



CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

INFORMATION PACK

Date: Thursday, 1 October 2026

- 1 **AGENDA ITEM 6: PUBLIC QUESTIONS** *(Pages 5 - 14)*
- 2 **AGENDA ITEM 7: ORAL QUESTIONS** *(Pages 15 - 18)*
- 3 **AGENDA ITEM 8A: CABINET RECOMMENDATIONS_RIVER CAM, CHALK STREAMS AND TRIBUTARIES – STRATEGIC REVIEW AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS** *(Pages 19 - 20)*
- 4 **AGENDA ITEM 8A_COUNCIL DECISION ON JESUS GREEN WALL REPAIRS** *(Pages 21 - 28)*
- 5 **AGENDA ITEM 8B:CABINET RECOMMENDATIONS_ BUDGET OUTTURN 2025-2026** *(Pages 29 - 30)*
- 6 **AGENDA ITEM 8C: CABINET RECOMMENDATIONS_DEVELOPMENT LOAN TO CAMBRIDGE INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP** *(Pages 31 - 32)*
- 7 **AGENDA ITEM 9B: LABOUR AMENDMENT TO LIB DEM MOTION_ HERBICIDE-FREE WEED MANAGEMENT** *(Pages 33 - 36)*
- 8 **AGENDA ITEM 9B: GREEN AMENDMENT TO LIB DEM MOTION_ HERBICIDE-FREE WEED MANAGEMENT** *(Pages 37 - 42)*
- 9 **AGENDA ITEM 9C: LIB DEM AMENDMENT TO LABOUR MOTION_ IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND DATA SHARING FOR CITYWIDE ROADWORKS** *(Pages 43 - 44)*
- 10 **AGENDA ITEM 9C: GREEN AMENDMENT TO LABOUR MOTION_ IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND DATA SHARING FOR CITYWIDE ROADWORKS** *(Pages 45 - 48)*
- 11 **AGENDA ITEM 11: WRITTEN QUESTIONS** *(Pages 49 - 50)*

Question 1)

The HMO petition debate on 16th July was evidence of a strong democratic mandate for an Article 4 Direction and the cross-party support for it was welcome: we await public confirmation that it will be enacted. However, as numerous other cities recognise, Article 4 alone is only a halfway measure for the following reasons:

- The argument is frequently made that Cambridge's high housing costs demand a highly flexible rental market. But this hands-off approach ignores the reality that the primary force driving the HMO market now is corporate young professionals from the tech and biotech industries. Within the last nine months there has been an alarming surge of HMO conversions in Romsey, with one developer in particular submitting multiple planning applications simultaneously, giving rise to concern not just about the impact on social cohesion but about the actual quality of their so-called 'premium' accommodation for the tenants who live in them.
- An Article 4 Direction alone cannot stop this hollowing out of local communities: the draft policy is essentially subjective. There are no objective criteria by which to determine what constitutes "a negative impact on amenity" or "a harmful concentration". Applications will have to be determined on a time-consuming case by case basis, with all the attendant cost implications.
- The corporate developers currently targeting areas like Romsey and Petersfield are well funded. Inevitably, their planning lawyers will pick apart rejections, exposing the Council to costly, taxpayer-funded losses at the Planning Inspectorate. A fixed 10% density threshold within a 100m radius is the only legally defensible line that the lawyers cannot cross.
- While there is no dispute that transient workers make a vital contribution to our communities, the argument that Cambridge's housing supply has unique challenges which must exempt it from imposing an HMO threshold is not a solid one: Oxford and Durham are also historic university cities with a collegiate system, facing the same problems of rapid corporate and academic expansion. Imposing a threshold has not led to a collapse of their private rental sectors.

- Conversely, *not* imposing a threshold will make Cambridge more vulnerable to speculative developers who will continue to deplete the family housing stock by looking for maximum rental yields, and purposely submitting aggressive HMO conversions knowing that if they are refused, they can easily take the case to the Planning Inspectorate and succeed, costing the Council thousands. The middle and lower-income families and long-term workers who form the backbone of our local communities will be forced further and further afield as prices rise and neighbourhood amenity deteriorates.
- It is hoped that the Council will address the significant data-gap exposed by the map commissioned by the Guest Road Area Residents Assn (GRARA) and presented to Cabinet on 21st July. However, no matter how comprehensive the final density map may be it is just an observational data set. Without an officially adopted register of all HMOs, it holds zero weight as a statutory ground for refusal during a legal appeal; a policy threshold is the only way of giving officers the confidence to refuse planning applications. Furthermore, developers benefit because a firm threshold replaces an unpredictable planning process with predictability and financial stability.
- I ask this question on behalf of Romsey residents, but across the city there is also concern that without an accurate accompanying quantitative density threshold an Article 4 Direction will fail to protect the stability and social cohesion of local communities.

Therefore, can the Leader tell me what the Council's position is on pairing the Article 4 Direction with an explicit, legally enforceable 10%/100m radius localised density threshold?

Question 2)

"This is a question about the Mission Street science park for 4,000 workers due to be built on the old landfill site off Coldham's Lane in Cherry Hinton. Phase One, four massive buildings up to 26 metres high, will start in the first quarter of next year. They will be very close to the houses in Kathleen Elliot Way.

This is a contentious project, with potential for pollution of Cherry Hinton Brook and the aquifer where we get our drinking water, from a cocktail of toxic chemicals already in the ground including many kinds of PFAS. The only construction method that is possible there will disrupt the ground with 20-metre-deep piles being driven down to reach solid ground, for foundations. Cherry Hinton never wanted this science park – of 106 third party comments on the planning application, 102 were against.

In April this year Mission Street promised that they would hold a meeting with residents before the work began. But no arrangements have yet been made. The company has answered some emails but with the bare minimum of information. We deserve to be kept informed.

Is there anything the council can do to force the company to improve communications with us? (I presume you have a duty of care, given that it is your planning committee who approved the development.)”

Question 3)

We are proud of Cambridge City Council's statements on the situation in Gaza and especially that our council was the first to call for an end to arms sales to Israel.

Last year the City Council resolved to fly the UN flag at the Guildhall on 29th November 2025 to mark the UN's International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People. This was a compromise on the request that the Palestinian flag was flown.

Cambridge PSC requests that the Palestinian flag is flown at the Guildhall this year on 29th November 2026.

Considering that:

- The UK formally recognised Palestine as an independent state on 21st September 2025
- In July 2024, the ICJ declared that Israel's presence in the occupied Palestinian territory is illegal. The ICJ confirmed that Gaza was still an occupied territory even after the settlements were dismantled in 2005. Israel's 57-year-long occupation of the Palestinian territories is unlawful in its entirety

The UK has accepted these findings.

