



CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

INFORMATION PACK

Date: Thursday, 21 October 2021

- 1 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE - 10 - DURATION OF MEETING** *(Pages 7 - 8)*
- 2 AGENDA ITEM 3: PUBLIC QUESTIONS** *(Pages 9 - 16)*
- 3 AGENDA ITEM 4D: CAM CONSERVATORS - COUNCILLOR APPOINTMENTS** *(Pages 17 - 18)*
- 4 AGENDA ITEM 5: ORAL QUESTIONS** *(Pages 19 - 26)*

- 5 **AGENDA ITEM 6A: CLLR PORRER - ALTERATION TO SINGLE USE PLASTIC-FREE EVENTS AT THE CITY COUNCIL MOTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 26** *(Pages 27 - 28)*
- 6 **AGENDA ITEM 6A: CLLR COLLIS - AMENDMENT TO SINGLE USE PLASTIC-FREE EVENTS AT THE CITY COUNCIL** *(Pages 29 - 30)*
- 7 **AGENDA ITEM 6B: CLLR MOORE - AMENDMENT TO WASTE ELECTRONIC & ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT RECYCLING FOR EVERYONE** *(Pages 31 - 32)*
- 8 **AGENDA ITEM 6C - CLLR COLLIS - AMENDMENT TO THE TACKLING ANTI-SOCIAL DRIVING MOTION** *(Pages 33 - 34)*
- 9 **AGENDA ITEM 6D: CLLR BENNETT - ALTERATION TO CARBON TAXES AND JOINT LOCAL AND NATIONAL CLIMATE EMERGENCY FUND MOTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 26** *(Pages 35 - 36)*
- 10 **AGENDA ITEM 6D: CLLR MOORE - AMENDMENT TO CARBON TAXES AND JOINT LOCAL AND NATIONAL CLIMATE EMERGENCY FUND** *(Pages 37 - 38)*
- 11 **AGENDA ITEM 6E: CLLR BENNETT - ALTERATION OF FUEL POVERTY AND CLIMATE CHANGE MOTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 26** *(Pages 39 - 42)*
- 12 **AGENDA ITEM 6E: CLLR MOORE - AMENDMENT TO THE FUEL POVERTY AND CLIMATE CHANGE MOTION** *(Pages 43 - 48)*
- 13 **AGENDA ITEM 6F: CLLR LEE - ALTERATION OF REMOVAL OF UNIVERSAL CREDIT BOOST MOTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 26** *(Pages 49 - 50)*
- 14 **AGENDA ITEM 6F: CLLR S.BAIGENT - AMENDMENT TO THE REMOVAL OF UNIVERSAL CREDIT BOOST MOTION** *(Pages 51 - 52)*
- 15 **AGENDA ITEM 6G: CLLR DALZELL - AMENDMENT TO GREAT HOMES UPGRADE MOTION** *(Pages 53 - 54)*
- 16 **AGENDA ITEM 6G: CLLR BENNETT - AMENDMENT TO GREAT HOMES UPGRADE MOTION** *(Pages 55 - 60)*

- 17 **AGENDA ITEM 6I - CLLR PORRER - AMENDMENT TO PARENTAL LEAVE AND FAMILY FRIENDLY POLICIES MOTION** (*Pages 61 - 62*)
- 18 **AGENDA ITEM 7: WRITTEN QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS** (*Pages 63 - 72*)

This page is intentionally left blank

Council Procedure Rule

10. Duration Of Meeting

10.1 When a meeting of the Council lasts to 10.30pm, the Mayor will announce that, if the meeting has not finished by then, a vote will be taken at 11.00pm on whether to close the meeting and (if it is a reasonable request given the remaining workload) urge members to assist in completing the remaining business by 11pm.

10.2 At 11.00pm, the Mayor will ask the Council if the meeting should close. Unless any member present dissents, the Mayor will then proceed to close the business of the meeting and go straight to the vote on any outstanding items without further debate .

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Questions

Question 1.

Member of the public will speak to anti-social driving motion submitted by Cllr Hauk.

Question 2.

"I congratulate and commend the Greater Cambridge Planning Service for commissioning a substantive evidence base to inform the emerging new local plan for 2030-41. Having watched and filmed many of the public hearings for the previous local plan, I hope that this will make the work of the planners defending the plan more straight forward.

I wrote a critical post about one of the consultant's reports - the Greater Cambridge Retail Study 2021 (See <https://lostcambridge.wordpress.com/2021/09/14/what-should-the-role-of-local-historians-be-in-the-local-planning-process/>) where I took apart their claim about Cambridge's night club scene over the decades.

Part of the challenge is that some of the historical evidence bases that would be useful for the new local plan pre-date the Internet and are held in the Cambridgeshire Collection and/or the County Archive on paper only.

I therefore call on the Council to digitise those historical council-produced documents (or at least inform the archivists that anyone who wants to digitise them has the Council's permission to do so, and upload the digital copies to the Internet Archive (<https://archive.org/>) so that the general public can access for free without subscription digital copies of those papers. Please could the Council also include these historical studies as part of their background evidence base?

These include but are not limited to studies produced by Gordon Logie including his prospectus for a new 2,500+ seat capacity concert hall in the City Centre, which the former Vice Chancellor Sir Ivor Jennings said the University of Cambridge would contribute funds to cover 50% of the costs back in June 1962.

(See <https://lostcambridge.wordpress.com/2021/10/06/vice-chancellor-sir-ivor-jennings-qc-says-cambridge-university-has-a-duty-to-improve-the-city-and-says-university-will-contribute-50-of-the-cost-of-a-new-large-public-hall-1962/> - please could the councillor inform the current VC that they are willing to have discussions about fulfilling this commitment?)

Question 3.

The over-reliance of the City Council on the results of the delayed GTANA is misplaced, particularly in regard to Transit Sites. The evidence of need is before you in plain sight. Last year, during the pandemic, South Cambridgeshire had 10 unauthorised encampments while Cambridge City had five.(1) Despite that, Cambridge City was the only council in the county to evict travellers during the first lockdown, and this punitive response has continued. There is a chequered history of GTANAs, with the 2006 GTANA being the most successful in reaching out to the Traveller communities across Cambridge and its surroundings (2). This was largely because of the County Council's provision of Traveller Education (CREDS) and the existence of the Traveller Health Team. Both these services have been decimated. Cambridge City has little engagement between Councillors and Travellers in their constituencies or travelling through and camping on Council land. The 2011 GTANA was a desktop exercise, which failed in its duty to consult with the Gypsy & Traveller communities resulting in the ludicrous assessment of the need for only 1 pitch between 2011 and 2031 in Cambridge City. Judging by the number of successful Appeals, this GTANA was worse than useless. The 2016 GTANA produced by ORS (3), took place during the changes to the definition of Travellers for planning purposes (PPTS) (4). This resulted in a methodology by ORS wildly underestimating who should be included and with only a few interviews actually conducted, in large part because many families refused to speak to them. Despite this, their figures went into the Local Plan as the basis for housing policy for Travellers. There is little reason to expect the 2020 GTANA by RRR to have much greater success in reaching communities who have little to no trust in officials approaching them for personal information. This is due to the punitive fashion in which their needs have been dealt with and the systemic racism that characterises their experience of living in and around Cambridge. With the imminent threat of passage of the PCSC Bill, which will criminalise trespass and eliminate the nomadic way of life, the solution is obvious. We need transit sites and negotiated stopping places in Cambridge now.

Will the draft findings of RRR's GTANA be available for public view and when and where will the Council conduct a meaningful period of public consultation?

NOTES

(1)<https://www.cambridge-news.co.uk/news/cambridge-news/council-traveller-evictions-during-lockdown-18608736>

(2) For 2006 Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment

Section F: Chapter 33: Gypsy and Traveller housing issues:

www.communities.gov.uk/publications/housing/preparingregionalspatial

(3) For 2016 GTANA see www.eastcambs.gov.uk for PE09 Gypsy & Traveller Acc Assess.pdf

(4) Re: PPTS 2015 Update www.gypsy-traveller.org Changes-to-planning-for-Gypsies-and-Travellers-website-leaflet.pdf

Question 4.

At the Full Council Meeting, on 22 July, the Council resolved to: Express strong concerns, Stand in solidarity, Write to the Home Secretary, Continue to work and Identify opportunities in its resolution on the PCSC Bill (1). No actions were listed to immediately support Gypsy and Traveller communities in the face of Section 4 of the Bill. In answer to Public Questions (2), with regard to 'process', the Executive Councillor stated that "encampment is also considered in respect of the welfare needs of those present. We assess the reason for the visit, the intended length of stay, homelessness status, medical need, and access to services such as education and social care."

With regard to the question of 'eviction', the Executive Councillor said "In the last two years we have dealt with 16 unauthorised encampments, involving 6 family groups. This did not include the most recent encampment at Arbury Town Park. All of these have resulted in evictions after having followed due process and after a Court decision."

At the Environment and Communities Scrutiny Committee on 7 October, the Council reaffirmed its commitment to promote equality and tackle discrimination in its 'Single Equality Scheme 2021–24'.(3)

Despite these commitments, there have been at least three evictions since these documents were approved by the Council.

The Arbury Town Park unauthorised encampment is a case in point. The families were served with a S.77 Order by an Environment Protection Officer (nailed to a tree) and addressed to 'the occupant(s)'. One and a half days later, 'Occupants and Persons unknown' were issued with a Summons to appear at Huntingdon Magistrates Court. (4)

It is difficult to imagine at what point in these proceedings a welfare assessment was carried out. If the Council had done so, it would be odd if they hadn't then referred to the family/(s) by name. Note also, that many Travellers of this generation are functionally illiterate and written documents attached to trees is not an effective form of communication. In this instance, reading the Order and Summons aloud and answering any questions would have shown greater respect and understanding for

this communities' oral culture. In any event, it is more than likely that the families would have refused to respond, precisely because of their mistrust of officials attending these encampments asking questions as well as the systemic racism this community has experienced over the years in and around Cambridge.

