

**COUNCIL**

14 April 2016  
6.00 - 9.50 pm

**Present:** Councillors Abbott, Ashton, Austin, Avery, Baigent, Benstead, Bick, Bird, Blencowe, Cantrill, Dryden, Gawthrope, Gillespie, Hart, Herbert, Hipkin, Holland, Holt, Johnson, McPherson, Meftah, T. Moore, O'Connell, O'Reilly, Owers, Perry, Pippas, Pitt, Price, Ratcliffe, Reid, Roberts, Robertson, Sarris, Sinnott, C. Smart, Smart, Smith, Todd-Jones and Tunnacliffe

<b>FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL</b>
---

**16/14/CNL To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 25 February 2016**

The minutes of the 25 February 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

**16/15/CNL Mayors Announcements****APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Gehring and Sanders.

**REACH FAIR**

The Mayor reminded Councillors that they had received invitations to attend the annual Proclamation of Reach Fair which this year would take place on Bank Holiday Monday, 2nd May. Those Councillors who would like to attend should contact Lucy Milazzo no later than next Tuesday 19 April to confirm attendance.

**BEACON LIGHTING CEREMONY**

The Mayor announced that to mark Her Majesty the Queen's 90th birthday, Cambridgeshire County Council would be holding a beacon lighting event at Shire Hall on Thursday 21 April at 7pm, which was open to the public. Those Councillors who wanted to attend should contact Lucy Milazzo for further information.

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Cantrill	16/16/CNLb	Personal: A Winter Comfort Trustee

## **ELECTIONS**

The Mayor informed those present that Councillors Owers, Pitt, Reid and Sanders whose terms on the Council ended in May, had decided not to stand for re-election. He went on to say that the Council were losing some extremely able Members and thanked them all for their service to the City. He wished those Councillors who were standing for re-election well.

### **16/16/CNL Public Questions Time**

Members of the public asked a number of questions as set out below.

1. Mr Carpen raised the following points:
  - i. Given that Cambridge Assessment were due to vacate many premises over the next few years, would there be a strategy from Cambridge City Council and Cambridge Assessment on what to do with the vacant buildings? There was a huge chance to right some historical wrongs.
  - ii. Cambridge used to have a 'Theatre Royal' with nearly 2,000 seat capacity. The footprint of the building was occupied by the Maplin/Sainsbury's site & some offices behind & on top.
  - iii. Asked if money aside, could the site be flattened and a modern 2,000 capacity large theatre be built on that site (but keep the nice Cambridge Assessment building) which would be a two minute walk from Emmanuel St bus stops, three minutes from Drummer St, five minutes from Lion Yard car park and thirty seconds from the pizza hut bike park on Parker's Piece?
  - iv. Mindful of the growth of the city, would call for the City to get together and achieve this dream.

The Executive Councillor or Planning Policy and Transport responded:

- i. There were several factors and trends that played a part to why Cambridge had changed over the years which had to be taken into consideration.
- ii. Cambridge Assessment were vacating their existing premises to consolidate their operations onto a single site off Shaftesbury Road.

- iii. He believed there were a total of seven buildings that Cambridge Assessment were responsible for and as the owner /landlord they were entitled to determine what they wanted to do with those buildings; whether a change of use (if they could justify the reasons for the change against local planning policy) or to sell on the open market.
- iv. There used to be a theatre on Newmarket Road which was now the Buddhist Centre.
- v. Suggested the derelict Mecca Bingo building on Hobson Road required some life put back into the building.

Mr Carpen made the following supplementary points:

- i. He had been contacted by various individuals to ask what could be done with the old Mecca Bingo building on Hobson Street and suggested this could be a possible location for the Cambridge Student Hub and a local community hub.

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport responded with the following:

- i. He agreed it was a great shame for the old Mecca Bingo building to be unused and he would be encouraged if a group of residents would be able to come forward and demonstrate how they were able to take on the challenge of bringing the building back to life.

2. Mike Sergeant raised the following points:

- i. Many residents of West Chesterton were concerned about the Greater City Deal's proposals to Milton Road.
- ii. Many residents believed that the proposals would encourage more traffic on Milton Road which would then move the congestion further into the City.
- iii. Queried what measures could be taken to prevent this from happening.