- On 8th September 2026, the UK announced sanctions on Israeli settlements. In response Israel ordered the closure of the British consulate in Jerusalem and banned 12 British MPs from entering the country.
- 14 countries, including Ireland and Spain, have filed a “declaration of intervention” in South Africa's case at the IJC, which accuses Israel of genocide in the Gaza Strip.
- Since 7th October 2023 more than 73,900 Palestinians have officially been recorded as killed in Gaza, more than 174,000 have been injured and up to 14,000 people are believed to be buried under rubble. Approximately 70% of those killed were women and children.
- Israel has restricted or denied the entry of the heavy machinery needed to clear rubble and recover bodies from collapsed buildings. On 15th September 2026, UN human rights chief Volker Türk, expressed concern about the IDF's clearing of rubble in Gaza, which shows no respect for the dead and potentially destroys evidence of war crimes.
- Since the “ceasefire” began on 10th October 2025, Israel's attacks on Gazan civilians have continued with over 1,000 killed by June 2026. On 6th August UNICEF reported that at least 300 children had been killed in Gaza in the 300 days following the “ceasefire.”
- The Conflict monitoring organisation, ACLED (Armed Conflict Location & Event Data) recorded a 35% increase in Israeli attacks in Gaza in the 5 weeks following the launch of the United States and Israel's war on Iran.
- Israel continues to hinder the passage of humanitarian aid into Gaza. Last week Jordanian Foreign Minister Ayman Safadi stated that aid intended for Gaza is expiring in warehouses due to Israel's blockade while more than two million Palestinians still face severe deprivation.
- **Displacement and violence in the West Bank:** An Oxfam analysis of data UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian

Affairs found that between 2023 and 2025 1,244 Palestinians, including 268 children, were killed in the West Bank. Over the same period, nearly 46,000 Palestinians were displaced.

During the first eight months of 2026, 275 Palestinian communities were attacked.

Will the City Council fly the Palestinian flag on 29th November 2026?

Question 4)

Are the city councillors aware of the new report by a number of academics called "The register of British Slave Traders" published September 2026? It contains extensive information regarding Tobias Rustat who was a director of the Royal African Corporation hugely involved in the slave trade. Does the council agree with me that the roads in the Coleridge ward of the city named for him Rustat Road and Rustat Close are a stain on our city and should be renamed and that process / consultation should begin immediately

Question 5)

Cambridge City Council rightly stands committed to a housing programme framed in the importance of making affordable housing and council housing central to its aims.

The North Cambridge Development is key to ensuring that Cambridge north of the River Cam provides housing of optimal standard for council housing residents, built to complement surrounding residential areas, and to maintain or add to green space, trees and play areas so that environmental standards are maintained and residents of the development live in housing that is, internally and externally, consistent with health, safety, and well-being. Key also is proportionate density of building and attention paid to infrastructure including transport access and road safety.

Cambridge City Council is therefore requested to:

(1) Consider Arbury Court, Kingsway, and Brackley Close together on building density, so that housing density is proportionate over the three sites – at present Arbury Court appears disproportionate in density, site capacity, and proposed housing.

(2) Further to (1) height presently existing at Arbury Court (one story (Library), two and up to four storeys (shops, flats) provides a good mix and, if it must be exceeded (which is disappointing), should be done to fit into the surrounding area, bearing in mind that Alex Wood Road and Hurst Park Avenue come directly onto the perimeter of Arbury Court, and in any event height should **not** rise to the level of six or seven storeys as is apparently being considered currently.

(3) Consult and collaborate with Cambridgeshire County Council on highway access, consistent with safety and security for all residents and, in particular (but not only), bearing in mind residents' concerns about safety, work with the County to ensure that the Mansell Way crossing be moved up further toward Arbury Road and away from the Alex Wood Road corner, as its location is dangerous for pedestrians and for motor vehicles coming around the bend confronted suddenly with the crossing.

(4) Consult and collaborate with Cambridgeshire County Council (in consultation with residents, and noting residents' concerns as dangers of fast moving traffic coming around the corner from Roseford Road into Butler Way, and from Butler Way into Roseford Road) as to whether Butler Way (running alongside Kingsway Flats and with no housing frontages) might be decommissioned so that it can become a part of the North Cambridge Development, providing additional green space and trees for Kingsway residents by creating an additional grassed, treed panorama between existing residences and the redeveloped Kingsway Flats.

Question 6)

Cambridge is a City of Sanctuary and welcomes refugees, consistently committing to support the work of the Cambridge chapter of City of Sanctuary in work and partnership with The Cambridge Convoy Refugee Action Group and Cambridge Refugee Resettlement Campaign – as Cambridge City website attests, 'to build a culture of hospitality and welcome for refugees arriving in Cambridge'.

Cambridge 'Stand Up to Racism' applauds this work and stands with the City in a pledge to ensure that refugees in Cambridge can, in resettling, 'feel safe, welcome and part of our community'.

Unity Rallies are being held this Autumn across the United Kingdom to affirm anti-racism and the principle and practice of unity. Cambridge 'Stand Up to Racism' requests that Cambridge City Council stands with Stand Up to Racism' in supporting the major Unity Demonstration and Rally to be held in Cambridge assembling at Jesus Green on Saturday 17 October to stand with our neighbours, communities, and fellow residents for the right of all people to be held in respect and comradeship, entitled to human rights, freedom and dignity, without racism in any form being accepted or tolerated as a part of our City.

We request that this pledge be proclaimed by Cambridge City Councillors cross-party, so that all political parties that are a party of Cambridge City Council stand with the people of Cambridge and Stand Up to Racism to affirm our City as a City of sanctuary, friendship and community for all.

Question 7)

The Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, Paul Bristow, has set a CPCA policy to "triple our local economy" by 2050. Whether people like it or not, the policy he has decided will mean a very substantial increase in the number of people and jobs (including offices, labs, etc.). This is in a City that already has a very large amount of driving beyond the limited road space available, so a tripling of activity will present huge challenges for transport provision. Under Mr Bristow's policy, Cambridge will be a new "Global City Cambridge" Opportunity Zone, with huge expansion of industry (such as labs and offices) and housing.

<https://www.easternpowerhouse.uk/post/mayor-bristow-launches-landmark-local-growth-plan-to-supercharge-cambridgeshire-peterborough>

Does council agree that, in transport terms, the only way that the Mayor's tripling of growth policy could possibly be workable is by reallocation of roadspace towards non-car modes of transport, such as public transport, cycling, and walking, for the simple reason that there is not physical space for even more driving between all the new houses and labs/offices his policy will result in?

Furthermore, does the council agree with your own Emerging Local

Plan's top transport policy statement that "Development must be designed through a vision-led approach which reflects the road user hierarchy"? The road user hierarchy, as defined by UK government, prioritises pedestrians, then cyclists, then public transport, then cars last.

Question 8)

Since the start of the market project, the key message from Councillors and officers has been "a 7 day a week market". But the Sunday market is full of stalls and traders; most of whom are only there for the one day, on a Sunday. It is a discrete entity, a vibrant, eclectic 1 day a week market. But in spite of repeated questions, queries, and prompts, both Councillors and officers have pushed the Sunday market under the carpet. Nor is it even mentioned anywhere in the current planning application 26/03254/FUL for the temporary market.

This repeated ignoring of their existence has brought many of the Sunday traders to the place where they have had enough. They are disappearing from our market altogether. The latest loss means you can no longer buy fresh fish on a Sunday.