Punitive responses and universally applied evictions are incompatible with a welfare-based approach. The Council will never improve its relationship with this Community or tackle the discrimination they experience without offering real solutions, in this case the urgent provision of transit sites and authorised stopping places.

Will the Council now move urgently to the provision of Transit sites in the face of the imminent passage of the PCSC Bill?

NOTES

(1) See: Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee Agenda of the Meeting: 9. Decision Sheet. 6b: Motion on Policing Bill

(<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=476&MIId=3969&Ver=4> or link through from <https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?Committeeld=476> to meeting of 7th October if link is broken due to updates on the page)

(2) Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee Agenda of the Meeting: Agenda Item 10: Question 4

(<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=476&MIId=3969&Ver=4> or link through from <https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?Committeeld=476> to meeting of 7th October if link is broken due to updates on the page)

(3) See: [cambridge.gov.uk/news/2021/10/12/council-reaffirms-commitment-to-promote-equality-and-tackle-discrimination](https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/news/2021/10/12/council-reaffirms-commitment-to-promote-equality-and-tackle-discrimination)

(4) See: Arbury Park notices S77 order 31 Aug and Summons 2 Sept 2021

Question 5.

Under its Public Sector Equality Duty, the last Environment and Communities Scrutiny Committee on 7th October [2021] approved an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) regarding enhancements to the boundary of Trumpington Meadows. Under Item 11 Action Plan, it was stated 'We have also contacted a Traveller representative, who had expressed concerns about previous project at this site,

which was subsequently withdrawn' (sic). Under item 13 Sign Off, there are no Traveller representatives listed amongst people consulted on the new plan. To my certain knowledge, neither myself nor my colleague, Beverley Carpenter, who were the Traveller representatives who raised objections to the scheme, were contacted. Our names were known by Trumpington Councillors including Katie Thornburrow and Peter Lord as we attended the meeting of the September 29th 2020 Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee on Microsoft Teams (as indicated in email communications with Democratic Services) (1). Councillor Lord put forward the S106 funding application on behalf of a resident, which was clearly aimed at the prevention of unauthorised encampments by building ditches, bunds and fencing around the perimeter thinly disguised behind provision of new habitats for wildflowers, flowering shrubs, insects and invertebrates. (Lib Dem leaflet attached) The posting on Facebook and the recording of the meeting no longer exists.

The Action plan (point 11.) states that impacts will be identified ... throughout the planning and implementation stages and 'to stand in solidarity with Traveller and Gypsy communities and continue to build trust and good relations with them' and resolves 'to find solutions where it is found that there is a lack of legal sites' to help mitigate potential impacts of this project. The Council have fallen at the first hurdle by incorrectly inferring that they consulted with any members of the communities impacted or with the Traveller representatives who were easily contactable. This seriously undermines this Equality Impact Assessment. At the risk of sounding like a broken record, the solution to this issue is the urgent and immediate provision of transit sites and negotiated stopping places.

What actions will the Council now take to publicly correct the misrepresentations in the EqIA approved on the 7/10/21 and published 8/10/21 on the Council website, and what plans do they have in place to remedy the failure to consult with the Traveller community and/or its representatives, one of the groups impacted by the current enhancement Project on Trumpington Meadows?

(1) There is some confusion in my email trail of whether this meeting took place of September 29th or October 29th.

Question 6.

Why has the council closed its waiting lists for the allotment sites at Auckland Road, New Street and Empty Common?

This is bad practice: the National Allotment Society "opposes the closure of waiting lists, irrespective of their length, because waiting lists are an important measure of the unsatisfied demand for plots, and thus of the need to expand supply if the allotment provider is to fulfill its statutory duty to provide a sufficient number of allotments." [1]

Will you re-open these lists?

You could make it clear that waits are long without denying people the opportunity to register their interest in a particular site, informing demand for allotments in that part of the city.

[1][NAS policy on waiting lists](#)

Question 7.

Over the past few months the world has watched in horror as a crisis has unfolded in Afghanistan, with the Taliban seizing back control of the country and forcing thousands of Afghan citizens to flee their homes. The UN has estimated that, by the end of 2021, this could be as many as half a million people. And this comes on top of 2.2 million Afghan refugees already in neighbouring countries and 3.5 million people forced to flee their homes within the country's borders. Some of those airlifted out of Afghanistan will be here in the UK, where local councils like ours will support them. Can you please update us on what progress the City Council has made in its commitment to resettling any refugees that arrive here?

Question 7 - supplementary question

How is City Council planning to develop the collaborative relationship and connections with the new county joint administration that strengthen the refugee resettlement offer?

Question 8 – First question.

My questions relate to the motions put by Councillors Moore and Bennett. I am unable to come in person as I am speaking at a concurrent meeting. I raise my question as both Cambridge resident, and as Heritage Chair of the Sustainable Traditional Buildings Alliance (STBA) <https://stbauk.org>, a UK-wide group which brings construction industry, heritage, and sustainability interests. The STBA developed and promoted the “whole-house” approach to retrofit, now promoted by the Government.

Cllr Moore’s motion references 51,124 homes needing to be retrofitted, with 6,405 per year to meet the Council’s Net Zero carbon vision.

All such targets raise serious issues, including:

- lack of industry skills and capacity, particularly in relation to traditional construction;

- the time required to train a competent workforce; and
- the risks of unintended consequences , wasting both money and carbon.

What consideration has Cllr Moore given to potential complementary approaches?
Including

- the need for a risk-based approach
- the potentially reduced need for retrofit as Grid Decarbonisation progresses ;
and
- promoting behaviour change. As Dr Tia Kansara said recently to the Environmental Audit Committee “The fastest way to retrofit a building, if I may say so, is behaviour change. In a number of studies we have found that between 20% and 35% of energy can be reduced inside a building primarily with use.”

Has Cllr Moore noted that the PAS 2035 standard (cited in the “proposed Policy Direction’ of the draft Local Plan Great Places topic paper “GP/CC: Adapting Heritage Assets to Climate Change”) costs £190, and that the companion standard BS 7913 (essential for traditional and historic buildings) costs £218?

Has Cllr Moore noted the free guidance prepared by STBA and other bodies, and will the Council join STBA and others in pressing for the key retrofit standards to be made freely available?

Question 8 – Second question.

Cllr Bennett’s motion cites the CLC’s “National Retrofit Strategy” which ignores the need for a different approach to traditional buildings, which form at least 20% of the stock (up to 35%, according to a study by the Building Research Establishment for the Government). I ask Councillors to recognise that a “one size fits all” approach such as that being promoted by the CLC may not be appropriate for buildings of traditional construction.

I commend to all Councillors the STBA’s recently-published “From Retrofit to Regeneration – a blueprint for post-Covid recovery” <https://stbauk.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/From-Retrofit-to-Regeneration-STBA-2021.pdf>: this looks beyond reductions in energy use, to potential co-benefits including health and wellbeing, and protection and enhancement of cultural heritage. These are also among the objectives of the PAS 2035 standard (which STBA helped to draft).

This page is intentionally left blank

<p style="text-align: center;">APPOINTMENT OF CITY COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS TO THE CONSERVATORS OF THE RIVER CAM</p>

- 1.1 The three-year term of office for the seven Conservators of the River Cam appointed by the City Council (four non-councillor appointments and three City Councillors) ends on 31 December 2021.
- 1.2 The maximum term of office is 3 x three-year terms with thereafter a break period of three years before a re-application can be made.
- 1.3 New appointments are required for the three-year term commencing 1 January 2022.
- 1.4 Legislation requires the seven city council appointments to be made by the Full Council on the recommendation of the Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing
- 1.5 A selection meeting is taking place on the day of the Council Agenda publication so the nominated persons will be published to Council in the supplementary Council pack on 20 October.

Accordingly, Council is recommended to:

- 2.1 Approve nominations of three City Councillor appointments (two Labour and one Liberal Democrat appointment) to the Conservators of the River Cam commencing 1 January 2022:
 - Katie Thornburrow
 - Mike Sargeant
 - Alan Cox

This page is intentionally left blank

**Council-21 October 2021
Agenda Item 5**

Oral Questions for Council

Question number: 1

From Councillor J Gawthrop Wood

To Leader of the Council and Executive Councillor for
Strategy and External Partnerships

Question

What does he anticipate will be the Government's proposals for devolution?

Question number: 2

From Councillor H Davies

To Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food
and Community Wellbeing

Question

Can the executive councillor please give an update on the planned herbicide free trial?

Question number: 3

From Councillor J Page-Croft

To Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food
and Community Wellbeing

Question

Are there any plans to find transit sites for the Gypsy/Romany/Traveller community to stay on for a few weeks, especially close to Addenbrookes?

Question number: 4

From Councillor H Copley

To Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing

Question

How many people have requested an allotment in Cambridge in the last two years, and how many of them were provided with an allotment?

Question number: 5

From Councillor M Healy

To Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing

Question

Given public concern at recent high-profile attacks, can the executive councillor outline what is being done locally to ensure women's safety?

Question number: 6

From Councillor C Payne

To Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment & City Centre

Question

I hope the Executive Councillor join me in expressing her horror at the report of the sexual assault which took place in the market square on Tuesday 13th October, along with her support to the alleged victim. Will she offer the Council reassurance that actions are being investigated to improve the safety of the market square?