The Leader responded:

- i. He understood and recognised the concerns of local residents in and around Milton Road.
- ii. Results from the consultation would be reported in the June cycle to the City Deal Assembly and the Executive Board which should reflect the comments of residents and all those that had taken part.

- iii. From the results a proposal would be put forward for consideration which would be linked to the City Deal wider project proposals to reduce congestion and improve traffic links in and out of the City.
- iv. The objective was not to increase the amount of traffic on the road but to enable a mode shift increasing the use of buses and cycles.
- v. There would also be a focus on improving the living environment and street scape.

Mr Sergeant made the supplementary points:

- i. Brought to the Leader's attention the Liberal Democrat leaflet which had been circulated around West Chesterton regarding the City Deal proposals.
- ii. The leaflet stated 'These schemes would be unnecessary if proper demand management were put in place to get more cars off the road.'
- iii. Questioned if this was the view of the Leader.

The Leader made the following points:

- i. He believed there had been recognition across the political spectrum that there was a need for improvement as had been discussed over the previous eighteen months.
- ii. Access routes into the City could not be left as it was and it was wrong to suggest otherwise.

3. Sophie Draper made the following points:

- i. She lived in a shared house in Cherry Hinton and did not receive money off her rent for being under 25. Paid the same amount as any other adult would for gas, electricity and broadband and even when food shopping there was no discount.
- ii. She was pleased Cambridge City Council had recognised true adult living costs by being an accredited Living Wage Employer.
- iii. She appreciated the City Council was taking a stand against the Government's implementation of the scheme with this evening's motion (item 6a of the agenda).
- iv. However, it seemed that writing to George Osborne, Daniel Zeichner and Heidi Allen would make much difference to the situation.
- v. The Chancellor was determined to continue trampling on young people and she could not imagine that either of our MPs employs large numbers of people.

- vi. Cambridgeshire County Council, was a massive employer and it was very noticeable that they were not accredited by the Living Wage Foundation and often did not offer the real Living Wage in their job adverts.
- vii. Both Cambridge City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council often worked together, with one Councillor who serves on both.
- viii. Questioned if the City Council had put much pressure on the County Council to pay the Living Wage and if the City Council could do so in future?

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources responded with the following:

- i. It was correct that the national minimum wage did not apply to those under the age of 25 years.
- ii. He would like to see Cambridgeshire County Council pay the living wage but there was a vast number of people who were employed by the County compared to the City Council and it was a bigger financial challenge for them.
- iii. Cambridge City Council had supported the Unison and GMB campaign calling for Cambridgeshire County Council to pay the living wage hourly rate.
- iv. Labour County Councillors had previously put forward two motions calling for Cambridgeshire County Council to pay the living wage in 2012 and 2014, both of which had been lost.
- v. The City Council would continue to encourage Cambridgeshire County to pay their employees the living wage.

Sophie Draper made the following supplementary point:

- i. Asked how the City Council checked those organisations, who stated they paid above the living way to all directly employed staff and complied with the annual increase in the Living Wage rate, but had taken a business decision not to pursue Living Wage accreditation.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources responded:

- i. Acknowledged that this was a problem.
- ii. Could only promote the benefits of pay the living wage to all businesses.
- iii. Freedom of Interests requests could be made to some companies but not if they were a private company.
- iv. Consumer pressure needed to play a role.

- v. In certain sectors if one employer were to pay a living wage this may have a positive impact on other companies within that sector.

4. Wendy Blythe made the following points.

- i. Questions relates to items 4b and 4c on the Council agenda.
- ii. Cambridge was the fastest growing city in the UK. Its Local Plan was under severe challenge from well-funded developers.
- iii. The University of Cambridge and Colleges were among those challenging the Local Plan.
- iv. The Planning Department and its Urban Design and Conservation teams played a vital role in safeguarding the unique character of Cambridge and supporting the quality of life of our local communities, and the best possible legal advice was now needed to defend the Local Plan.
- v. Residents were extremely concerned at the loss of such experienced senior Council officers.
- vi. Enquired if the Leader of the Council would be able to reassure residents sufficient resources were in place to ensure that our City's unique character and the quality of its community life were not only defended but enhanced and protected.