When will the Councillors wake up, and understand that the plans that have been presented to them for the market, do not work for them; do not work for their constituents; and most vitally do not work for the traders? As councillors they have set a pattern for the destruction of what was once our thriving, traditional, and diverse vibrant market.

But all is not yet lost. Although planning permission has been granted (by appallingly few councillors) for the market redevelopment, the Council as owner and manager of the market can amend its proposals.

As has been said before, the market is the beating heart of our historic city. A market has been serving the people of Cambridge since Saxon times, long before the University. A thriving, traditional eclectic market would continue to be a huge asset to our City going forward. Instead, the extent to which the Council's plans are destroying the market are becoming more vivid every day.

It is time for all councillors to get involved, and make it clear that they will not countenance the destruction of our traditional market.

Question 9)

Heatwaves of the degree and intensity of this summer have resulted in the tragic loss of huge numbers of recently planted trees, notably on Milton Road where many trees are now marked for felling which is a travesty. Given that the heatwaves we had are likely to be the new normal, will the council be doing a survey of which trees have survived and not survived to ensure that only species appropriate trees with the highest chance of survival of current and future heatwaves are planted as part of the ongoing tree strategy? What other techniques will the council employ to try and prevent future tree losses?

This page is intentionally left blank

1. From Councillor Young to the Leader

Can the Leader please explain the administration's strategy for community centres across the city, in particular those being built as required under the local plan and in accordance with good community practice?

2. From Councillor Illingworth to the Leader

Does the Leader agree with me that after the government established such momentum and focus behind its proposals to reorganise local government, first its failure to decide between proposed options for this area and then its suspension of the whole programme here and elsewhere, suggests the whole project descended into a shambles? What has been the cost of this to the Council?

3. From Councillor Glasberg to the Cabinet Member for Nature, Open Space and City Services

At the last Council meeting there was unanimous support for our motion to declare the Rights of the River, and a report has now come to the Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet setting out all the work that the Council is undertaking to protect and enhance it.

Under the heading, 'Planning, Water Resources and Sustainable Growth', the report states that, 'Water availability is a strategic constraint for Greater Cambridge. The issue is particularly important because of the relationship between groundwater abstraction and the chalk aquifer which supports the area's chalk streams '. Water availability is also a potential constraint on the substantial growth proposed in the emerging Local Plan.

This issue is recognised as key by the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service, which has undertaken considerable work on this area in preparing the Local Plan. It is also recognised by the Government, which set up a Water Scarcity Group to look at ways to address this problem, which is a potential block on the major growth planned for this region.

Although it seems water credits are not being pursued further at present, a range of other measures is being considered, including water-efficiency and retrofit programmes, water reuse, the proposed Grafham transfer, the Fens Reservoir and agricultural reservoirs. However, these measures

have different delivery dates and remain subject to significant assumptions.

Can the Executive Councillor set out the evidence on which the Council relies to conclude that sufficient water will be available to meet the needs of the existing population and planned development throughout the Local Plan period, without further damage to our chalk streams?

4. Councillor Nicmanis to the Leader (Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport)

Thank you, Cambridge city councillors, for voting unanimously in favour of an Article 4 Direction on 16th July. This was an important first step in the direction of controlling the proliferation of Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs) in our residential areas which create increased wealth for the few off the back of those in our city who cannot afford to get on the housing ladder. We must understand that this escalating problem is contributing to further economic inequality in our unfair city.

HMOs are a necessary part of the Cambridge housing mix but their recent rapid spread due to the opportunistic grab by property investors to make huge profit margins from people studying and working in our city must be curbed. 10% is understood nationally as the accepted 'tipping point' at which community cohesion and access to local amenities become irreversibly damaged. Numerous other university cities with similarly sized student populations like York, Bath, Durham, Leeds, Bristol and Leicester recognise that a 10%/100m radius cap based on measurable data is essential in order to:

1. protect community stability against high-rent housing trends
2. freeze excessive expansion as developers learn to avoid properties where a conversion would not be permitted
3. prevent expensive planning appeals
4. protect council officers from spending hours on planning reports
5. protect planning members from having to make decisions on vague criteria like "harm to neighbourhood character" or "amenity impact" whose subjectivity developers can exploit with bespoke bike storage, noise management plans, and waste management plans.

Will the council re-confirm their commitment to supporting the inclusion of a 10%/100m threshold and communicate what steps have been taken towards this end since our commitment made at the July Full Council?

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet
23 September 2026
5.00pm – 8.15pm

Present: Councillors Thornburrow (Chair), Moore (Vice-Chair), Bird, Gawthroe Wood, Nestor, Smart and Todd-Jones

Councillors in attendance:

Councillors Bennett, Bick, Davison, Dazell, Glasberg and Young

Officers Present:

Chief Executive: Robert Pollock

Chief Financial Officer: Jody Etherington

Communities Director: Sam Scharf

Assistant Director, Development: Ben Binns

Assistant Director, People & Change: Hannah Ralph

Assistant Director, Public Realm and Environment: Alistair Wilson

Head of Strategy and Policy: David Kidston

Head of Governance & Democracy (Deputy Monitoring Officer): Dan Kalley

Biodiversity Manager: Guy Belcher

Drainage and Flood Resilience Manager: Rachel Veysey

Planning Policy Manager: Jon Dixon

Environmental Health Manager and Public Safety Lead: Yvonne O'Donnell,

Deputy Democratic Services Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

River Cam, Chalk Streams and Tributaries – Strategic Review and Environmental Projects

Recommendation of the Cabinet, which met on 23 September 2026, is outlined below:

Cabinet **resolved unanimously** to approve the recommendation on to Full Council.

Accordingly, Council is recommended to:

Approve an increase in the Jesus Green River wall project budget from the £850,000 approved in October 2024 to a maximum of £2.441 million, to enable the stabilisation and replacement works to proceed and the competitive procurement process to commence.

Further recommendations attached in update report include:

Approve the additional capital provision being funded from reserves, with financing implications incorporated into the Council's Medium-Term Financial Strategy

**REPORT TITLE: Jesus Green Wall repairs**

To: Council 1st October

Report by:

Alistair Wilson – Assistant Director for Public Realm and Environment

Tel: 01223 458514 Email alistair.wilson@cambridge.gov.uk

Wards affected:

Market and West Chesterton

Director Approval: Director James Elms confirms that the report author has sought the advice of all appropriate colleagues and given due regard to that advice; that the equalities impacts and other implications of the recommended decisions have been assessed and accurately presented in the report; and that they are content for the report to be put to Council for decision.

1.	Recommendations
1.1	It is recommended that Council: a) approves an increase in the capital budget for the Jesus Green River wall project from £850,000 to a maximum of £2.441 million, an increase of £1.591 million, to enable the stabilisation and replacement works to proceed; b) approves the additional capital provision being funded from reserves, with financing implications incorporated into the Council's Medium-Term Financial Strategy; and c) notes that Cabinet, on 23 September 2026, supported an open, two-stage procurement process, with appointment of a preferred contractor under a Pre-Construction Services Agreement followed by entry into the main construction contract only if the final design, construction methodology, cost plan and contract sum are acceptable and remain within the approved budget.
2.	Purpose and reason for the report
2.1	This report seeks Council approval for the additional capital budget required to stabilise and replace the Council-owned river wall at Jesus Green, between Jesus Green Lido and Jesus Green Lock.