Question number: 7

From Councillor M Bond

To Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Question

A significant number of representations were made in last year's consultation, calling for the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan to provide for more open space at the heart of this major new development and a closer matching of the standard for open space within our current local plan. Can you tell us whether this view has been

received and understood and will be reflected in the final version of the plan when it is published shortly?

Question number: 8

From Councillor O Hauk

To Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing

Question

Considering the obvious benefits of productive allotments to the community with respect to healthy and sustainable living, well-being, biodiversity and community spirit: Can the Executive Councillor push for a variation in planning permission for the Trumpington Meadows and Clay Farm allotment sites to allow buildings and structures of normal shed height on the land, or explain what constraints and possibly developer-led conditions prevent her from doing so?

Question number: 9

From Councillor M Davey

To Executive Councillor for Communities

Question

Can we have an update on the progress towards achieving the resolutions in the council's Black Lives Matters motion

Question number: 10

From Councillor T Bick

To Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment & City Centre

Question

Do neighbourhood recycling centres feature in your view of the future of the waste service?

Question number: 11

From Councillor J Dalzell

To Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

Question

What lessons has the Executive Councillor taken from the collapse of Visit Cambridge and Beyond and the losses subsequently incurred by this Council?

Question number: 12

From Councillor A Cox

To Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Question

As the number 25 bus is expected to cease running on the completion of the Trumpington development, can the Executive Councillor say what discussions she has had with Stagecoach about continuing the service and what the outcome is?

Question number: 13

From Councillor K Porrer

To Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment & City Centre

Question

Can the Executive Councillor confirm that the council will use its influence with the new Visit Cambridge organisation to ensure that the new website will have up to date and wide ranging information about our valued local market traders, in our vibrant market square, and also for those around the city centre, including at the Arts and Craft market and the stalls on Fitzroy Street.?

Question number: 14

From Councillor A Gilderdale

To Executive Councillor for Housing

Question

Can the executive councillor give a report on the progress towards net zero carbon new council homes?

Question number: 15

From Councillor A Smith

To Executive Councillor for Open Spaces Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing

Question

Can the executive councillor give an update on progress towards increasing the city's tree canopy cover?

Question number: 16

From Councillor I Flaubert

To Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Question

Although it is fashionable to talk about biodiversity gain and new planted trees, the truth is that it is not clear how loss is monitored and the real wildlife gain. Could the Exec Cllr explain whether the city council and its shared planning service has a mechanism to record tree loss on city land, including those recently planted that do not survive, as well as the loss of trees in conservation areas?

Question number: 17

From Councillor D Baigent

To Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Question

What commitments are there to reduce the amount of traffic in the city?

Question number: 18

From Councillor G Bird

To Executive Councillor for Communities

Question

Following the decision not to hold the bonfire night event, what other, smaller, events are planned for the winter months?

Question number: 19

From Councillor M Gehring

To Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing

Question

Reports of a rising number of cycle thefts at the station and in the Cambridge City Centre are very worrying, could the Executive Councillor update us on the efforts to improve cycle security?

Question number: 20

From Councillor D Lee

To Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Question

The much loved Flying Pig will shut its doors for the last time at the end of this month, barring a deus ex machina. At a time when the pandemic has demonstrated to us all the importance of community assets and cultural venues including pubs and music venues, it's very disappointing that in losing The Flying Pig we lose a pub, a place to enjoy live music and a place for up and coming musicians to hone their craft. Without venues like the Flying Pig, the world have been deprived of Pink Floyd, and Katrina and the Waves may not have won the Eurovision song contest. Can the Exec Cllr confirm what the council is doing to protect Cambridge's cultural heritage from wealthy developers taking community cultural assets from the city to give to themselves in the form of soulless office space?

Question number: 21

From Councillor R Robertson

To Executive Councillor for Housing

Question

Can the executive councillor report give an update on Cambridge Street Aid week?

Second Questions

Question number: 22

From Councillor H Copley

To Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Question

The Local Plan is being prepared at a time of great uncertainty in national planning policy. The sweeping reforms proposed in the Planning White Paper seem likely to be shelved as the new Secretary of State implements a new set of priorities – possibly including a refocusing of housebuilding towards the North of England. Meanwhile, the Government continues to push forward their plans for the Ox-Cam Arc, which would reportedly see 1 million new houses built between Oxford and Cambridge, and would interact with Local Plans in ways which are yet to be explained.

These uncertain external drivers threaten to take away the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning body's autonomy and ability to determine for itself what level of housebuilding is desirable and sustainable in our region. Council acknowledges that we are experiencing serious and worsening water shortages, that the City is in essence facing a traffic congestion crisis, and that we have insufficient public green space and protected nature areas, but has thus far treated the housing allocation as a minimum. In the Greater Cambridge Local Plan first proposals, it is suggested that Greater Cambridge takes an 'employment-led approach' to quantifying housing need. This would *increase* the number of homes to be built beyond the original allocation, based on a projection that job creation will continue to grow (without any assessment of whether the latter is desirable in our overheated regional economy).

Cambridge Water and others are working on solutions to the water supply problem currently facing the region, while attempting to allow for a wide range of possible future growth scenarios. Water consumption has increased significantly during and since the pandemic to 151 litres/person/day, well above the national target of 110

litres/person/day, and even further from the Greater Cambridge target of 80 litres/person/day in new dwellings.

Question:

What attempt has been made to calculate the amount of development our area can support, taking into account that: water is already being over-abstracted and attempts to reduce per capita consumption have so far not succeeded; solutions to the current traffic congestion have yet to be found; suitable sites for building are limited; there is desperate need for more green space; and we have committed to 'doubling nature'? What is the justification for taking an 'employment-led' approach to housing allocation (which increases the number of houses to be accommodated in the Local Plan), given the known environmental constraints to further growth in this region?

Question number: 23

From Councillor J Gawthrope Wood

To Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Question

What plans are there for new allotments within planning policy?

Agenda Item 6a:

Alteration of motion under Council Procedure Rule 26, additional text underlined, deleted text ~~struckthrough~~.

Council notes:

The acceptance in May 2018 at council of a Plastics motion, which asked that caterers for City commissioned events approach these in as sustainable way as possible;

That this motion did not commit the Council to removal of single use plastics by a specific date;

The increasing urgency of the climate emergency, and the documented and evidenced detrimental effects of single use plastics on our oceans, waterways and beaches;

That the government consultation on the introduction of a ban on single use plastics is unlikely to become law until at least 2023;

That events put on by the city council, and those on City Council land, are not yet required to be single use plastic-free, or to provide clearly marked on site recycling facilities, or to offer incentives for members of the public to bring their own cups and glasses (as is common in most cafes now).

Council commits to:

Introducing new standard contractual terms to ensure that organisers for any future events sponsored or supported by the City Council, or taking place on City Council land, must now:

-Cease the use of any single use plastic on site and provide evidence of this when planning or applying for the event, as well as displaying signage at events to inform the public of this;

-Encourage the use of compostable materials and if used, ensure that separate recycling is provided for these with clear signage;

-Ensure that any events using litter pickers and collections either separate rubbish on site using clearly marked bins, or have arrangements in place that can be provided as part of the application for the event to ensure that this is done off site;

-Install appropriate signage at the event to ensure that members of the public are aware of the different bins and to assist them in putting the correct rubbish in the right bins;

-Ensure that all stalls at least encourage but preferably incentivise the use of ~~recyclable~~ reusable cups for beverages and other cutlery and crockery, for example by advertising discounts for these, as is already very common in cafes across the city;

Council also commits to:

Promoting the urgent need to remove single use plastic from all day to day use in businesses and events around the city.

Agenda Item 6

Agenda Item 6a

Councillor Collis proposed and Councillor S.Smith seconded the following amendment to motion, additional text underlined, deleted text ~~struckthrough~~.

Council notes:

- The acceptance in May 2018 at council of a Plastics motion, which asked that caterers for City commissioned events approach these in as sustainable way as possible;
- That this motion did not commit the Council to removal of single use plastics by a specific date;
- The increasing urgency of the climate emergency, and the documented and evidenced detrimental effects of single use plastics on our oceans, waterways and beaches;
- That the government consultation on the introduction of a ban on single use plastics is unlikely to become law until at least 2023;
- That events put on by the city council, and those on City Council land, are not yet required to be single use plastic-free, or to provide clearly marked on site recycling facilities, or to offer incentives for members of the public to bring their own cups and glasses (as is common in most cafes now).

Council requests the Executive Councillor commits to:

- Introducing new ~~standard~~ contractual terms to ensure that organisers for any future events ~~sponsored or supported by the City Council, or taking place on City Council land, must now:~~
- Cease the use of any single use plastic on site and provide evidence of this when planning or applying for the event, as well as displaying signage at events to inform the public of this;
- Encourage the use of compostable materials and if used, ensure that separate recycling is provided for these with clear signage;
- Ensure that any events using litter pickers and collections either separate rubbish on site using clearly marked bins, or have arrangements in place that can be provided as part of the application for the event to ensure that this is done off site;
- Install appropriate signage at the event to ensure that members of the public are aware of the different bins and to assist them in putting the correct rubbish in the right bins;
- Ensure that all stalls at least encourage but preferably incentivise the use of reusable or recyclable (or both) cups for beverages and other cutlery and crockery, for example by advertising discounts for these, as is already very common in cafes across the city;

Council also commits to:

- Promoting the urgent need to remove single use plastic from all day to day use in businesses and events around the city.
- Instruct Officers to monitor and advise on best practice that is currently being developed by the Government, the Local Government Association and representatives from across the festival sector in relation to their commitment for 2023 to have standardised environmental objectives that local authorities must adopt when licensing festivals.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6b

Councillor Moore proposed the following amendment (additional text underlined, deleted text struckthrough).