The Leader responded with the following:

- i. The two reports which had been referenced in Mrs Blythe's questions did not have any direct link to the Local Plan.
- ii. The City Council had appointed a Director of Planning and Economic Growth which would be responsible for both Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- iii. The role would bring the two Local Plans and Councils closer together.
- iv. The new Director's post had created a higher level of responsibility for planning which had not been there before.
- v. The number of staff in planning services had not decreased and posts were being appointed and would continue to be.
- vi. Cambridge City Council had a clear commitment to protect planning.
- vii. The Planning Policy Team had demonstrated great commitment and skills to their work on the Local Plan, addressing the Inspectorate questions, meeting objectives within tight timescales.

Wendy Blythe made the following supplementary points:

- i. In 2008 the City Council's Conservation Environment Manager stated he did not have the resources and staff and he was eventually made redundant.
- ii. There had been no specialist Conservation Senior Management to engage in partnership with the Colleges and major developers, this had been reflected in the recent consultation of the City's Historic Core.
- iii. Central Government cuts had left Cambridge, a heritage city without adequate resources to deal with the growth issues.
- iv. Queried what positive constructive action could local residents take to assist the City Council with the conservation of the City.

The Leader responded:

- i. The Council have professional Conservation Officers in the planning team who were extremely capable in what they did.
- ii. The Council recognised the link between the built environment and the conservation team.
- iii. The Council did listen to residents and were currently working with residents of Barrow Road who had requested conservation area status.
- iv. He would be happy to discuss this matter in further detail outside of the meeting.

### **16/17/CNL To consider the recommendations of Committees for Adoption**

**4a** 21/03/16 Licensing Committee: Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Policy – Revisions

#### **Resolved unanimously to:**

- i. Endorse the post-consultation updated Statement of Gambling Principles and Local Area Profile and Guidance on Risk Assessments shown in Appendix A of the Officer's report and recommend to full Council that the policy is approved for publication on 15 April 2016 for it to come into effect on 13 May 2016.

**4b** 22/03/16 Employment (Senior Officer) Committee: Legal Shared Service Restructuring

#### **Resolved unanimously to:**

- i. Approve the termination of employment of the Head of Legal Services and Monitoring Officer by reason of redundancy in the light of implementation of the shared legal service.
- ii. Note with regret that one consequence of the decision to combine three legal services into one is that the Head of Legal services will be leaving the Council's employment. The Council wished to place on record its thanks to Simon Pugh for 30 years of fantastic service to the Council and to the City. Officers and Members have been very fortunate to have access to his sound advice over such a long period.

**4c 22/03/16 Employment (Senior Officer) Committee: Future Management Restructuring**

**Resolved unanimously to:**

- i. Approve the payment of the exit costs that arise on termination of employment of the Director of Environment by reason of redundancy.
- ii. Note with regret that one consequence of the restructure of the council's management is that the Director of Environment would be leaving the Council's employment. The Council wished to place on record it's thanks to Simon Payne for his 11 years of service to the Council and to the City, noting this is but a small part of 41 years' dedicated service to local government.

**16/18/CNL To deal with Oral Questions**

**1) Councillor Austin to the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places.**

**What benefits will independent market stall holders get from the rent increase of up to 30% which they are now expected to pay?**

The Executive Councillor responded that the General and Sunday Market service was a commercially run service, which currently generated a modest return to the Council. A service review had recently been undertaken with the aim of simplifying the complex pitch pricing structure and associated administrative system which aligned fees and charges to other similar markets.

A report setting out the results of the review and associated market trader consultation recommended changes in pricing and associated terms which was approved at the Community Services Scrutiny Committee in March.

The approved increases in charging rate affected only 30% of all pitches, with 66 of the 99 pitches continuing to remain at their 2015/16 rates.

Only the Sunday 'standard category' pitch rate change equated to a 30% increase. This change had arisen as a result of harmonising the previous weekend rates so that the new Sunday market standard rate mirrored the Saturday market standard rate.

The Sunday market has 100% occupancy and was the most popular market (just three pitches had become available on the Sunday market since March 2015) and Saturday at 99% occupancy was next most popular day, so harmonising the weekend rates had been considered fair and reasonable.

As part of the review work, the General and Sunday Market service had been benchmarked against other markets across the country. The approved changes in rate, including hot food surcharge, was entirely consistent with rates charged by other benchmarked markets. Comparison with other markets had shown that, even with the proposed changes, the General and Sunday market service offer was still extremely competitive in terms of stall size, price charged and facilities provided.