2.2 2.3	Cabinet considered the River Cam, Chalk Streams and Tributaries report on 23 September 2026 and agreed to recommend that Council increase the approved project budget. Council approval is required because the revised capital requirement exceeds the £850,000 provision approved in October 2024. The recommendation allows the project to move into competitive two-stage procurement while retaining a clear control point before the Council enters the main construction contract. The Services, Climate and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee 21st September 2026 considered the proposals and endorsed the recommendations following debate. Members sought assurance on the revised project cost and controls on expenditure, the likely timescales, and the work already undertaken to establish the condition of the wall and develop the proposed solution. Cabinet on the 23rd of September, subsequently approved the recommendations. Its discussion included questions about the project timetable and assurance that cost and construction risks would be managed within the proposed budget. The two-stage procurement approach provides a further control point before the Council enters the main construction contract.
3.	Background and Key Issues
3.1	The City Council is the riparian owner of the affected river wall. Inspections and investigations have confirmed active movement and rotation of the structure. A gap of up to two feet has developed between the concrete capping beam and the soil embankment, indicating continuing structural failure. In October 2024, Council approved a capital budget of £850,000. This early estimate was based on a high-level assessment of the wall length and assumed that conventional construction plant could work from the bankside. Subsequent arboricultural, engineering and geotechnical investigations have shown that this assumption is not deliverable. The river wall adjoins an avenue of mature trees, and the scale of land-based piling plant would have unacceptable effects on root-protection areas and tree canopies. The works must instead be undertaken from the river using floating plant and pontoons. Low bridge clearances also restrict the equipment that can reach the site, requiring specialist river access, plant and construction methods. Since the original budget was approved, the Council has undertaken inspections and arboricultural, engineering and geotechnical investigations. These established the

	extent of the wall's movement, tested the original assumption that construction could take place from the bank, and informed the assessment of repair options. The investigations found that the heavy plant needed for bankside piling would cause unacceptable damage to the mature tree avenue. No viable land-based method was identified that would both protect the trees and deliver the required works. The investigations and design work explain why the proposed method and budget differ from the high-level estimate made in 2024. The permanent wall repair has yet to be undertaken.
4.	Preferred engineering solution and revised budget
4.1	The technical assessment identifies steel sheet piling as the most viable solution capable of meeting the site's geotechnical and load-bearing requirements while maintaining the required river frontage alignment. The proposed steel sheet piles would be installed in front of the existing concrete retaining wall, with the ground behind reinstated. This would retain the river frontage alignment and avoid extensive excavation beside the mature trees. Alternative hard-engineering solutions would cost more, take longer to install and have greater embodied carbon. Softer revetment approaches would not provide the necessary structural performance or retain the required alignment because of the adjacent infrastructure and lock. The revised maximum project budget is £2.441 million, including the £850,000 already approved. Council is therefore asked to approve an additional £1.591 million. The revised estimate reflects construction from the river, specialist plant and access arrangements, design and project costs, and risk allowances identified as the investigations progressed. The final construction methodology, programme, risk allocation, and contract sum will be developed and evaluated with the preferred contractor during the pre-construction stage.

5.	Procurement and project control
	Cabinet has approved an open, two-stage procurement approach: • Stage 1 - appoint a preferred contractor under a Pre-Construction Services Agreement to work with the Council and design team on the detailed design, temporary works, river logistics, construction methodology, programme and final cost plan. • Stage 2 - subject to an acceptable final design, risk allocation and contract sum, enter the main construction contract. This approach brings specialist contractor knowledge into the design before the Council commits to the principal works. It is intended to improve buildability and cost certainty, allocate risk appropriately and reduce exposure to inflated tender prices or later variations. If an acceptable contract sum cannot be achieved, the Council will retain the ability to re-tender the developed scheme. Approval of the maximum budget does not itself authorise expenditure beyond the pre-construction stage unless the final contract remains affordable and the required technical, legal, procurement and financial assurances have been completed. The detailed construction programme cannot be confirmed until the preferred contractor has tested river access, temporary works and the construction sequence during the Pre-Construction Services Agreement. Officers will monitor progress against the programme developed at that stage and assess the effect of any delay on the condition of the wall and the need for interim measures. Before entering the main construction contract, officers will review the developed design, programme, risk allocation and contract sum, with appropriate technical, legal, procurement and financial advice. The main contract will proceed only if those matters are acceptable and the project remains within the budget approved by Council. If they are not, the Council can reconsider or re-tender the developed scheme. Any proposal requiring a higher budget will need further approval.
6.	Case for investment
	The wall is actively moving and continued reactive maintenance does not address the underlying structural failure. Delaying intervention would increase the risk of localised collapse, emergency works, service disruption and higher costs. Failure could affect: • Jesus Green Lido and the adjoining public open space; • Jesus Green Lock and river navigation; • Foul water pump-out facility for river vessels and residential boats; • Adjoining footpaths and strategic cycle routes; • Granta Backbone Network and drainage infrastructure;

	• Mature trees and the riverbank environment; and • Public safety and access along a heavily used riverside route. • High-speed fibre-optic cables, foul and surface water sewers, and other buried utilities. The preferred option is therefore planned replacement through a controlled procurement process. This provides a more proportionate and financially responsible response than continued temporary repairs or waiting for structural failure.
7	Relationship with Jesus Green Lock
	The proposed maximum capital budget is £2.441 million, comprising the existing £850,000 provision and an additional £1.591 million sought from Council. The recommendation is that the additional provision be funded from reserves, with the financing implications reflected in the Medium-Term Financial Strategy. The estimate includes an allowance for identified project risks, but specialist river construction, access constraints, ground conditions and temporary works remain sources of cost uncertainty. The two-stage procurement process will provide a more developed cost plan before commitment to the main construction contract. The projects should continue to be coordinated where practical, but the river wall project should not be delayed if this would increase structural or financial risk. Any shared access or delivery arrangement must clearly allocate costs, liabilities and future maintenance responsibilities. The budget request in this report relates only to the Council-owned river wall and does not transfer responsibility for the lock or the Conservators' statutory navigation functions to the Council.
8.	Implications
8.1	Financial Risk
	A total of £850,000 is already allocated and approved within the Council's current Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). The remaining balance of £1,591,000 will be funded from the Council's unallocated capital reserves. • Financing Costs: Because the project is entirely funded by cash from the MTFS and existing reserves, the Council will not take on any debt or pay any interest costs for this work. • Impact on Council Plans: Using these reserves means those funds will not be available for other future projects. However, drawing from reserves ensures this urgent safety work can move forward without disrupting the existing MTFS budget plans.