Cambridge City Council notes:

- Waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) is the fastest growing waste stream on the planet.
- WEEE contains a high volume of critical raw materials (CRMs), which are vital components of many 'green' technologies.
- Research in 2019 showing that:
 - 51% of UK households had at least one unused electronic device;
 - 45% had up to 5 unused devices;
 - 82% of these households had no plans to recycle or sell their devices.
- The City Council currently operates ~~four~~ six recycling banks for small electricals, all of which are at four sites in Trumpington ward.
- The Greater Cambridge Shared Waste Service are seeking additional funding that is now available from an electrical compliance scheme, as part of the producer responsibility regulation, to expand the number of banks within the City and introduce collections in South Cambridgeshire where there are currently no WEEE banks.
- Greater Cambridge Shared waste service has recently drawn up plans to expand the number of WEEE banks it provides from 6 to 14.
- Locations have been chosen so that residents can also use other banks at these sites to recycle textiles, bulbs, and batteries at the same time, ensuring that the best service is available and the environmental impact of travelling to recycle items is kept to a minimum.

Cambridge City Council believes:

- The climate crisis requires that we establish a circular economy and ensure the efficient use of CRMs.
- That all households in Cambridge should be able to easily recycle electronic devices.

Therefore, Cambridge City Council requests that the Executive Councillor:

- ~~Establishes at least one small electrical recycling bank in every ward in the city by April 2022.~~
- Introduce a network of eight additional permanent WEEE banks at existing (and new) recycling points across Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire in 2022. Using external grant funding to provide the estimated £56,683 cost of the project.
- Promotes WEEE recycling in the next appropriate Cambridge Matters, and on the City Council website, with leaflets, stalls at events and new vehicle livery.
- Ensures that the emerging Household Waste and Recycling Policy includes ambitious targets to maximise recycling of CRMs.

Motion 6c

Councillor Collis proposed and Councillor Robertson seconded the following amendment to motion (additional text underlined, deleted text ~~struckthrough~~)

Council notes:

- The number of complaints made by residents about the disturbance and danger caused to neighbourhoods by loud and speeding vehicles using the roads as race tracks.
- That residential areas in Cambridge can suffer heavily from the noise caused by some modified cars, motorbikes and scooters.
- That some drivers of all types of motorised vehicles frequently break the speed limit and drive unsafely through residential areas.
- That anti-social driving has a negative impact on the environment, personal safety and people's wellbeing, and potentially discourages active travel.
- That noise detection cameras have recently been installed in central London to detect engines revving at over 80 decibels and use video footage to record the offenders.
- That the issue of dangerous or antisocial driving is police-led, and that we should continue as a council to share any information we have with them.
- The current discussions at Area Committees around antisocial driving that is often taken up as police priorities for those areas.
- That, at a recent Community Safety Partnership meeting, it was reported that the police will make road safety a priority and will take action on anti-social driving, moped use and speeding.
- The establishment of the new road safety partnership, Vision Zero, which incorporates the international Safe System policy approach for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

Council calls on the Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing:

- ~~To bring together representatives of the Highways Authority and Police to develop a joint strategy to combat anti-social driving.~~
- ~~To investigate the noise detection cameras being used in London, with a view to using a similar approach in Cambridge.~~
- Request the Community Safety Partnership to feed the concerns of residents and Councillors over anti-social driving, including interest in the noise detection cameras being used in London, into the Vision Zero Partnership and to work with that partnership to address the issues
- To report back to council on the work of the Vision Zero Partnership.

Agenda Item 6d:

Alteration of motion under Council Procedure Rule 26, additional text underlined.

This Council ~~declares~~ calls upon Rishi Sunak MP (Chancellor of the Exchequer) to complete his review of the IFS Report “Carbon taxes and the road to net zero “ and to enact legislation to ensure that all green taxes (including relevant VAT) are ringfenced and allocated to a new joint Local and National Climate Emergency Fund which would be utilised to support councils in implementing the National Retrofit Strategy.

The Council also calls upon Rishi Sunak to top up the funds so raised to ensure that in total an additional £11.7 bn is allocated for retro-fitting in the 2021 government spending review to fund the retrofitting of all council homes and housing association homes by 2025.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6d

Councillor Moore proposed the following amendment (additional text underlined, deleted text ~~struckthrough~~).

This Council ~~declares~~ calls upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer Rishi Sunak MP to review the IFS Report “Carbon taxes and the road to net zero “ and to enact legislation to ensure that all ~~green~~ taxes (including relevant VAT) are ~~ringfenced~~ progressive and are used to support a just transition to a green economy, including and being allocated to a new joint Local and National Climate Emergency Fund which would be utilised to support councils in implementing the a National Retrofit Strategy. We also ask our Chancellor to ensure that any new carbon pricing is used as a tax on fossil fuels as they are produced and that revenues should also be used to increase the flow of finance to developing countries to help them mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to climate change impacts, as promised under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, thereby ensuring a just transition for all.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6e:

Alteration of motion under Council Procedure Rule 26, additional text underlined, deleted text ~~struckthrough~~.

The Great Homes Upgrade calls on the government to offer long term support to local authorities so we can help improve our residents' lives and homes, create thousands of high-quality jobs and decarbonise our housing stock in the face of climate change.

This council resolves to join the 'Great Homes Upgrade' campaign and to calls upon Michael Gove MP (Secretary of State for DLUHC) to work to end fuel poverty, create new jobs and achieve the UK's emission targets by adopting the comprehensive and detailed National Retrofit Strategy set out in the Construction Leadership Council consultative document of the same name. ~~and in particular to fund the retrofitting of all council homes and housing association homes by 2025.~~

This council also resolves to:

- Share best practice and stories of retrofit success with the campaign.
- Write to neighbouring Local Authorities asking them to join the campaign.
Sign and circulate the Great Homes Upgrade petition.

~~Background notes on the motions~~

- 1 — ~~Councillors will be well aware that the UK is legally committed to achieving net zero emissions by 2050 and of our own council's ambitions of achieving that goal by 2030.~~
- 2 — ~~The Institute for Fiscal Studies ("IFS") have published two reports in October 2021 that address how this plan might be funded.~~
- 3 — ~~IFS reports that most UK councils will require substantial additional funding to meet current service levels and statutory obligations.~~
<https://ifs.org.uk/publications/15673>

- 4 — This shows that councils have only the most limited scope to fund this work.
- 5 — This is borne out by Cambridge's own forecasts and accounts.
- 6 — Although the UK does not have a named carbon tax as such, it has had a variety of taxes that have a similar rule for 30 years. The positive impact of these taxes on business and consumer behaviour is well documented and is considered to be one of the principal drivers for the 38% reduction in UK greenhouse emissions between 1990 and 2018.
- 7 — The Office of Budget Responsibility ("OBR") reports that the tax yield from emissions taxes exceeds new government expenditure on reducing emissions and has actually fallen as a percentage of the total tax yield.
- 8 — There is currently no rule of law that requires "green" taxes to be used for "green" purposes such as the establishment of a National Climate Change Fund.
- 9 — IFS have reviewed the UK's complex green tax system and have published an advance report timed to coincide with COP 26.
- 10 — The report calls for review and reform as well as international co-operation on aviation and business taxes.
- 11 — It also states that the 5% VAT rate on domestic gas is effectively a subsidy on emissions and a disincentive to energy efficiency improvements.
- 12 — One in 7 UK households lives in acute fuel poverty (BEIS statistics 2019) and fuel bill fears affect a much broader demographic.
- 13 — While BEIS statistics note the value of insulation incentives in reducing fuel poverty, Green Deal and Green Homes grants were withdrawn in March 2021.
- 14 — Cold homes are responsible for 11,500 of excess deaths every year and treatment for related conditions costs the NHS c £2 billion a year (ONS, CLG)
- 15 — The Construction Leadership Council's report "Greening our Existing Homes" states that homes use 35% of all UK energy and account for 20% of CO2 emissions. It sets out a detailed National Retrofit Strategy without which the UK emission targets cannot be achieved
- 16 — Emissions taxation policy, fuel poverty and retrofitting existing homes remain inextricably linked. It is for this reason that we have chosen to put two linked motions before the council today.

Further reading <https://ifs.org.uk/publications/15653>,
<https://www.constructionleadershipcouncil.co.uk/workstream/net-zero-carbon-workstream/>

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6e

Councillor Moore proposed the following amendment to motion:
(additional text underlined).

This council believes that a socially just and carbon-neutral recovery from the pandemic is not only possible but imperative if we are to meet the vision set out in our Climate Change Strategy 2021. However, up to now much of national Government's proposed actions are little more than rhetoric. We really need to turn rhetoric into action.

Melting ice caps and forest fires can often seem like someone else's crisis when many are taking effect so far from our homes. But crises closer to home affecting thousands of local families cannot be separated from those further afield.

Across the UK there are more than 24 million homes leaking heat, not just wasting the Earth's precious resources and creating greenhouse gas emissions but also leaving many residents in cold, damp homes and in fuel poverty. There is no route to decarbonising the economy without retrofitting these homes. Doing so would not only help to protect our planet, improve housing and lead to cheaper energy bills but it would also create hundreds of thousands of good quality jobs across the whole country.

This council notes that;

- The highest temperature ever recorded in the UK was here in Cambridge, in July 2019 and we know that we are already facing a serious water shortage.
- Cambridge has approximately 51,240 homes which need to be retrofitted.
- It is estimated that the average investment needed to fully decarbonise each home in the UK is a minimum of £50k.
- Therefore, to decarbonise all homes in Cambridge would cost an estimated £2.562 billion.
- To retrofit all homes in Cambridge by this council's own Net Zero Carbon vision of 2030 would require 6,405 homes being completed each year.
- To retrofit all homes in Cambridge by the government's Net Zero Carbon target of 2050 would require 1,830 homes being completed each year.

