam.ac.uk/>.

Copy should be sent as early as possible in the week before publication; short notices will be accepted up to **4 p.m. on Friday** for publication the following Wednesday. Inclusion of notices is at the discretion of the Editor.