	Future Maintenance Costs (Revenue Budget) Once the new river wall is built, it will require routine safety checks and visual inspections annually to check for defects relating to the moorings and path. The main structural component of the steel piles will have a design life of at least 60 years. We estimate these ongoing costs of minor repairs to surfacing or mooring points will be in the region of £500-1000 annually as an average over the next 12 years. This can be absorbed within the existing annual revenue budget as an existing asset. Before the report is finalised, we need to confirm the funding source, financing costs if any, cash-flow profile, treatment of inflation and risk allowance, and any effect on the Medium-Term Financial Strategy. Any ongoing inspection or maintenance costs arising from the completed asset should be incorporated into future revenue budgets. The two-stage procurement provides a further financial control. Entry into the main construction contract will take place only when the developed design and contract sum are acceptable and within the maximum approved budget. Any proposal exceeding that limit, or creating material unfunded liabilities, will require further approval under the Council's financial governance arrangements. Financial and Governance Controls The two-stage procurement process ensures that the Council retains full control over project expenditure. Progression from the pre-construction phase to the construction contract will only occur where the final design and tendered construction cost remain within the approved budget of £2,441,000. Any cost exceeding the approved budget, or any material increase in future financial liabilities, would require further approval through the Council's formal decision-making and financial governance processes before a contract could be awarded at the second stage.
8.2	Risk Management
	The principal risks and controls are: Structural deterioration: The active movement may worsen before construction. Monitoring, interim safety measures and timely procurement will continue. Cost uncertainty: Specialist River working, restricted access, ground conditions and temporary works may affect price. Early contractor involvement, an explicit risk allowance and a maximum budget provide control.

	Failure to secure an acceptable tender: The Council will retain the ability to revise the design or re-tender the developed scheme rather than enter an unaffordable main contract. Environmental and tree impacts: Detailed design, construction methodology, arboricultural controls and relevant consents will minimise effects on mature trees, habitats and the river. Interface with the Conservators: The wall and lock projects will be coordinated, but responsibilities, costs and liabilities will remain clearly separated. Programme delay: Delay increases the likelihood of emergency intervention and disruption. The two-stage route is intended to resolve buildability and logistics early.
8.3	Legal Implications
	The Council owns the affected river wall and may undertake works to protect and maintain its asset. The project will require appropriate land, navigation, environmental, flood-risk and construction consents. Contract documents must clearly allocate design, construction, river access, third-party and future maintenance liabilities. Partnership and funding arrangements will need to clearly identify responsibilities, liabilities, ownership of works and future maintenance obligations.
8.4	Equalities and socio-economic Implications
	The completed works will protect continued public access to an important riverside open space and route. Temporary construction arrangements will need to consider accessibility, alternative routes, and clear public information.
8.5	Net Zero Carbon, Climate Change and Environmental implications
	Construction will have temporary environmental and carbon impacts. The developed design and procurement should minimise embodied carbon, protect trees and habitats, control pollution and disturbance, and consider material reuse where feasible. The preferred steel sheet-pile solution has lower embodied carbon than the other viable hard-engineering options assessed.
8.6	Procurement Implications

	Cabinet has approved an open, two-stage procurement process. The procurement will comply with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and applicable procurement legislation.
8.7	Community Safety Implications
	Planned intervention reduces the risk associated with continuing structural movement. Construction will require site controls, safe diversions and coordination with river and open-space users. In the longer term, investment in riverbank infrastructure, appropriate management of riverside land and improved environmental condition should contribute positively to the safety, resilience and quality of the river environment.
9	Background documents Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
	River Cam, Chalk Streams and Tributaries - Strategic Review and Environmental Projects, Cabinet, 23 September 2026.
10	Appendices
10.1	None
	To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact Alistair Wilson, City Services, alistair.wilson@cambridge.gov.uk

Cabinet
23 September 2026
5.00pm – 8.15pm

Present: Councillors Thornburrow (Chair), Moore (Vice-Chair), Bird, Gawthrope Wood, Nestor, Smart and Todd-Jones

Councillors in attendance:

Councillors Bennett, Bick, Davison, Dazell, Glasberg and Young

Officers Present:

Chief Executive: Robert Pollock

Chief Financial Officer: Jody Etherington

Communities Director: Sam Scharf

Assistant Director, Development: Ben Binns

Assistant Director, People & Change: Hannah Ralph

Assistant Director, Public Realm and Environment: Alistair Wilson

Head of Strategy and Policy: David Kidston

Head of Governance & Democracy (Deputy Monitoring Officer): Dan Kalley

Biodiversity Manager: Guy Belcher

Drainage and Flood Resilience Manager: Rachel Veysey

Planning Policy Manager: Jon Dixon

Environmental Health Manager and Public Safety Lead: Yvonne O'Donnell,

Deputy Democratic Services Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Budget Outturn 2025-26

Recommendations of the Cabinet, which met on 23 September 2026, are outlined below:

Cabinet **resolved unanimously** to approve the recommendations on to Full Council.

Accordingly, Council is recommended to:

- i. Approve of the revenue budget carry forwards greater than £50,000 listed at Appendix C of the Officer's report.
- ii. Approve the creation of a new earmarked reserve for asset compliance, and the transfer into this reserve of the net 2025/26 General Fund underspend of £1.930 million.

- iii. Approve the General Fund capital budget carry forwards listed at Appendix D, together with the carry forward of associated resources to finance this expenditure (including £1.767 million of planned revenue contributions to capital).
- iv. Approve the Housing Revenue Account capital budget carry forwards listed at Appendix F of the Officer's report.

Cabinet
23 September 2026
5.00pm – 8.15pm

Present: Councillors Thornburrow (Chair), Moore (Vice-Chair), Bird, Gawthrope Wood, Nestor, Smart and Todd-Jones

Councillors in attendance:

Councillors Bennett, Bick, Davison, Dazell, Glasberg and Young

Officers Present:

Chief Executive: Robert Pollock

Chief Financial Officer: Jody Etherington

Communities Director: Sam Scharf

Assistant Director, Development: Ben Binns

Assistant Director, People & Change: Hannah Ralph

Assistant Director, Public Realm and Environment: Alistair Wilson

Head of Strategy and Policy: David Kidston

Head of Governance & Democracy (Deputy Monitoring Officer): Dan Kalley

Biodiversity Manager: Guy Belcher

Drainage and Flood Resilience Manager: Rachel Veysey

Planning Policy Manager: Jon Dixon

Environmental Health Manager and Public Safety Lead: Yvonne O'Donnell,

Deputy Democratic Services Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Development Loan to Cambridge Investment Partnership

Recommendations of the Cabinet, which met on 23 September 2026, are outlined below:

Cabinet **resolved unanimously** to approve the recommendations on to Full Council.

Accordingly, Council is recommended to:

- i. Increase the maximum development loan amount to be drawn down by Cambridge Investment Partnership LLP in respect of Newbury Farm, ATS/Murketts Histon Rd, and Fanshawe Road, by £12 million.
- ii. Approve a corresponding increase of £12 million to the total investment counter-party limit with CIP in the Treasury Management Strategy.