- We have commissioned two high-level retrofit studies to identify what energy efficiency and renewable energy measures would need to be installed for different property archetypes in Cambridge to reach net zero carbon emissions and to provide more accurate costings for retrofitting both council and private homes.
- Over the period of the Council's previous climate change strategies, we have invested £4.3 million in energy efficiency improvements to Council homes, focussing on bringing the lowest rated properties up to an EPC rating of C.
- From 2020/21 to 2022/23, we have committed to investing a further £2.5 million to improve the energy efficiency of some of the remaining Council homes with EPC ratings of D to G, with the aim of bringing these up to a C rating or above where feasible.
- In February 2021 the Council was successful in its consortium bid with other Cambridgeshire local authorities to the Government's Green Homes Grant Local Authority Delivery (LAD) scheme and was awarded just over £2m to retrofit social and private housing.
- As part of a Cambridgeshire local authority consortium, the council has recently submitted a further £5.5m bid into the Sustainable Warmth Scheme, which is scheduled to be implemented between January 2022 and March 2023 if successful.
- The latest fuel poverty data for 2019 states 14.9% of Cambridge residents are experiencing fuel poverty. Energy efficiency also helps to reduce the impact of increasing energy prices and volatile energy markets.
- Cambridge City Council is currently working with PECT with the Warm Homes scheme to provide support to those experiencing fuel poverty.
- The Minimum Energy Efficiency Standards (MEES) regulation for the private rented sector restricts poor energy performing properties being available to rent. Cambridge City Council is implementing this regulation to improve the energy efficiency of the Cambridge rental sector.
- We have established a working group to plan how we will retrofit our own council housing stock and how best we can support private homeowners and landlords to retrofit theirs.

- Our project for Building Control to give homeowners energy saving advice using thermal imaging will launch at the end of this year.

The Great Homes Upgrade calls on the government to offer long term support to local authorities so we can help improve our residents' lives and homes, create thousands of high-quality jobs and decarbonise our housing stock in the face of climate change.

This council commits to;

- Join the “Great Homes Upgrade” campaign and for the leader to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Sec of State DLUHC asking for an additional £11.7bn for retrofitting over the next three years as part of the government’s spending review in 2021.
- The leader will write to ~~This council calls upon~~ Michael Gove MP asking him to work to end fuel poverty, create new green jobs and achieve the UK’s emission targets by adopting the National retrofit strategy set out in the Construction Leadership Council consultative document and in particular to fund the retrofitting of all council homes and housing association homes by 2025.
- Widen the scope of our working group to include working with housing associations, private landlords and owner occupiers to help access investment and to build the skills and expertise necessary to reach our Climate Change Strategy aspirations.
- Work with local partners, including the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority (who lead on skills strategy), the Greater Cambridge Partnership, local councils, businesses and education providers to create the skilled workforce that we need.
- Share best practice and stories of retrofit success with the campaign.
- Write to neighbouring Local Authorities asking them to join the campaign.
- Sign and circulate the Great Homes Upgrade petition.

Background notes on the motions

- 1 Councillors will be well aware that the UK is legally committed to achieving net zero emissions by 2050 and of our own council's ambitions of achieving that goal by 2030.
- 2 The Institute for Fiscal Studies ("IFS") have published two reports in October 2021 that address how this plan might be funded.
- 3 IFS reports that most UK councils will require substantial additional funding to meet current service levels and statutory obligations.
<https://ifs.org.uk/publications/15673>
- 4 This shows that councils have only the most limited scope to fund this work.
- 5 This is borne out by Cambridge's own forecasts and accounts.
- 6 Although the UK does not have a named carbon tax as such, it has had a variety of taxes that have a similar rule for 30 years. The positive impact of these taxes on business and consumer behaviour is well documented and is considered to be one of the principal drivers for the 38% reduction in UK greenhouse emissions between 1990 and 2018.
- 7 The Office of Budget Responsibility ("OBR") reports that the tax yield from emissions taxes exceeds new government expenditure on reducing emissions and has actually fallen as a percentage of the total tax yield.
- 8 There is currently no rule of law that requires "green" taxes to be used for "green" purposes such as the establishment of a National Climate Change Fund.
- 9 IFS have reviewed the UK's complex green tax system and have published an advance report timed to coincide with COP 26.
- 10 The report calls for review and reform as well as international co-operation on aviation and business taxes.
- 11 It also states that the 5% VAT rate on domestic gas is effectively a subsidy on emissions and a disincentive to energy efficiency improvements.
- 12 One in 7 UK households lives in acute fuel poverty (BEIS statistics 2019) and fuel bill fears affect a much broader demographic,

- 13 While BEIS statistics note the value of insulation incentives in reducing fuel poverty, Green Deal and Green Homes grants were withdrawn in March 2021.
- 14 Cold homes are responsible for 11,500 of excess deaths every year and treatment for related conditions costs the NHS c £2 billion a year (ONS, CLC)
- 15 The Construction Leadership Council's report "Greening our Existing Homes" states that homes use 35% of all UK energy and account for 20% of CO2 emissions. It sets out a detailed National Retrofit Strategy without which the UK emission targets cannot be achieved
- 16 Emissions taxation policy, fuel poverty and retrofitting existing homes remain inextricably linked. It is for this reason that we have chosen to put two linked motions before the council today.

*Further reading <https://ifs.org.uk/publications/15653>,
<https://www.constructionleadershipcouncil.co.uk/workstream/net-zero-carbon-workstream/>*

This page is intentionally left blank

Motion 6f

Alteration of motion under Council Procedure Rule 26, additional text underlined.

Council notes:

- That in March 2020, the government increased Universal Credit and Working Tax Credit by £20 a week to support families through the economic challenges presented by the Covid-19 pandemic.
- That this scheme officially ended on 6th October 2021.
- That the cut to Universal Credit is the biggest overnight cut to the basic rate of social security since the modern welfare state began.
- Analysis by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation indicates that 21% of all working-age families will experience a £1,040-a-year cut to their incomes due to the removal of the uplift.
- The increase in the number of children receiving Free School Meals nationally, the increase in families relying on help from food banks nationally, and the increase in the number of families claiming Universal Credit in Cambridgeshire following the pandemic.
- That pressures on family incomes are mounting, due to the rise in the cost of living as a direct consequence of this government's actions in leaving the European Union, and inactions in failing to implement policies that could have negated some of its impacts.
- That due to the price of gas rising by 250% this year, energy bills have dramatically increased also, while Winter Fuel Payments, which were already inadequate, have not kept up with this rise.

Council believes:

- It is a national disgrace that anyone should have to rely on help from food banks in one of the largest economies in the world.
- That the withdrawal of the Universal Credit boost at this time will have a significant detrimental impact on the financial security and wellbeing of those affected in Cambridge.
- That the decision to remove the uplift is deplorable, and not the actions of a responsible government.

Council resolves to:

- Write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, to express this council's grave concern at the impact that the cut of £20 a week to Universal Credit will have on many families in Cambridge, and request that the cut to the Universal Credit uplift be reversed.
- Continue to offer support to our families who are on Universal Credit through our existing Council services.
- Ensure the council website and social media provides clear signposting to sources of financial support.

Motion 6f

Councillor S. Baigent proposed and Councillor Sweeney seconded the following amendment to motion (additional text underlined, deleted text ~~struckthrough~~).

Council notes:

- That in March 2020, the government increased Universal Credit and Working Tax Credit by £20 a week to support families through the economic challenges presented by the Covid-19 pandemic.
- That this scheme officially ended on 6th October 2021.
- That the cut to Universal Credit is the biggest overnight cut to the basic rate of social security since the modern welfare state began.
- Analysis by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation indicates that 21% of all working-age families will experience a £1,040-a-year cut to their incomes due to the removal of the uplift.
- The increase in the number of children receiving Free School Meals nationally, the increase in families relying on help from food banks nationally as well as food hubs locally, and the increase in the number of families claiming Universal Credit in Cambridgeshire following the pandemic.
- That pressures on family incomes are mounting, due to the rise in the cost of living as a direct consequence of this government's actions in leaving the European Union, including rising food prices and fuel costs as well as their failure and inactions in failing to implement sustained, long-term policies that could have negated some of its impact.
- That the Winter Support Payments proposed by the Government are not at a sufficient level to meet the level of need.
- The Welsh Government's bold commitment to trial a Universal Basic Income (UBI) with 5000 residents over 24 months and welcomes its bold vision and clear commitment to tackling inequality.

Council believes;

- That it is a national disgrace that anyone should have to rely on help from food banks in one of the largest economies in the world.
- That the withdrawal of the Universal Credit boost at this time will have a significant detrimental impact on the financial security and wellbeing of those affected in Cambridge.
- That the decision to remove the uplift is deplorable, and not the actions of a responsible government.

Council resolves to;

- Write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, to express this council's grave concern at the impact that the cut of £20 a week to Universal Credit will have on many families in Cambridge, and request that the cut to the Universal Credit uplift be reversed.
- Continue to offer support to our families who are on Universal Credit through our existing Council services.
- Ensure the council website and social media ~~provides~~ continues to provide clear signposting to sources of financial support.

Agenda Item 6g

Councillor Dalzell proposed the following amendment to motion (additional text underlined)

This council believes that a socially just and carbon-neutral recovery from the pandemic is not only possible but imperative if we are to meet the vision set out in our Climate Change Strategy 2021. However, up to now much of national Government's proposed actions are little more than rhetoric. We really need to turn rhetoric into action.