The surcharge on hot food vendors had been aligned to disproportionate increase in utility and cleansing service costs arising from hot food.

The additional net income (£55,000 pa) arising from these changes would increase commercial value/ viability of service and provide additional net return to Council for re-investment in service developments/ improvements, including agreed increased market cleansing (daily 2 hour cleansing operative between 12-2pm).

Traders that choose to pay by direct debit would receive a 4% rebate

## **2) Councillor Avery to the Executive Councillor for Housing**

**Given recent media comment, does the Executive Councillor for Housing remain confident that the Lettings Policy for the Housing Company and the business plan for Town Hall Lettings, to the extent that it relates to the Housing Company, are appropriate in the particular context of Cambridge?**

The Executive Councillor confirmed that he remained confident the Lettings Policy for the Housing Company and the business plan for Town Hall Lettings,

to the extent that it related to the Housing Company, were appropriate in the particular context of Cambridge.

### **3) Councillor Gehring to the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste (asked by Councillor Pitt)**

**Could the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste explain the achievements that the Council has made in recycling in the 2016 council report delivered to residents recently?**

The Executive Councillor provided a list of the following examples:

- i. Pack for Good Campaign: End of term waste collections from the University of Cambridge Colleges liaising with the British Heart Foundation (BHF) for the collection of goods from students when they leave at the end of term. The scheme collated a range of items which they sold in its Cambridge shops all collected by the Waste Team.
  - 18 out of 31 colleges had signed up this year with a total of 6,644 bags of goods donated or 53 tonnes.
  - Anglian Ruskin University had taken part for the first time producing 846 bags or 6.7 tonnes.
  - A total of 7,490 bags, 59.8 tonnes had been generated which had been diverted from landfill during April to September.
- ii. Free Electrical Recycling event: Cambridge City Council had teamed up with European Recycling Platform (ERP) and the Environment Team at Cambridge University to host an event to collect electronic and electrical items from anyone in the city. This year's event had created over 20 tonnes of goods collected for recycling.
- iii. Christmas Tree Recycling: Residents had been encouraged to bring their trees to Cherry Hinton Hall for chipping and create a useful product for the Streets and Open Spaces team. An estimated 750 trees had been brought to the site this year. In addition to this, and for the first time, the Waste Team and Arthur Rank Hospice collaborated to set up collections from resident's homes for a small fee that would benefit the charity, with over 400 people registering for a collection and 6.9 tonnes of trees collected for composting.
- iv. Community Actions Days: The Waste team had worked with Housing, Streets and Open Spaces and Community Development to establish Community Action Days across the City. Twelve events had been held in 2015 with a total of 69 tonnes of rubbish collected and 27 tonnes of recycling. Many household items were also passed onto others for re-use or donated to charity.

- v. Love Food Hate Waste Campaign: At least 23 events were attended and 990 Kitchen caddies distributed to encourage recycling as well as prevention. The campaign held this year is to support the Cambridge Sustainable Food network and its work to achieve Sustainable Food City status in Cambridge. The first milestone of Bronze award for Cambridge has just been achieved.
- vi. Community Recycling Champions: Resident volunteers have attended at least 35 events this year and played an important role in communicating recycling messages to the public. At least 1,300 people have been spoken to at events during the course of the year. In addition to this they have been instrumental in aiding specific projects such as public survey work and door knocking at flats. Fifteen new champions had been recruited this year and the volunteer coordinator employed for a further 6 months.
- vii. The Recycling Officer post had continued when the post had been due to expire.

#### **4) Councillor Ashton to the Leader**

##### **How has the change worked on the Council taking over the funding of overnight street lighting from 2am to 6am?**

The Leader confirmed the City Council had given a financial contribution of £45,500 to ensure that the streetlights in Cambridge had remained on from 1 April 2016. As part of the negotiation the County Council had agreed to undertake responsibility for the cost of street lights in the City Centre particularly those near to CCTV cameras. At forty pence per city resident, the Council believed the cost to keep the lights on was a price well worth paying. However, the City Council should not be financially accountable for services that Cambridgeshire County Council were responsible for.

#### **5) Councillor Moore to the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste**

##### **Why have no Community Clean Up days been scheduled for South Area this year?**

The Executive Councillor responded that organisation and delivery of the Clean Up Day events were led by City Homes Officers with support from the Council's Recycling and Waste Minimisation and Streets and Open Spaces teams. The location/ number of events were determined by City Homes Officers using the following criteria:

- Available budget
- Available staff
- Target estates with highest density of City Home properties
- Target locations within those estates where most fly tipping occurred.