This page is intentionally left blank

Labour Amendment to Agenda Item 9b: Proposed by Councillor Smart,
Seconded by Councillor x

Existing text ~~struck through~~, additional text underlined

Council notes:

- That in 2019 the Council unanimously supported calling a Biodiversity Emergency, which has since then been put into practice with the Council's Biodiversity Strategy.
- That in 2021 the Council unanimously supported a herbicide-free trial in two wards which has since then progressed to the adoption of the council's city-wide Herbicide-Free Weed Strategy in 2025.
- ~~That Cambridge Liberal Democrats called for the Council to adopt and trial herbicide-free weed management, both through the declaration of a Biodiversity Emergency in 2019 and through a motion proposing trials in two wards in 2021.~~
- ~~That the Liberal Democrat motion received unanimous Council support and was welcomed by local environmental organisations and community groups.~~
- That Cambridge City Council has been successful in stopping the use of herbicides.
- Certain widely used formulas, such as glyphosate, have been linked by various health organisations and studies to chronic issues, including potential carcinogenic risks and hormone disruption. The World Health Organisation's International Agency for Research on Cancer classified glyphosate as "probably carcinogenic to humans".
- Herbicides are therefore potentially dangerous to all plant life including edible foodstuffs, as well as animals, including pets.
- It is the policy of this Council to cultivate a healthy, nature-positive urban environment that supports local wildlife and ecosystems.
- That there has been continuing cross-party support for developing a herbicide-free approach in Cambridge.

- Recognises the important contribution made by Pesticide Free Cambridge, On the Verge and others in developing and supporting Cambridge's herbicide-free ambition.
- That the trials demonstrated the environmental benefits of reducing herbicide use, but also identified significant operational challenges associated with replacing chemical treatment with mechanical and manual methods.
- That mechanical and manual weed removal is more labour-intensive, is affected by weather, seasonal growth, parked vehicles and accumulated detritus, and requires repeat visits because it does not prevent regrowth.
- That, ~~following the trials and investment~~ the Council has invested in specialist equipment, ~~the Council moved in order~~ to extend herbicide-free weed management across the city.
- That, since then, implementation has been challenging ~~slow~~, reflecting the difficult and time-consuming nature of herbicide-free weed removal and the need to tackle years of accumulated detritus alongside the visible growth. Consequently, ~~a substantial number of some areas that are between~~ are still awaiting treatments, and can cause residents to be ~~are~~ understandably concerned about the condition of streets and public spaces.
- That responsibility for weed management is divided between Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and other landowners, requiring strong ~~stronger~~ coordination and clear ~~clearer~~ information for residents.

Council believes:

- That the Council-led ambition to end the routine use of herbicides remains the right approach for Cambridge and should not be abandoned because its implementation has proved more difficult than anticipated.
- That herbicide-free weed management supports the Council's commitments to biodiversity, environmental protection and more sustainable management of public spaces.
- That environmental ambition must be matched by effective implementation, sufficient resources, suitable equipment and an honest assessment of what is required to deliver the service successfully.

- That Cambridge residents are entitled to streets and public spaces that are safe, accessible, properly maintained and attractive.
- That priority must be given to weed growth that obstructs footways, affects accessibility, restricts drainage, creates a safety concern or risks damage to highways and other infrastructure, though not an exclusive list
- That some vegetation can be tolerated where it does not affect safety, accessibility, drainage, infrastructure or the reasonable enjoyment of public space, though not an exclusive list
- That residents should be given clear information about the standards they can expect from an herbicide-free service, including the greater likelihood of seasonal growth and regrowth between treatments.
- That the present challenges will not cause ~~difficulties require decisive corrective action and additional support for the service, rather than~~ any retreat from the Council's herbicide-free commitment.

Council therefore calls on the Leader and Executive Councillor to:

- Reaffirm the Council's commitment to cross-party support for the ~~Liberal Democrat-led ambition of ending the routine use of herbicides on land managed by the City Council.~~
- Commission an urgent Officer review of the current weed-management programme, identifying:
 - the reasons for departure from the original programme;
 - the extent of the outstanding work;
 - the staffing, equipment and financial capacity required;
 - the effectiveness and whole-life cost of the different mechanical and manual methods;
 - the frequency of repeat treatment needed;
 - seasonal and weather-related constraints;
 - the effect of parked vehicles and other access restrictions; and
 - opportunities for better coordination with the County Council, contractors, communities and other landowners.
 - Any additional costs to the City Council of cutting the County Council's verges on their behalf.
- ~~Bring forward a costed, non-recurring recovery programme to blitz outstanding priority areas and establish a manageable baseline for future maintenance.~~

-
- ~~Ensure that any short-term intervention is supported by a sustainable annual maintenance programme, so that areas cleared through the recovery work receive appropriate repeat treatment.~~
- Bring forward an options appraisal for a non-recurring recovery programme to blitz outstanding priority areas and establish a manageable baseline for future maintenance and a sustainable annual maintenance programme, so that areas cleared through the recovery work receive appropriate repeat treatment.
-
- Develop a risk-based approach that prioritises safety, accessibility, drainage, transport routes and the protection of public infrastructure.
-
- Continue to test and evaluate new equipment and working methods, drawing on operational evidence from Cambridge and good practice elsewhere.
-
- Present ~~Bring forward~~ any necessary suggested budget bid for 2027-28, clearly distinguishing between the one-off cost of recovering the service and the recurrent resources required to maintain it, so that Councillors can make an informed decision weighing up the costs of any necessary bid with any additional savings that will need to be made elsewhere
-
- Publish a clear statement for residents setting out responsibilities, priorities, expected service standards, seasonal constraints and how urgent concerns should be reported.
-
- Introduce transparent performance reporting covering areas completed, outstanding initial treatments, repeat visits, complaints, service requests, costs and operational learning.
-
- Report the findings of the review, together with costed options and a revised delivery programme, to the relevant scrutiny committee within an agreed timescale.

Green Amendment to Agenda Item 10b: Proposed by Councillor Davison,
Seconded by Councillor Clough

Existing text ~~struck through~~, additional text underlined

Council notes:

- That ~~Cambridge Liberal Democrats called for to adopt and trial herbicide-free weed management, both through the declaration of a Biodiversity Emergency in 2019 and through a motion proposing trials in two wards in 2021~~ the Council declared a Biodiversity Emergency in 2019 and subsequently supported the introduction and trial of herbicide-free weed management in Cambridge.
- That the Liberal Democrat motion received unanimous Council support and was welcomed by local environmental organisations and community groups.
- The important contribution made by Pesticide Free Cambridge and others in developing and supporting Cambridge's herbicide free ambition.
- That the trials ~~demonstrated the environmental benefits of reducing herbicide use,~~ provided evidence supporting the environmental case for reducing routine herbicide use but also identified significant operational challenges associated with replacing chemical treatment with mechanical and manual methods.
- That mechanical and manual weed removal is more labour intensive, is affected by weather, seasonal growth, parked vehicles and accumulated detritus, and requires repeat visits because it does not prevent regrowth.
- That, following the trials and investment in specialist equipment, the Council moved to extend herbicide-free weed management across the city.