Melting ice caps and forest fires can often seem like someone else's crisis when many are taking effect so far from our homes. But crises closer to home affecting thousands of local families cannot be separated from those further afield.

Across the UK there are more than 24 million homes leaking heat, not just wasting the Earth's precious resources and creating greenhouse gas emissions but also leaving many residents in cold, damp homes and in fuel poverty. There is no route to decarbonising the economy without retrofitting these homes. Doing so would not only help to protect our planet, improve housing and lead to cheaper energy bills but it would also create hundreds of thousands of good quality jobs across the whole country.

This council notes that;

- The highest temperature ever recorded in the UK was here in Cambridge, in July 2019 and we know that we are already facing a serious water shortage.
- Cambridge has approximately 51,240 homes which need to be retrofitted.
- It is estimated that the average investment needed to fully decarbonise each home in the UK is a minimum of £50k.
- Therefore, to decarbonise all homes in Cambridge would cost an estimated £2.562 billion.
- To retrofit all homes in Cambridge by this council's own Net Zero Carbon vision of 2030 would require 6,405 homes being completed each year.
- To retrofit all homes in Cambridge by the government's Net Zero Carbon target of 2050 would require 1,830 homes being completed each year.
- We have commissioned two high-level retrofit studies to identify what energy efficiency and renewable energy measures would need to be installed for different property archetypes in Cambridge to reach net zero carbon emissions and to provide more accurate costings for retrofitting both council and private homes.
- Over the period of the Council's previous climate change strategies, we have invested £4.3 million in energy efficiency improvements to Council homes, focussing on bringing the lowest rated properties up to an EPC rating of C.
- From 2020/21 to 2022/23, we have committed to investing a further £2.5 million to improve the energy efficiency of some of the remaining Council homes with EPC ratings of D to G, with the aim of bringing these up to a C rating or above where feasible.
- In February 2021 the Council was successful in its consortium bid with other Cambridgeshire local authorities to the Government's Green Homes Grant Local Authority Delivery (LAD) scheme and was awarded just over £2m to retrofit social and private housing.
- The premature closure of the Government's Green Homes Grant programme in March 2021 due to a lack of uptake, which has been subsequently blamed by the Business Minister on "challenging timelines" and a failure to run local pilots.

- The new Government ‘Heat and buildings strategy’, which seeks to introduce Home Upgrade Grants, but appears to provide insufficient policies and investments to decarbonise the UK in line with the Paris Accord.
- As part of a Cambridgeshire local authority consortium, the council has recently submitted a further £5.5m bid into the Sustainable Warmth Scheme, which is scheduled to be implemented between January 2022 and March 2023 if successful.
- The latest fuel poverty data for 2019 states 14.9% of Cambridge residents are experiencing fuel poverty. Energy efficiency also helps to reduce the impact of increasing energy prices and volatile energy markets.
- Cambridge City Council is currently working with PECT with the Warm Homes scheme to provide support to those experiencing fuel poverty.
- The Minimum Energy Efficiency Standards (MEES) regulation for the private rented sector restricts poor energy performing properties being available to rent. Cambridge City Council is implementing this regulation to improve the energy efficiency of the Cambridge rental sector.
- We have established a working group to plan how we will retrofit our own council housing stock and how best we can support private homeowners and landlords to retrofit theirs.
- Our project for Building Control to give homeowners energy saving advice using thermal imaging will launch at the end of this year.

The Great Homes Upgrade calls on the government to offer long term support to local authorities so we can help improve our residents' lives and homes, create thousands of high-quality jobs and decarbonise our housing stock in the face of climate change.

This council commits to;

- Join the “Great Homes Upgrade” campaign and for the leader to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Sec of State DLUHC asking for an additional £11.7bn for retrofitting over the next three years as part of the government’s spending review in 2021.
- Include in this letter an offer to host pilot schemes in Cambridge to help develop nationwide insulation programmes and to help avoid further failures like the Green House Grant scheme.
- To put forward a clear deadline for getting all Council homes to an EPC standard of C or above in next HRA Budget Setting Report.
- Widen the scope of our working group to include working with housing associations, private landlords and owner occupiers to help access investment and to build the skills and expertise necessary to reach our Climate Change Strategy aspirations.
- Work with local partners, including the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority (who lead on skills strategy), the Greater Cambridge Partnership, local councils, businesses and education providers to create the skilled workforce that we need.
- Actively support homeowners to identify and apply for Home Upgrade Grants, and any other government grants that become available, and promote such grant schemes more widely on our website, social media and in Cambridge Matters.
- Share best practice and stories of retrofit success with the campaign.
- Write to neighbouring Local Authorities asking them to join the campaign.
- Sign and circulate the Great Homes Upgrade petition.

Agenda Item 6g:

Councillor Bennett proposed the following amendment to motion, additional text underlined and deleted text ~~struckthrough~~:

~~This council believes that a socially just and carbon-neutral recovery from the pandemic is not only possible but imperative if we are to meet the vision set out in our Climate Change Strategy 2021. However, up to now much of national Government's proposed actions are little more than rhetoric. We really need to turn rhetoric into action.~~

~~Melting ice caps and forest fires can often seem like someone else's crisis when many are taking effect so far from our homes. But crises closer to home affecting thousands of local families cannot be separated from those further afield.~~

~~Across the UK there are more than 24 million homes leaking heat, not just wasting the Earth's precious resources and creating greenhouse gas emissions but also leaving many residents in cold, damp homes and in fuel poverty. There is no route to decarbonising the economy without retrofitting these homes. Doing so would not only help to protect our planet, improve housing and lead to cheaper energy bills but it would also create hundreds of thousands of good quality jobs across the whole country.~~

This council resolves to continue to work to reduce fuel poverty and combat the climate emergency.

In particular, the council resolves to continue the following actions:

This council notes that;

- ~~• The highest temperature ever recorded in the UK was here in Cambridge, in July 2019 and we know that we are already facing a serious water shortage.~~
- ~~• Cambridge has approximately 51,240 homes which need to be retrofitted.~~
- ~~• It is estimated that the average investment needed to fully decarbonise each home in the UK is a minimum of £50k.~~
- ~~• Therefore, to decarbonise all homes in Cambridge would cost an estimated £2.562 billion.~~

- To retrofit all homes in Cambridge by this council's own Net Zero Carbon vision of 2030 would require 6,405 homes being completed each year.
- To retrofit all homes in Cambridge by the government's Net Zero Carbon target of 2050 would require 1,830 homes being completed each year.
- We have commissioned two high-level retrofit studies to identify what energy efficiency and renewable energy measures would need to be installed for different property archetypes in Cambridge to reach net zero carbon emissions and to provide more accurate costings for retrofitting both council and private homes.
- Over the period of the Council's previous climate change strategies, we have invested £4.3 million in energy efficiency improvements to Council homes, focussing on bringing the lowest rated properties up to an EPC rating of C.
- From 2020/21 to 2022/23, we have committed to investing a further £2.5 million to improve the energy efficiency of some of the remaining Council homes with EPC ratings of D to G, with the aim of bringing these up to a C rating or above where feasible.
- In February 2021 the Council was successful in its consortium bid with other Cambridgeshire local authorities to the Government's Green Homes Grant Local Authority Delivery (LAD) scheme and was awarded just over £2m to retrofit social and private housing.
- As part of a Cambridgeshire local authority consortium, the council has recently submitted a further £5.5m bid into the Sustainable Warmth Scheme, which is scheduled to be implemented between January 2022 and March 2023 if successful.
- The latest fuel poverty data for 2019 states 14.9% of Cambridge residents are experiencing fuel poverty. Energy efficiency also helps to reduce the impact of increasing energy prices and volatile energy markets.
- Cambridge City Council is currently working with PECT with the Warm Homes scheme to provide support to those experiencing fuel poverty.
- The Minimum Energy Efficiency Standards (MEES) regulation for the private rented sector restricts poor energy performing properties being available to rent. Cambridge City

Council is implementing this regulation to improve the energy efficiency of the Cambridge rental sector.

- We have established a working group to plan how we will retrofit our own council housing stock and how best we can support private homeowners and landlords to retrofit theirs.
- Our project for Building Control to give homeowners energy saving advice using thermal imaging will launch at the end of this year.