Where a target location had been identified for a Clean Up Day event, City Homes officers would seek to work with any established local residents groups to agree the date and management arrangements. Where a local residents group did not exist, Officers would use the event to seek to engage with individual residents as part to secure their commitment to help with any such future events. The overarching aim was for the local residents to take 'ownership' of the organisation/ management of Clean Up Days.

## **6) Councillor M. Smart to the Leader**

### **What are the Government plans for councils to retain business rates and how will Cambridge have a say, and be affected?**

The Leader responded stated that it was a 'breath-taking' announcement that the Chancellor of the Exchequer delivered in his autumn statement when he announced that Local Authorities would be able to retain 100% of their business rates. Presently only 5% were retained. It was questionable if there would be total self-management of 100% of the business rates which equated to £100 million pounds.

However this did provide many opportunities (although set against the reduction of a yearly grant from Central Government), one being to tackle inequality in Cambridgeshire, particularly in the North.

## **7) Councillor Ratcliffe to the Leader**

### **What potential improvements to plans for receiving further Syrian refugees will be possible after the meeting the Leader arranged with Home Office Minister Richard Harrington MP last Monday?**

The Leader reminded Councillors that housing in Cambridge had been provided to several Syrian families before Christmas. Central Government had further plans to bring more families in June 2016, although in a more structured way. The nature of this programme did raise issues for the City, although the majority of feeling was that the City would like to do more.

The Leader went on to say that Central Government had a damaging policy of ignoring the 'penning in of refugees' in Calais and denying there were a significant number of unaccompanied teenagers travelling into the Country which had put a huge strain on the care system, particularly in the South East.

The Government had listened to the City Council with regards to finance and the need for further information on the families to ensure that the right levels of support was offered to the families which would be housed in the future.

The following oral questions were tabled but owing to the expiry of the period of time permitted, were not covered during the meeting. The Mayor asked Executive Councillors if a written response could be provided to those questions that had not received a verbal response.

#### **8) Councillor Gillespie to the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

**The Executive Councillor said at community services committee that she would love nothing more than to regenerate the market square. The heavy increase in charges for market traders will bring in a lot more income, so can the executive councillor please tell me if she has asked officers to prioritise a report on options for regenerating the marketplace and giving something back to the traders?**

#### **9) Councillor Perry to the Leader**

**Can you update the Council on the further meetings on the devolution proposals in the Budget and will the 'three county plan' that the Council opposed at its last meeting still be going ahead?**

#### **10) Councillor Cantrill to the Executive Councillor for Communities**

**Could Exec Cllr Johnson indicate what action the council is taking regarding the NHS proposals to cut by 6% the funding for provision of drugs by pharmacies across Cambridge?**

#### **11) Councillor Bick to the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

**Based on the feedback that has been received and the physical aftermath, what specific instructions has she issued or will she be**

**issuing to the North Pole Experience about the running of ice rink on Parker's Piece over next Christmas?**

**12) Councillor Pitt to the Executive Councillor for Communities**

**Could the Exec Cllr please give an update on recent discussions between himself, officers, Cambridge Live, and the Showmans Guild (and any others!) about Midsummer Fair?**

**13) Councillor Sinnott to the Leader**

**What is the updated position on the Council's review of consultation responses on the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order to tackle anti-social punt touting?**

**Secondary Questions**

**1) Councillor Gillespie to the Executive Councillor for**

**Graffiti is becoming an increasingly visible problem in the city, and Market Ward is suffering badly. The last wave of street cleaning didn't successfully remove the tags. Can you tell us if more staff resource is needed to get on top of the cleaning, and if there are options open for contributing to the clean up of graffiti on upper storeys?**

**16/19/CNL To consider the following Notices of Motion, notice of which has been given by:**

**6a Councillor Robertson: New National Minimum Wage**

Councillor Robertson proposed and Councillor Perry seconded the following motion:

This Council welcomes the new national minimum wage of £7.20 per hour but recognises that it is nonsense to call it a living wage. The real cost of living was analysed last year independently of the government by Loughborough University for the Living Wage Foundation and an hourly rate of at least £8.25 was set for areas outside London.

