



CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

INFORMATION PACK

Date: Thursday, 20 November 2025, 5:30pm
Downing Place United Reform Church, 4 Downing Place,
Cambridge, CB2 3EL

- 1 SEATING PLAN** *(Pages 5 - 6)*
- 2 PUBLIC QUESTIONS** *(Pages 7 - 8)*
- 3 AMENDMENT SHEET TO PAGE 44 OF THE AGENDA PACK_LIST OF
OPTIONS** *(Pages 9 - 10)*

Door

Screen

Dais – Seating in a row for 8 people with table – Mayor in the middle, Deputy Mayor on the left with their back to the screen and Mayor’s Chaplain. To the Mayor’s right, Head of Legal, Interim Committee Manager, Deputy Democratic Service Manager.

1 2

Table for Cabinet Meeting to be held after Council to seat 4

37 Seats around the room at tables (blue lines) plus one wheelchair. Cllr Seating plan to be produced

Chris – AV Desk

Seating for 4 officers with tables in a row with backs to the wall

Seating for 2 Cllrs with table
41
42

- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15

- 40
- 39
- 38
- 37
- 36
- 35
- 34
- 33
- 32
- 31
- 30
- 29
- 28

16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

AV

Main Door in

Registered Public Speakers

Public seating x 10

Public Seating x 10

Key to seating chart:

1. The Mayor Cllr Dinah Pounds
2. Deputy Mayor Cllr Richard Swift
3. Cllr Robertson
4. Cllr Gawthrope Wood
5. Cllr Nestor
6. Cllr Thornburrow
7. Cllr Gardiner-Smith
8. Cllr Thittala
9. Cllr Dryden
10. Cllr Smart
11. Cllr Griffin
12. Cllr Davey
13. Cllr Moore
14. Cllr Holloway
15. Cllr Wade
16. Cllr Bird
17. Cllr S Smith
18. Cllr Sheil
19. Cllr Divkovic
20. Cllr Ashton
21. Cllr McPherson
22. Cllr Hossain
23. Cllr Baigent
24. Cllr Martinelli
25. Cllr Payne
26. Cllr Flaubert
27. Cllr Hauk
28. Cllr Illingworth
29. Cllr Dalzell
30. Cllr Lee
31. Cllr Lokhmotova
32. Cllr Porrer
33. Cllr Bick
34. Cllr Young
35. Cllr Blackburn-Horgan
36. Cllr Howard
37. Cllr Tong
38. Cllr Clough
39. Cllr Glasberg
40. Cllr Bennett
41. Cllr Todd-Jones
42. Cllr A Smith

List of Public Questions, Council 20 November 2025

Question 1:

In Wales, the reorganisation into unitary authorities in the 1990s promised savings and better services but instead delivered higher costs, cuts and weaker accountability. How can the Council claim that this proposal will save money and improve services when these benefits have historically failed to materialise?

Question 2:

The Cambs Unitaries Campaign welcomes the proposal for option B and unitarisation more generally.

Our campaign is non-partisan, and includes members from all five political parties locally. At our AGM, members democratically decided on a set of principles that should be looked at for determining new unitaries: www.cambsunitaries.org.uk/principles .

As well as ensuring viable economic arrangements and an improvement in democratic accountability through clearer structures, we feel that three key principles apply:

- A reasonable coherent economic area: A Greater Cambridge Unitary would rightly avoid having to 'look both ways': the immense challenges of the growth agenda as well as completely different rural farming matters;
- A reasonably coherent culture: the County Council has long had the problem of rural/Fenland councillors dominating voting on Cambridge matters, or vice versa as more recently, when each instead simply ought to run their own areas;
- An integrated travel for work area: Cambridge and the area around it form the travel for work area. While there is some travel from Ely or Hunts, these are similar to flows from Hertfordshire.

For all these reasons, a new Greater Cambridge Unitary that is focussed on the many challenges of the area makes sense.

We therefore back option B (or Peterborough's proposal for option D): <https://www.cambsunitaries.org.uk/2025/10/09/our-view-on-options/>

The officer report however notes that “the Mayoralty and city status for Cambridge will not automatically transfer from Cambridge City Council to a Greater Cambridge unitary council. The LGR proposal will recommend that the Mayoralty is transferred to the Greater Cambridge successor authority”.

At no point have citizens of Cambridge ever been asked whether they want to be part of a Mayoralty, especially one dominated by Peterborough and Fenland views. There is already significant disquiet at many CPCA meetings where the interests of the southern and northern areas of the county clash.

Almost everything that the CPCA has done over the last decade, or is proposed to do under the Devolution Bill, used to be done routinely by the County Council. Following transfer, the Greater Cambridge Unitary is almost guaranteed to be outvoted politically.

While the paper on page 13 notes the “deeper devolution of powers from central government”, much of the Devolution Bill actually takes most strategic power away from local authorities to a single individual with executive powers, leaving councils with merely a service delivery function.

Question:

We hope that our support for option B is welcomed.

However, does the Council and Leader feel that having a layer of government between Greater Cambridge and central government add anything? Why does the paper propose this transfer, which will result in less power for Cambridge decision-makers and taking away self-determination on strategic matters, without public consultation or consent?

4.3 **Option A – Two unitary proposal**

Unitary 1 Peterborough City Council, Huntingdonshire and Fenland District Councils along with County Council functions

Unitary 2 Cambridge City Council, East Cambridgeshire and South Cambridgeshire District Councils along with County Council functions

Option B – Two unitary proposal

Unitary 1 Peterborough City Council, Huntingdonshire, East Cambridgeshire and Fenland District Councils along with County Council functions (**North Cambridgeshire & Peterborough**)

Unitary 2 Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council along with County Council functions (**Greater Cambridge**)

Option C – Two unitary proposal

Unitary 1 Peterborough City Council, East Cambridgeshire and Fenland District Councils along with County Council functions

Unitary 2 Cambridge City Council, Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire District Councils along with County Council functions

Option D – Three unitary proposal

Unitary 1 Peterborough City Council, parts of Huntingdonshire District Council along with County Council functions

Unitary 2 Parts of Huntingdonshire, Fenland and East Cambridgeshire District Councils along with County Council functions

Unitary 3 Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council along with County Council functions

Option E – Three unitary proposal

Unitary 1 Peterborough City Council, Fenland and East Cambridgeshire District Councils with County Council functions

Unitary 2 Huntingdonshire District Council with County Council functions

Unitary 3 Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council along with County Council functions

This page is intentionally left blank