~~The Great Homes Upgrade calls on the government to offer long term support to local authorities so we can help improve our residents' lives and homes, create thousands of high quality jobs and decarbonise our housing stock in the face of climate change.~~

This council commits to;

- ~~• Join the "Great Homes Upgrade" campaign and for the leader to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Sec of State DLUHC asking for an additional £11.7bn for retrofitting over the next three years as part of the government's spending review in 2021.~~

The Council also resolves to carry out the following further actions:

- Widen the scope of our working group to include working with housing associations, private landlords and owner occupiers to help access investment and to build the skills and expertise necessary to reach our Climate Change Strategy aspirations.
- Work with local partners, including the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority (who lead on skills strategy), the Greater Cambridge Partnership, local councils, businesses and education providers to create the skilled workforce that we need.
- ~~• Share best practice and stories of retrofit success with the campaign.~~
- ~~• Write to neighbouring Local Authorities asking them to join the campaign.~~
- ~~• Sign and circulate the Great Homes Upgrade petition.~~

Background notes on the motions

- 1 Councillors will be well aware that the UK is legally committed to achieving net zero emissions by 2050 and of our own council's ambitions of achieving that goal by 2030.
- 2 The Institute for Fiscal Studies ("IFS") have published two reports in October 2021 that address how this plan might be funded.
- 3 IFS reports that most UK councils will require substantial additional funding to meet current service levels and statutory obligations.
<https://ifs.org.uk/publications/15673>
- 4 This shows that councils have only the most limited scope to fund this work.
- 5 This is borne out by Cambridge's own forecasts and accounts.
- 6 Although the UK does not have a named carbon tax as such, it has had a variety of taxes that have a similar rule for 30 years. The positive impact of these taxes on business and consumer behaviour is well documented and is considered to be one of the principal drivers for the 38% reduction in UK greenhouse emissions between 1990 and 2018.
- 7 The Office of Budget Responsibility ("OBR") reports that the tax yield from emissions taxes exceeds new government expenditure on reducing emissions and has actually fallen as a percentage of the total tax yield.
- 8 There is currently no rule of law that requires "green" taxes to be used for "green" purposes such as the establishment of a National Climate Change Fund.
- 9 IFS have reviewed the UK's complex green tax system and have published an advance report timed to coincide with COP 26.
- 10 The report calls for review and reform as well as international co-operation on aviation and business taxes.
- 11 It also states that the 5% VAT rate on domestic gas is effectively a subsidy on emissions and a disincentive to energy efficiency improvements.
- 12 One in 7 UK households lives in acute fuel poverty (BEIS statistics 2019) and fuel bill fears affect a much broader demographic.
- 13 The latest fuel poverty data for 2019 states 14.9% of Cambridge residents are experiencing fuel poverty. Energy

- efficiency also helps to reduce the impact of increasing energy prices and volatile energy markets
- 14 While BEIS statistics note the value of insulation incentives in reducing fuel poverty, Green Deal and Green Homes grants were withdrawn in March 2021.
- 15 Cold homes are responsible for 11,500 of excess UK deaths every year and treatment for related conditions costs the NHS c £2 billion a year (ONS, CLC)
- 16 The Construction Leadership Council’s report “Greening our Existing Homes” states that homes use 35% of all UK energy and account for 20% of CO2 emissions. It sets out a detailed National Retrofit Strategy without which the UK emission targets cannot be achieved
- 17 The highest temperature ever recorded in the UK was here in Cambridge, in July 2019 and we know that we are already facing a serious water shortage.
- 18 Cambridge has an estimated 51,240 homes which need to be retrofitted.
- 19 It is estimated that the average investment needed to fully decarbonise each home in the UK is a minimum of £50k.
- 20 To decarbonise all homes in Cambridge would cost an estimated £2.562 billion.
- 21 To retrofit all homes in Cambridge by this council’s own Net Zero Carbon vision of 2030 would require 6,405 homes being completed each year.
- 22 To retrofit all homes in Cambridge by the government’s Net Zero Carbon target of 2050 would require 1,830 homes being completed each year.
- 23 The Council has already commissioned two high-level retrofit studies to identify what energy efficiency and renewable energy measures would need to be installed for different property archetypes in Cambridge to reach net zero carbon emissions and to provide more accurate costings for retrofitting both council and private homes.
- 24 The Council has already invested £4.3 million in energy efficiency improvements to Council homes, focussing on bringing the lowest rated properties up to an EPC rating of C.
- 25 Emissions taxation policy, fuel poverty and retrofitting existing homes remain inextricably linked. It is for this reason that we have chosen to put three linked motions before the council today.

Further reading <https://ifs.org.uk/publications/15653>,
<https://www.constructionleadershipcouncil.co.uk/workstream/net-zero-carbon-workstream/>

Agenda Item 6i

Councillor Porrer proposed and Councillor Gehring seconded the following amendment to motion (additional text underlined).

This council notes the following.

1. The community has a right to be represented by a diversity of councillors and residents should have a diversity of councillors for whom to vote.
2. Analysis, by the Fawcett Society, of the 2019 Local Election results found that only 35% of councillors in England are women, up 1% since 2018. Of the seats up for election in 2018, 38% went to women, up just 3 percentage points on 2014 when these seats were last contested.
3. Only 15% of councillors nationally are under 45 years of age.
4. As of October 2020, 27 councils have passed the LGA Labour Group's Parental Leave policy, and an additional 9 councils have their own parental leave policy.
5. Cambridge does not have a formal parental leave policy for councillors.
6. The role of a councillor should be open to all, regardless of background, and introducing a parental leave policy and other family friendly policies is a step towards encouraging a wider range of people to become councillors, and is also a step to encourage existing councillors who may wish to start a family to remain as councillors;
7. Parental leave must apply to parents regardless of their gender, and should cover adoption leave to support those parents who choose to adopt.
8. Parental leave is only part of the picture and other family friendly policies such as support for carers, remote/hybrid meetings, and becoming a breastfeeding-friendly council would further ensure a greater diversity of councillors. And also that family friendly policies are in themselves only a small part of the wider need for policies which encourage truly diverse representation.

This Council resolves the following.

1. To adapt to suit a Cambridge context the parental leave policy drafted by the LGA Labour Group's Women's Task Force and to bring the recommendations to Civic Affairs as part of the next round of discussions on councillor remuneration.
2. To ensure that councillors with children and other caring commitments are supported as appropriate.
3. To acknowledge this is only one part of the picture, and to commit to investigating other inclusive policies and bringing those recommendations forward in the future.
4. To write to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities to urge him to introduce legislation to allow councils to adopt remote and hybrid meetings where they deem it appropriate to do so.
5. Further to this council's resolution at Civic Affairs on 9th October 2019 (19/41/Civ), that this council shall continue to apply pressure via the Local Government Association and any other appropriate routes to allow for proxy voting for local government for those on parental leave, which is not currently permissible, despite already being available to MPs in parliament.

<https://local.gov.uk/parental-leave-policy-councils>

Council 21 October 2021 Written Questions

1. Councillor S.Davies

To Councillor Thornburrow the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

When did Cambridge City Council last publish the planning enforcement register required under section 188 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and article 43 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, and how can this be accessed by members of the public?

Response:

Thank you for this question.

The City Council's planning enforcement register for records is available online for the period 2017-2021. This register is still being updated to incorporate the pre-2017 records.

The links is:

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/planning-enforcement-register>

The older records on the hard copy register are available for inspection, by prior appointment, at our Customer Service Centre at Mandela House, Regent Street.

Phase 1 of the ongoing planning service review process includes projects to maximise the digitalisation of planning enforcement data and to provide an enhanced level of information on the website, with the objectives of streamlining the process for serving of enforcement notices and improving public understanding of planning enforcement processes and procedures; as well as promoting the important role of the planning enforcement service in protecting both the City of Cambridge environment and its local communities.

2. Councillor Bennett

To Councillor Thornburrow the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

"Residents in Abbey have expressed their concerns about the amount of construction in their neighbourhoods and the length of time it takes. It can feel to them as if they are living surrounded by a building site for many years. Could the new Local Plan and relevant officers (or officers??) address the issue of new developments and housing in an already built up area and find mechanisms to prevent construction work causing long-term disruption to existing residents?"

Response:

Thank you for your question

The pace at which new development granted planning permission comes forward is a matter that has been discussed in planning communities for many years. The reasons why a specific project takes the time that it does to be delivered can be manifold; including process issues with, for example the need to discharge planning conditions, to difficulties (notably at present) with the supply chain for materials and labour, as well as market and economic factors which impact the access to funding both for the developer, and the people who buy new homes or offices. These are structural issues over which the City Council can have very limited influence.

During Covid, the government recognised some of these difficulties and asked Local Authorities to apply flexibility to the operating hours during which construction could take place on a site. Directions subsequently came out from government introducing a new process for developers to seek relaxation of working hours to provide for later and weekend working on construction sites to speed up completions.

The Local Government Association, in response to recent proposals for planning reform, has highlighted that around 1m homes have planning permission but are not coming forwards for development. The Planning White paper last year suggested the principle of a "use it or lose it" for planning permissions. As it stands at present, legal provisions mean that provided a planning permission is implemented before the expiry of the time period, and there is clear statement that the development is not to be progressed, the permission itself, once started, will last indefinitely. Given this is a matter of law, the LPA cannot locally offer a different position or seek to inhibit this development right.

We will nevertheless continue to press, through our response to consultations and through the collective voice of the LGA, the importance

and impact of ensuring that consented development takes place in a timely manner. The widespread use of construction management plans on new developments and the City Council and national “Considerate Contractor” programmes will also, meanwhile, seek to mitigate and manage the impacts of construction on our communities locally as far as possible.

3. Councillor Bennett

To Councillor Collis the Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing

I would like to follow up my last council meeting question where I asked for both paper and website based improvements to the council's reporting systems for complaints with particular focus on multi-agency complaints such as drug related ASB.

Response:

The Community Safety Team have updated the guide to reporting ASB and related criminal behaviour and will publish this poster style information with both phone numbers and web links in Open Door and Cambridge Matters.

The Team are also working with the web to refine the ASB and report ASB pages so that someone searching anti-social behaviour can quickly find information on reporting ASB and crime, as well as links to information on reporting environmental issues such as noise and needle finds. Main ASB pages now have clearer details on reporting crime, with the link out to the police website

Under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 we have authority to share to share information with the police and other partners to prevent or address ASB and crime and disorder. We also data information sharing agreements with the majority of our partners.

The ASB online form starts with an edited Privacy Notice, with a link to the Council’s full Privacy Notice, which details everything about the GDPR. If the complainant has provided contact details, we would contact them to discuss actions, including who we might share information with.

Prior to the ASB online report link, it says “Reports of antisocial behaviour are treated in confidence at all times. As a witness, you will not be

identified unless you have given us permission to do so.” We are working with the web team to refine the wording to make it clearer that it is possible to make an anonymous report.