Workers in Cambridge already have to face much higher costs of living than almost any area outside London, particularly with regard to housing costs and especially those renting from private landlords, and buying a home in the city is beyond the reach of most people who work here.

In Cambridge, there are 72 employers committed to paying all their workers this real living wage. Many of them are accredited and are also requiring companies contracting with them to supply goods and services, to pay their workers at least the £8.25. The City Council is one of these accredited Living Wage employers.

The £7.20 minimum wage is also only payable to workers aged over 25 whereas living wage employers pay the £8.25 to all workers aged 18 or more. Those employers recognise the value to them of paying their workers a wage they can live on, not the poverty wage of £5.30 per hour which is the new minimum wage for 18 to 20 year olds or the £6.70 per hour for 21 to 24 year olds.

This Council is committed to continue its efforts to persuade all employers in Cambridge to recognise and pay their workers at least the Living Wage currently assessed as £8.25 per hour and due for review each year in October.

The Council also asks the Chief Executive to write to George Osborne and the City's two MPs sharing our views on the failure of the new national minimum wage to match the local cost of living faced by local Cambridge workers.

Councillor Owers proposed the following amendment to last paragraph of the motion (additional text underlined)

The Council ~~also~~ asks the Chief Executive to write to George Osborne and the City's two MPs sharing our views on the failure of the new national minimum wage to match the local cost of living faced by local Cambridge workers. Also to write to Cambridgeshire County Council to seek the living wage accreditation.

Members resolved (nem com) to accept the additional recommendation.

**It was RESOLVED (unanimously):**

This Council welcomes the new national minimum wage of £7.20 per hour but recognises that it is nonsense to call it a living wage. The real cost of living was analysed last year independently of the government by Loughborough University for the Living Wage Foundation and an hourly rate of at least £8.25 was set for areas outside London.

Workers in Cambridge already have to face much higher costs of living than almost any area outside London, particularly with regard to housing costs and

especially those renting from private landlords, and buying a home in the city is beyond the reach of most people who work here.

In Cambridge, there are 72 employers committed to paying all their workers this real living wage. Many of them are accredited and are also requiring companies contracting with them to supply goods and services, to pay their workers at least the £8.25. The City Council is one of these accredited Living Wage employers.

The £7.20 minimum wage is also only payable to workers aged over 25 whereas living wage employers pay the £8.25 to all workers aged 18 or more. Those employers recognise the value to them of paying their workers a wage they can live on, not the poverty wage of £5.30 per hour which is the new minimum wage for 18 to 20 year olds or the £6.70 per hour for 21 to 24 year olds.

This Council is committed to continue its efforts to persuade all employers in Cambridge to recognise and pay their workers at least the Living Wage currently assessed as £8.25 per hour and due for review each year in October.

The Council asks the Chief Executive to write to George Osborne and the City's two MPs sharing our views on the failure of the new national minimum wage to match the local cost of living faced by local Cambridge workers. Also to write to Cambridgeshire County Council to seek the living wage accreditation.

**6b** Councillor Bick: Rough Sleeping in the City

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor Cantrill seconded the following motion:

Council notes with concern the big spike in rough sleeping in the city over the past 2 months on top of an already worsened annual picture, together with the particularly unhelpful backcloth of government welfare and NHS policies. It nevertheless regards Cambridge as an affluent and humane city whose people would expect its local services to do whatever is practicable and in their power to respond and mitigate the situation. It therefore calls for an urgent examination of further measures that could be taken or instigated by the city council or shared with partner agencies to alleviate the problem.

Councillor Price proposed and Councillor Ratcliffe seconded the following amendment to motion (deleted text struck through and additional text underlined):

Council notes with concern the big spike in rough sleeping in the city over the past 2 months on top of an already worsened annual picture, together with the particularly unhelpful backcloth of government welfare and NHS policies. It nevertheless regards Cambridge as an affluent and humane city whose people would expect its local services to do whatever is practicable and in their power to respond and mitigate the situation. It therefore calls for an urgent examination of further measures that could be taken or instigated by the city council or shared with partner agencies to alleviate the problem the increase of over 12% in the number of rough sleepers in Cambridge over the last year. It further notes that the national picture is even worse with rough sleeping numbers doubling since 2010 including a rise of 30% over the last 12 months alone, and that recent research by the Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research on youth homelessness nationally estimates that 9% of 16 - 25 year olds have slept rough in the last year.