- That the Council's approved 2025 Herbicide-Free Weed Management Work Programme identified an initial backlog of weed growth requiring intensive treatment before moving to a programme of regular scheduled maintenance
- That, since then, implementation has been slow, reflecting the difficult and time-consuming nature of herbicide-free weed removal and the need to tackle years of accumulated detritus alongside the visible growth. Consequently, a substantial number of areas are still awaiting treatment, and residents are understandably concerned about the condition of streets and public spaces. there remains outstanding work in some areas, and concerns have been raised about the condition and accessibility of streets and public spaces.
- That there is currently no sufficiently clear and publicly accessible picture of the outstanding backlog, broken down by ward and priority, or of actual delivery against the treatment programme approved in 2025.
- That responsibility for weed management is divided between Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and other landowners, requiring stronger coordination and clearer information for residents.
- That the proposed Civic Quarter capital redevelopment project relies on taking on over £60 million in external borrowing at last estimate, alongside drawing on the Council's general reserves.
- That while there has been adjustment in plans for the Civic Quarter in light of both recent consultation and higher-than-anticipated borrowing costs, concerns remain among traders, residents, and stakeholder groups about disruption caused by the project, as well as project costs and the financial risks associated with a major capital scheme.

Council believes:

- That the Council-led ambition to end the routine use of herbicides ~~remains the right approach for Cambridge and should not be abandoned because its implementation has proved more difficult than anticipated.~~ should be maintained, while recognising that its success depends on a properly resourced, sustainable and effective weed management service.
- That herbicide-free weed management supports the Council's commitments to biodiversity, environmental protection and more sustainable management of public spaces.
- That environmental ambition must be matched by effective implementation, sufficient resources, suitable equipment and an honest assessment of what is required to deliver the service successfully.
- That Cambridge residents are entitled to streets and public spaces that are safe, accessible, properly maintained and attractive.
- That priority must be given to addressing weed growth that obstructs footways, affects accessibility, restricts drainage, creates a safety concern or risks damage to highways and other infrastructure.
- That some vegetation can be tolerated where it does not affect safety, accessibility, drainage, infrastructure or the reasonable enjoyment of public space.
- That residents should be given clear information about the standards they can expect from an herbicide-free service, including the greater likelihood of seasonal growth and regrowth between treatments.
- That the present difficulties require ~~decisive corrective action and additional support for the service, rather than any retreat from the Council's herbicide-free commitment.~~ a clear recovery plan for outstanding work, followed by a sustainable recurring maintenance programme, rather than a retreat from the Council's commitment to ending the routine use of herbicides.

- That a commitment of over £60 million in external borrowing, as well as significant draw on the Council's general reserves, for a major redevelopment project while basic street maintenance is failing due to underfunding reflects flawed financial and civic priorities.

Council therefore calls on the Leader and Executive Councillor to:

- Reaffirm the Council's commitment to ~~the Liberal Democrat-led ambition~~ of ending the routine use of herbicides on land managed by the City Council.
- ~~Commission an urgent officer review of the current weed management programme, identifying:~~ Require Officers to report on delivery against the Council's approved 2025 Herbicide-Free Weed Management Work Programme, identifying:
 - the work originally planned and the work actually delivered to date;
 - the current outstanding backlog of outstanding work, broken down by ward and priority;
 - the reasons for any material delays or variance from the approved programme;
 - the staffing, equipment and financial capacity currently available and the capacity required;
 - the effectiveness and whole-life cost of the different mechanical and manual methods;
 - the frequency of repeat treatment required to maintain acceptable standards;
 - seasonal and weather-related constraints;
 - the effect of parked vehicles and other access restrictions; and
 - opportunities for better coordination with the County Council, contractors, communities and other landowners.
- ~~the reasons for departure from the original programme;~~
- ~~the extent of the outstanding work;~~
- ~~the staffing, equipment and financial capacity required;~~
- ~~the effectiveness and whole-life cost of the different mechanical and manual methods;~~
- ~~the frequency of repeat treatment needed; o seasonal and weather-related constraints;~~

- ~~the effect of parked vehicles and other access restrictions; and~~
 - ~~opportunities for better coordination with the County Council, contractors, communities and other landowners.~~
- ~~Bring forward a costed, non-recurring recovery programme to blitz outstanding priority areas and establish a manageable baseline for future maintenance.~~ time-limited recovery programme to clear the outstanding priority backlog and establish a measurable baseline for future maintenance.
 - ~~Ensure that any short-term intervention is supported by a sustainable annual maintenance programme, so that areas cleared through the recovery work receive appropriate repeat treatment.~~ Establish a sustainable recurring maintenance programme, including appropriate treatment frequencies for different categories of location, so that areas cleared through the recovery programme do not return to an unsustainable backlog.
 - ~~Develop a risk-based approach that prioritises safety, accessibility, drainage, transport routes and the protection of public infrastructure.~~ Adopt a transparent risk-based prioritisation framework, giving priority to safety, accessibility, drainage, transport routes and the protection of public infrastructure, with clear service standards and target response times.
 - ~~Continue to test and evaluate new equipment and working methods, drawing on operational evidence from Cambridge and good practice elsewhere.~~
 - ~~Bring forward any necessary budget bid for 2027-28, clearly distinguishing between the one-off cost of recovering the service and the recurrent resources required to maintain it.~~ clearing the existing backlog and the recurrent staffing, equipment and other resources required to maintain the service thereafter, and setting out the consequences of different funding levels.

- Instruct officers to conduct an immediate financial review of the planned Civic Quarter project aimed at scaling back borrowing and capital allocations, with such resources as needed for the above budget bid to be reallocated to frontline street cleansing, gully clearing, and manual weed management teams.
- Publish a clear statement for residents setting out responsibilities, priorities, expected service standards, seasonal constraints and how urgent concerns should be reported. the division of responsibilities between the City Council, County Council and other landowners; service priorities and standards; seasonal constraints; and how urgent concerns should be reported and escalated.
- Introduce transparent and regular performance reporting covering areas completed, outstanding initial treatments, repeat visits, complaints, service requests, costs and operational learning the outstanding backlog by ward, initial treatments completed, repeat visits, compliance with service standards, complaints and service requests, expenditure, cost per treatment, and operational learning.
- Report the findings of the review, together with costed options and a revised delivery programme, to the relevant scrutiny committee within an agreed timescale current backlog, costed recovery options, proposed recurring maintenance programme and measurable service standards to the relevant scrutiny committee within an agreed timescale, with subsequent regular reporting on delivery against those commitments.

Liberal Democrat Amendment to Agenda Item 9c: Proposed by Councillor Bick, Seconded by Councillor x

Existing text ~~struck through~~, additional text underlined

As residents of Cambridge, City Councillors experience the impact of roadworks first hand, whether we are walking, cycling, using public transport or driving. We know that this causes frustration and delays, adds to the costs for businesses, makes parents late to pick up children, or simply adds to the friction of daily life. While proper maintenance of the city's infrastructure is vital, with better planning and clearer information at least some of the burden could be reduced. ~~However, it appears that the County Council has no interest in limiting the impact of utility works and its own scheduled works on the residents of Cambridge, despite our significance within Cambridgeshire.~~

The purpose of this motion is to create a closer working relationship between City and County Councils with a view to managing the process ~~more~~ as effectively as possible. It will also support the planned creation of a unitary authority.