4. Councillor Copley

To Councillor Thornburrow the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Cambridge City Council are to partner with Anglian Water in order to propose the relocation of Anglian Water’s Waste Water Treatment Plant on the edge of Cambridge.

It is noted that a Cambridge City Council press release from January 28th, 2021, stated that “The proposed relocation would allow a new net zero carbon facility, meeting exemplar environmental standards, to replace the existing plant near Cambridge North railway station.” [1]. It is also noted that it has been reported in that “Anglian Water has announced it wants the plant to be located between Fen Ditton and Horningsea, near Cambridge. It said the facility would be carbon-neutral and provide green energy.” and that “The government has allocated up to £227m to Anglian Water and Cambridge City Council to relocate the water treatment plant and use the existing site to build housing and commercial properties.” [2]

However, increasing numbers of experts including the Architects’ Journal [3,4] are calling for a greater emphasis on the role of embodied carbon as part of the transition to net zero, and to ensure that carbon accounting takes note of the role of emissions occurring from construction. The Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) estimates that 35% of the lifecycle carbon from a typical office development is emitted before the building is even opened, and that for residential premises the figure is 51% [5].

In order to assess the carbon emissions associated with this proposed facility, and to assess whether this facility can be described as net zero, knowing whether these figures include the embodied carbon is important. Embodied carbon calculations are estimated from the energy used to extract and transport raw materials as well as emissions from manufacturing processes. Often, comparisons of carbon emissions associated with alternative options exclude the embodied carbon associated with new construction, instead only focusing on the carbon emissions associated with running costs.

In order for councilors and members of the public to determine whether they support the proposed development of this area as described in the draft area action plan (North East Cambridge Area Action Plan - NECAAP), which is reliant on the relocation of Anglian Water's Waste Water Treatment Plant), it is essential for them to have a true understanding of the environmental impacts of this development which must include the carbon emissions associated with the proposed move.

Questions therefore are as follows:

Part A) What is the expected lifespan of the current Waste Water Treatment Facilities (assuming current levels of demand stay consistent)?

Part B) What is the estimated total embodied carbon that would be emitted as a result of:

B1) demolition of current Waste Water Treatment Facilities?

B2) construction of Waste Water Treatment Facilities on proposed Honey Hill Site and associated additional infrastructure in order to deliver waste water and any other associated necessary infrastructure?

B3) The total of both of the above?

NB If applicable: if a range of construction options are being considered, would an upper and lower range be provided in response to each of the above questions?

Part C) What proportion of the lifetime emissions of the proposed relocated sewage treatment works would be emitted before the facility would be opened, i.e. what proportion of the total emissions (embodied carbon + any carbon emissions associated with the running of the facility) are a result of the embodied carbon?

NB: For any questions for which Cambridge City Council is not able to provide a response, will they resolve to communicate directly with Anglian Water to obtain a response on the grounds that:

- The NECAAP proposed development is dependent on the relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Works

- This environmental costs of any proposal is a critical issue for councilors and residents as they consider whether to support this in the context of the existential threat of the climate emergency and urgent need to reduce carbon emissions and avoid every form of needless waste?

References:

1. <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/news/2021/01/28/councils-encourage-communities-to-help-shape-environmentally-friendly-waste-water-treatment-plant>
2. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-cambridgeshire-55833833>
3. <https://www.architectsjournal.co.uk/news/retrofirst>
4. <https://www.architectsjournal.co.uk/news/retrofirst-parliamentary-inquiry-into-whole-life-carbon-launched>
5. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-53642581>

Response:

Thank you for this question.

These questions should all be addressed to Anglia Water to respond to as they relate to its proposal for the new Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP), which is not a matter for the local planning authority. We have passed the questions onto AW, and as soon as we receive any further information back will send this to you.

The North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (NECAAP) is dependant on the relocation of the WWTP having taken place and it is not a proposal of the Area Action Plan (AAP). Waste provision is the responsibility of the County Council as Minerals and Waste Authority, however, the proposal is being taken forward under the Development Control Order processes, which is subject to its own environmental assessment process.

The WWTP process is therefore a separate process to the NECAAP being prepared by the City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council as the local planning authorities. If the relocation does not take place the proposals contained in the draft AAP would not be able to be taken forward.

The AAP will consider the sustainability impacts of development proposed within the plans and as part of the Sustainability Appraisal supporting the AAP, the impacts of the Council's plan in combination with other plans and projects, including those prepared by other organisations, will be assessed.

5. Councillor Copley

To Councillor Thornburrow the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

The government consultation on a vision for the Oxford-Cambridge Arc Spatial Frameworkⁱ has recently closed. In the response which Cambridge City Council submitted jointly with South Cambridgeshire District Councilⁱⁱ, the Council noted that “*the amount and detail of information within the consultation is not sufficient or adequate in order to respond with any detail or certainty and significant further work will be needed in order for the councils to fully endorse or provide meaningful comment to the emerging Spatial Framework*”. The Councils urged government to ensure that the Spatial Framework aligns with the Local Plans being developed by Local Authorities in the Arc area, including the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. They raise further important points, including the key role for the Spatial Framework to address the issue of water abstraction, including by enabling authorities to impose stronger policy requirements on water efficiency.

To date, there is little evidence that Government is prioritising the concerns of Local Authorities as they develop the Arc plans. As noted by the Stop the Arcⁱⁱⁱ group among others, this is the first time residents and authorities in the area have been formally consulted although the plan was first conceived more than six years ago. The consultation presupposes that respondents support the Arc, despite presenting no evidence that the Arc concept is an effective way to achieve social or environmental goals, or whether if so the Ox-Cam corridor is a suitable location. The consultation does not make clear whether government has specific housing targets in mind for the Arc, or how any such targets will interact with Local Plans. The “*Shared regional principles for protecting, restoring and enhancing the environment in the Oxford-Cambridge Arc*”^{iv} drawn up by the regional Leadership Group appears to have been ignored in the current consultation.

Because of these concerns, South Oxfordshire District Council has recently resolved to write to the new Minister for Levelling up, Housing and Communities asking him to pause the Arc project, with a number of specific requests should the project continue (full text of motion below).

My question is therefore: ***What actions will the Council commit to should the plans for the Ox-Cam Arc plans continue on their current worrying trajectory?***

Full text of Motion from Cllr Robin Bennett to South Oxfordshire District Council (passed unanimously 7th October 2021)

Council notes that the Government is currently running its public consultation on the Vision for “the Oxford to Cambridge Arc”.

It appears that Government has made economic growth its priority for the Arc, without asking residents whether that is the right priority, considering natural limits and resource constraints, or even whether the Arc project is necessary.

The Dasgupta review, published earlier this year¹, found that the UK’s traditional approach to growth is unsustainable.

Local authority leaders, including from this council, have tried to prioritise nature and climate action by proposing Arc Environmental Principles, but the Government’s current consultation ignores them, as noted by BBOWT², RSPB³ and others.

Council notes these concerns and asks the Leader to write to the new Minister for Levelling up, Housing and Communities, asking him to:

- Pause the Arc project to reflect on whether the creation of an arbitrary geographic construct driving excessive growth in the South East will make a positive contribution to the government’s stated aim of ‘levelling up’ the UK.
- If the project is to continue, set out clearly what the Government’s aims for it are, including expected costs, projected housing and growth expectations, and how it will fit into a wider regional structure within the UK.
- Give local authorities within the Arc area the powers and funding needed to enable landscape-scale nature restoration and world-leading environmental standards.
- Ensure proper local democratic control, with constituent local planning authorities able to set their own housing requirements based on local need.

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/the-economics-of-biodiversity-the-dasgupta-review>

² <https://www.bbowt.org.uk/blog/estelle-bailey/government-must-rethink-arc-avoid-environmental-catastrophe>

³ <https://community.rspb.org.uk/ourwork/b/rspb-england/posts/time-to-rethink-the-arc>

Response:

Thank you for your question

The OxCam project is a government project with a range of objectives across country from Oxford to Cambridge. The OxCam proposals include a number of workstreams, including both infrastructure related projects (such as East West Rail) and working groups looking at the Environment, Infrastructure Planning, Place and Movement. Within those workstreams, MLUHC have committed to developing a Spatial Framework and your question refers to the recent consultation around this document.

Greater Cambridge meanwhile has embarked on a joint Local Plan and has commissioned an extensive evidence base to inform the development of a locally appropriate planning framework. The Council has sought to draw that work to the OxCam project team's attention and to use our evidence base as a means of ensuring that MLUHC understandings the Local Context. We are expecting further engagement on the scope and extent of the spatial Framework through the winter.

The level of ambition set out in our Joint Local Plan currently exceeds the standards contained in national planning policy. The environment principles agreed for the arc through the joint working arrangements provide an opportunity to raise the bar of national policy – against which our local plan will be tested in due course – to meet our ambitions for the Greater Cambridge Area. Whilst noting that the scope and extent of the OxCam project is still undefined, a commitment to working together with the other districts across the Arc, in my view, represents an opportunity to express our local ambitions sooner and on a larger stage. For that reason, and at this stage, I do not consider that it would be sensible to withdraw from the Arc project, and to effectively remove any ability of the Council to shape or influence the outcomes of the government's programme. We will of course however continue to keep our position on this project under review having regard to the views expressed to us.

ⁱ <https://placebuilder.io/futureofthearc>

ⁱⁱ <https://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ie/ListDocuments.aspx?CId=293&MIId=9277&Ver=4> (Item 8)

ⁱⁱⁱ <http://stopthearc.org>

^{iv} https://www.semlep.com/modules/downloads/download.php?file_name=2306

This page is intentionally left blank