



Cambridge City Council Notice of Council

Date: Thursday, 28 May 2020

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: This is a virtual meeting and therefore there is no physical location for this meeting. [To view meeting click here](#)

Contact: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk, tel:01223 457000

Dear Councillor,

A meeting of Cambridge City Council will be held in the This is a virtual meeting and therefore there is no physical location for this meeting. on Thursday, 28 May 2020 at 10.00 am and I hereby summon you to attend.

Dated 19 May 2020

Yours faithfully

Chief Executive

Agenda

- 1 To elect a Mayor for the Municipal Year 2020/21
- 2 To elect a Deputy Mayor for the Municipal Year 2020/21
- 3 To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on the 13 and 25 February 2020
- 4 Mayor's announcements
- 5 To elect from among the Members of the Council

(Pages 7 - 36)

four Bailiffs of the City for the Municipal Year 2020/21

- 6 To consider the recommendations of Committees for adoption
- 6a Civic Affairs: Nominations for Committees for the Municipal Year 2020/21 (Pages 37 - 50)
- 6b Civic Affairs: Nominations for Committee Chairs and Vice-Chairs Municipal Year 2020/21 (Pages 51 - 52)
- 6c Civic Affairs: Virtual Meetings Conventions (Pages 53 - 62)

7 Public questions time

8 To deal with oral questions

9 To consider the following notices of motion, notice of which has been given by:

9a Councillors Herbert and Payne: Motion of Thanks

The Council puts on record its thanks to all our staff for their outstanding response and leadership on the city's response to the Coronavirus epidemic, for maintaining quality Council services and protecting both public health and Cambridge people who need support.

We thank our local hospitals and the NHS, our partner councils and organisations, and key workers delivering essential services across Cambridge, and local charities and volunteer networks for all the work underway to support Cambridge residents through this crisis, and for the joint delivery being planned to address future challenges as lockdown eases.

9b Councillor Bick: Accommodation of Rough Sleepers

Council recognises as a substantial achievement the accommodation of well over 100 rough sleepers in response to the public health priority of preventing people sleeping out during the Covid lockdown. It thanks the council officers, our commissioned services and charities and churches who have enabled this.

Council sees this achievement as creating an opportunity for longer term change. It resolves to do everything reasonably within its power and influence to avoid the tragic outcome of individuals who have been accommodated going back to live on the streets after the Covid emergency is over, and to maintain the same lead in this mission that it has adopted during the crisis so far.

Council notes that significant funding has been received from government to address this issue, but that much of this is short term and does not enable the longer-term planning and commitment that is needed. As well as pressing government for this to be changed, council requests the Executive Councillor to consider the extent to which this funding could be underwritten out of its own resources.

Council also notes that mental ill-health and addiction to drugs and alcohol continue to make it hard for many entrenched rough sleepers to sustain housing even when available, and that overcoming these obstacles would be greatly assisted by improved pathways to services provided by partners in health and adult social care. It asks the Chief Executive to share a copy of this motion with the heads of these other organisations, requesting a review of how access to services can be improved.

9c Councillor Payne: Extension to Construction Hours

Council notes the request of the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government on 13th May for planning authorities to enable work on construction sites outside currently approved hours.

Council recognises the contribution of the construction industry to the exit from the Covid lockdown and the priority for its workforce to maintain social distancing, but it expresses concern about the potential implications for residents surrounding construction sites.

For the period the Secretary of State's request is in force, Council calls on the Shared Director of Planning to apply existing powers delegated to him within our constitution so that for all development within the city boundary he:

- includes consultation with relevant ward councillors in his considerations before determining whether to refer applications for variations in conditions relating to hours of construction to the Planning Committee or the Joint Development Control Committee
- consults relevant ward councillors before deciding not to enforce against construction work occurring outside approved hours, where this would normally have taken place.

<https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-statement/Commons/2020-05-13/HCWS234/>

10

Written questions

No discussion will take place on this item. Members will be asked to note the written questions and answers document as circulated around the Chamber.

Information for the public

[To view meeting click here](#)

Members of the public are welcome to view the live stream of this meeting, except during the consideration of exempt or confidential items, by following the link to be published on the Council's website.

Any person who participates in the meeting in accordance with the Council's public speaking time, is deemed to have consented to being recorded and to the use of those images (where participating via video conference) and/or sound recordings for webcast purposes. When speaking, members of the public should not disclose any personal information of any individual as this might infringe the rights of that individual and breach the Data Protection Act.

If members of the public wish to address the committee please contact Democratic Services by 12 noon two working days before the meeting.