This Council notes:

- Cambridge City Council receives regular roadworks bulletins, including 50 planned works and 18 full road closures between 16–30 September.
- These works affect roads, pavements and cycleways.
- ~~There is currently no comprehensive modelling~~ Skilled, data-based judgement is necessary of how cumulative works and closures impact congestion, movement across the city, bus reliability, or air quality.
- Full use of highways authority legal powers in managing the rights of private developers and utilities companies, together with the scheduling of highways improvement projects are needed to minimise disruption to road users.

This Council believes:

- Robust data gathering, modelling and impact analysis are essential for effective transport planning.

- Uncoordinated closures without clear assessment place unnecessary strain on residents, public transport operators and businesses, and worsen air quality.

This Council resolves:

- To recommend the Chair of the Performance, Assets & Strategy Overview & Scrutiny Committee to invite representatives of the County Highways Authority to a public scrutiny session to discuss their current powers and processes for regulating works on the city's road network and opportunities to optimise the performance for all road users through further co-operation with the city council and other stakeholders
- ~~To write to Cambridgeshire County Council, as Highway Authority, requesting full liaison with Cambridge City Council and the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority to ensure:~~
 - ~~1. Systematic data gathering and impact analysis of roadworks and closures, shared between authorities.~~
 - ~~2. Integration of this data into current and future transport and infrastructure planning.~~
- ~~To request continued liaison with the CPCA on the best use of this data for forward planning.~~

Green Amendment to Agenda Item 9ca: Proposed by Councillor Flaubert,
Seconded by Councillor Nicmanis

Existing text ~~struck through~~, additional text underlined

As residents of Cambridge, City Councillors experience the impact of roadworks first hand, whether we are walking, ~~cycling, using public transport or driving.~~ wheeling, cycling, using public transport or driving.

We know that this causes frustration and delays, adds to the costs for businesses, makes parents late to pick up children, or simply adds to the friction of daily life. While proper maintenance of the city's infrastructure is vital, with better planning and clearer information at least some of the burden could be reduced. However, ~~it appears that the County Council has no interest in limiting the impact of utility works and its own scheduled works on the residents of Cambridge despite our significance within Cambridgeshire.~~ better coordination of utility works and the County Council's own scheduled works could reduce their cumulative impact on residents, businesses, public transport, walking, wheeling and cycling across Cambridgeshire.

The purpose of this motion is to create a closer working relationship between City and County Councils with a view to managing the process more effectively. It seeks to make better use of existing roadworks, transport and environmental data, identify gaps in the evidence base, and ensure that cumulative impacts are considered in future planning. ~~It will also support the planned creation of a unitary authority.~~

This Council notes:

- Cambridge City Council receives regular roadworks bulletins, including 50 planned works and 18 full road closures between 16–30 September.
- These works affect roads, pavements and cycleways; and can have wider impacts on public transport, accessibility, air quality and movement across the city.

- ~~There is currently no comprehensive modelling~~ The Council does not currently have a comprehensive assessment of how cumulative works and closures impact congestion, movement across the city, bus reliability, or air quality. Including walking, wheeling and cycling accessibility.

This Council believes:

- Robust data gathering, modelling and impact analysis are essential for effective transport and infrastructure planning.
- ~~Uncoordinated closures without clear assessment place unnecessary strain on residents, public transport operators and businesses, and worsen air quality.~~ Effective coordination and assessment of significant roadworks and closures can help reduce unnecessary disruption to residents, public transport operators and businesses, and support consideration of impacts on air quality.

This Council resolves:

- To write to the Cambridgeshire County Council, as the Highway Authority, to explain exactly how this coordination has been organised to date: whose role is it to timetable the utility works and the county council's own scheduled works; and, what strengths, weaknesses and opportunities the county council's relevant employees have identified with this process so far.
- To write to Cambridgeshire County Council, as Highway Authority, requesting full liaison with Cambridge City Council and the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority to ensure:
 1. ~~Systematic data gathering and impact analysis of roadworks and closures, shared between authorities~~ A shared assessment of existing roadworks, traffic, public transport and active travel data, identifying gaps in the evidence base and providing additional data or modelling where necessary to assess the cumulative impacts of roadworks and closures. This should include, where available, the location, duration, type and scale of works, traffic flows and journey times, bus journey times and reliability, pedestrian and cycle movements, accessibility impacts and air quality.

2. That the County Council identifies which existing systems and datasets will be used for this purpose, including existing street works permitting and roadworks information systems, and avoids duplication of data collection where suitable information already exists.
3. That the assessment considers the cumulative impact of concurrent or sequential works on the same corridor, neighbourhood or alternative routes.
- 2 4 . Integration of this data into current and future transport and infrastructure planning. To consider how the resulting analysis could inform current and future transport and infrastructure planning, including the sequencing, timing and coordination of works to minimise unnecessary disruption to public transport, walking, wheeling and cycling routes.
5. That the Highway Authority coordinates the underlying roadworks data and that the agreed analysis is shared with Cambridge City Council and the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority.
6. To request continued liaison with the CPCA on the best use of this data for forward planning, including identifying and mitigating the cumulative impacts of planned works across the city, with findings reviewed at regular intervals and used to inform future roadworks coordination and transport planning.
7. That the Highways Authority shares the next 12 month programme of works for Cambridge city only in advance with city councillors showing how it is coordinated with the various work programmes/contractors including the dates of the works. This task should start immediately and recur annually so city councillors and therefore residents are better informed about roadworks in our city.

This page is intentionally left blank

1. Councillor Tong To the Leader

With local government reorganisation across our city now being reviewed, residents deserve to know how much of their money has been invested into this process so far. Factoring in the use of officer time, approximately how much council tax has gone towards reorganisation locally?

2. Councillor Flaubert To the Cabinet Member for Housing and the Cabinet Member for Inclusive Economy and Skills

Trumpington Population, Housing Growth and Demographic Data Background

Trumpington has experienced substantial population and housing growth over the past 10–15 years, with significant further development either underway or planned. The character of the ward has also changed considerably as new communities have developed, and it encompasses a wide range of socio-economic groups and household circumstances. I have previously sought up-to-date information on Trumpington's population, demographic profile and housing growth, but have found it difficult to obtain a single, current and comprehensive picture of the information held by the Council. Given the scale of development and the importance of ensuring that local services and infrastructure reflect the community as it exists today, it would be helpful to have a consolidated and up-to-date position.

Question

Could the Council provide, or commit to providing, a consolidated report setting out the current and projected population and housing-growth position in Trumpington, including the latest available demographic and socio-economic information, the sources and dates of the data used, how frequently it is updated, and how and when this information is communicated to the organisations responsible for transport planning?

3. Councillor Tong To the Cabinet Member for Housing

Will the council guarantee that the redevelopment of Ekin Road will not proceed if it fails to secure the funding from Homes England necessary to build at least the number of affordable homes (or/and cheaper) previously agreed at Housing Scrutiny Committee?

This page is intentionally left blank