The Council acknowledges the key role that our homelessness services, and those we fund from partners, play in preventing or ending rough sleeping by individuals including the Single Homelessness Service, support for the Chronically Excluded Adults team, the Street and Mental Health Outreach Team, and the Rapid Response Team.

Rough sleeping is the most visible form of homelessness and homelessness in all forms has become a significant and increasing pressure on the Council, and one we are determined to continue to prioritise. The Council welcomes the strategic report on homelessness already planned for the June Housing Scrutiny Committee along with a Homelessness Strategy Action Plan which will outline specific initiatives to help prevent people sleeping rough.

The structural causes of housing instability in Cambridge arise directly from national housing and welfare policies under the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Coalition and subsequent Government since 2015, generating cumulative damage due to cuts in housing benefit and other welfare reforms, the accelerating loss of social housing, and the reliance of housing policy on an unregulated private sector which is unaffordable for many.

The Council agrees it will continue to press Government for the freedoms it needs to build social rented homes and tackle the lack of affordable housing which is the root cause of homelessness in Cambridge. The Executive Councillor for Housing will write, again, to the Secretary of State for Local Government, as well as to the City's two MPs, to make the case for the need for social rented housing, to include social rented housing in discussions on devolution proposals, to seek agreement to mitigate or reverse damaging national welfare and housing policy changes impacting on Cambridge and to

request additional funding for homelessness prevention and rough sleeping in the City.

On a show of hands the amendment was carried by 28 votes to 0.

**It was Resolved (by 28 to 0):**

Council notes with concern the increase of over 12% in the number of rough sleepers in Cambridge over the last year. It further notes that the national picture is even worse with rough sleeping numbers doubling since 2010 including a rise of 30% over the last 12 months alone, and that recent research by the Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research on youth homelessness nationally estimates that 9% of 16 - 25 year olds have slept rough in the last year.

The Council acknowledges the key role that our homelessness services, and those we fund from partners, play in preventing or ending rough sleeping by individuals including the Single Homelessness Service, support for the Chronically Excluded Adults team, the Street and Mental Health Outreach Team, and the Rapid Response Team.

Rough sleeping is the most visible form of homelessness and homelessness in all forms has become a significant and increasing pressure on the Council, and one we are determined to continue to prioritise. The Council welcomes the strategic report on homelessness already planned for the June Housing Scrutiny Committee along with a Homelessness Strategy Action Plan which will outline specific initiatives to help prevent people sleeping rough.

The structural causes of housing instability in Cambridge arise directly from national housing and welfare policies under the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Coalition and subsequent Government since 2015, generating cumulative damage due to cuts in housing benefit and other welfare reforms, the accelerating loss of social housing, and the reliance of housing policy on an unregulated private sector which is unaffordable for many.

The Council agrees it will continue to press Government for the freedoms it needs to build social rented homes and tackle the lack of affordable housing which is the root cause of homelessness in Cambridge. The Executive Councillor for Housing will write, again, to the Secretary of State for Local Government, as well as to the City's two MPs, to make the case for the need for social rented housing, to include social rented housing in discussions on devolution proposals, to seek agreement to mitigate or reverse damaging national welfare and housing policy changes impacting on Cambridge and to

request additional funding for homelessness prevention and rough sleeping in the City.

**6c Councillor C Smart: The Anglia Water Site**

Councillor C. Smart proposed and Councillor Tunnacliffe seconded the following motion:

Council recognises the established ambition to secure a physical relocation of the Anglia Water plant at Cambridge Northern Fringe East. Relocation would enable the full potential of that area to be realised through its redevelopment as a new quarter of the city, including much needed housing.

It notes with disappointment that the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport has rejected the recommendation of officers, going against the views of both the Joint Strategic Transport and Planning Group and South Cambridgeshire District Council. His decision ruled out any further investigation of the relocation of Anglian Water as well as planning the area so that the Anglian Water site can be incorporated at a future date.

Considering it to be essential to the city that this Council works ambitiously, for the long term and engages partner organisations in so doing, Council calls on the Executive Councillor to reconsider his decision.

Councillor Blencowe proposed and Councillor Sarris seconded the following amendment to motion (deleted text struck through and additional text underlined):

~~Council recognises the established ambition to secure a physical relocation of the Anglia Water plant at Cambridge Northern Fringe East. Relocation would enable the full potential of that area to be realised through its redevelopment as a new quarter of the city, including much needed housing.~~

~~It notes with disappointment that the Executive Councillor for Planning has rejected the recommendation of officers, going against the views of both the Joint Strategic Transport and Planning Group and South Cambridgeshire District Council. His decision ruled out any further investigation of the relocation of Anglian Water as well as planning the area so that the Anglian Water site can be incorporated at a future date.~~

~~Considering it to be essential to the city that this Council works ambitiously, for the long term and engages partner organisations in so doing, Council calls on the Executive Councillor to reconsider his decision~~ importance of strategic city planning.

It also recognises the importance of site allocation planning policies that underpin such strategy being both viable and deliverable.

This Council notes that policies 9/4 and 9/6 of the existing 2006 local plan allocated thousands of new homes to be built at Cambridge East (primarily on the Airport site) and at Northern Fringe East. One required relocation of the airport, one required relocation of the Water Treatment Works.

This Council notes that no houses have yet been built on these two major sites, the policies have turned out to be fundamentally flawed and any planned development of the Northern Fringe East stalled as a result.

This Council believes that any future master planning of the Northern Fringe East by the City Council should be founded on a realistic, deliverable vision. It believes that development of the area, vitalised by the new Cambridge North rail station with the Water Treatment Works still in situ is the realistic scenario.

We appreciate that our South Cambs colleagues wish to explore both this option and the ambitious option to develop the site with the Water Treatment Works relocated. We respect their right to do so and if a viable, deliverable proposal to support the ambitious option comes forward from their investigations then clearly the City Council will reconsider its position and play a full part in enabling the enlarged site to be brought forward for appropriate and viable sustainable development.

On a show of hands the amendment was carried by 28 votes to 0 votes.

**Resolved (by 28 votes to 0):**

Council recognises the-importance of strategic city planning.

It also recognises the importance of site allocation planning policies that underpin such strategy being both viable and deliverable.

This Council notes that policies 9/4 and 9/6 of the existing 2006 local plan allocated thousands of new homes to be built at Cambridge East (primarily on the Airport site) and at Northern Fringe East. One required relocation of the airport, one required relocation of the Water Treatment Works.

This Council notes that no houses have yet been built on these two major sites, the policies have turned out to be fundamentally flawed and any planned development of the Northern Fringe East stalled as a result.

This Council believes that any future master planning of the Northern Fringe East by the City Council should be founded on a realistic, deliverable vision. It believes that development of the area, vitalised by the new Cambridge North rail station with the Water Treatment Works still in situ is the realistic scenario.

We appreciate that our South Cambs colleagues wish to explore both this option and the ambitious option to develop the site with the Water Treatment Works relocated. We respect their right to do so and if a viable, deliverable proposal to support the ambitious option comes forward from their investigations then clearly the City Council will reconsider its position and play a full part in enabling the enlarged site to be brought forward for appropriate and viable sustainable development.

**6d Councillor Ashton: Lloyds Bank**

Councillor Ashton proposed and Councillor Dryden seconded the following motion:

This Council notes the proposed closure of the Cherry Hinton Village branch of Lloyds Bank.

This Council notes that the Branch serves not only Cherry Hinton residents but also residents from surrounding areas, many of whom are frail and elderly.

This Council notes that Lloyds have conducted no consultation with local councillors, residents and customers.

This Council expresses its disappointment with the regrettable way that this decision has been taken, and calls upon Lloyds to listen to local residents, councillors and the MP.

This Council recognises that all its residents need to have easy access to banks to enable them to carry out their financial transactions, and that not all have access to internet banking, especially the old and vulnerable. This Council believes that Lloyd's decision will have a significant detrimental effect upon local residents and the environment.

This Council notes that the MP for Cambridge is already in the process of contacting Lloyds to express his disappointment and call upon them to reconsider.

This Council therefore calls upon Lloyds to reconsider their decision, and requests that the Chief Executive and Leader of the Council write to Lloyds urging them to conduct a full consultation and to keep the Cherry Hinton Village Branch open.

**Resolved** (unanimously):

To agree the motion as set out above.

### **16/20/CNL Written Questions**

The Mayor advised that no written questions had been received.

The meeting ended at 9.50 pm

**MAYOR**