For full information about committee meetings, committee reports, councillors and the democratic process:

- Website: <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk>
- Email: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk
- Phone: 01223 457000

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL

13 February 2020

6.00 - 8.45 pm

Present: Councillors Ashton, Baigent, Barnett, Bick, Bird, Cantrill, Chadwick, Collis, Dalzell, Davies, Davey, Dryden, Gehring, Green, Herbert, Hipkin, Johnson, Lord, Martinelli, Massey, Matthews, McGerty, McPherson, Moore, Payne, Pippas, Porrer, Price, Robertson, Sargeant, Sheil, Smart, Smith, Summerbell, Thittala, Thornburrow, Todd-Jones and Tunnacliffe

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

20/50/CNL Minutes

The minutes of the 17 October 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

20/51/CNL Mayor's announcements

Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors' Hadley, McQueen, O'Reilly and Page-Croft.

Councillors Gehring, Smith and Todd-Jones gave apologies for lateness.

Cambridge Chinese New Year Celebrations

The Mayor joined in three celebrations in various parts of the community to celebrate the Chinese New Year and stated it was a privilege to have been invited.

The Mayor also expressed her thoughts with those in the city with family and friends in China at this difficult time.

Mayor's Charity Quiz

Members were reminded the quiz was taking place on Wednesday 26 February and to contact Penny Jackson if they wished to enter a team.

Council Elections

As there was no Council meeting in April the Mayor took the opportunity to say

thank you to Councillors for their outstanding service to their wards and on Council committees. For those Councillors who were going to stand in the May elections the Mayor wished them well.

Honorary Councillor Caroline Hart

The Mayor led a minute's silence for the Late Honorary Councillor Caroline Hart and County Councillor Christine Carter.

Members were invited to attend a remembrance gathering for Caroline on Thursday 5 March at noon in the Szeged Room.

Declarations of Interest

Member	Item	Interest
Thornburrow	20/53/CNL	She was one of the applicants for the registration of Castle Mound as a Town and Village Green.

20/52/CNL Petitions

3a Park Street toilets

A petition had been received containing over 500 valid signatures stating the following:

We the undersigned object to the scrapping of public toilets from the council's redevelopment in Park Street. We call on Cambridge City Council to amend its plans so that it continues to provide this basic public service at this location.

Councillor Porrer presented and spoke in support of the petition and made the following points:

- i. Public amenities were critical in our busy city.
- ii. A petition had been submitted for the reinstatement of the Park Street car park toilets as part of the proposed development. This was following repeated requests to the ruling group to reinstate public toilets as part of the Park Street development.
- iii. She was not criticising the Planning Committee decision, she understood why that decision was made on the application as submitted. This was a

criticism of the ruling group who were creating a beautiful new building with no toilets.

- iv. She could not understand why profit was being put before public amenity. This was a council development which did not provide the thing that most people would want to see there.
- v. There were two key issues: 1) there would be fewer public toilets in Cambridge because of this decision. The Quayside toilet upgrade would not increase provision. People travelling to Cambridge in cars possibly with carers and people with bicycles and cargo bikes would expect to find facilities on site. 2) One of the few disabled accessible toilets in the city centre was being removed. This was raised at the Council Disability Consultative Forum. The minutes to the meeting stated this was a major issue for disabled users and should be re-examined.
- vi. She understood that Quayside toilets would be developed and include changing places provision, which was welcomed however this was not providing additional facilities and was a reduction in the overall toilet provision.
- vii. It was 400m to walk from Park Street to Quayside but the briefing note provided at the council meeting stated this was 380m. 50m was the maximum blue badge holders would be expected to walk.
- viii. £100,000 was proposed to be spent on a changing places toilet at Quayside, yet Quayside was probably the least accessible location in the centre for anyone with a disability.
- ix. She noted there were hardly any disabled parking spaces close by. The three closest disabled parking places at Round Church Street were being taken away and located in the car park. Suggested the funding proposed for Quayside toilets should be used to provide a changing places toilet in the Park Street development so that people could access this from their cars.
- x. She had been contacted by various residents who talked about hidden disabilities; toilets were essential in the city centre.
- xi. At the Park Street Liaison Group it was discussed that the development could not have cycle parking and public toilets. She was not asking to reduce the amount of cycle parking. She had previously fought to have outside cycle parking which had not been included in the planning application back in May 2019. Parking spaces should be removed and replaced by public toilet provision.
- xii. The Council's supplementary planning document talked about walking and cycling being a priority in Cambridge and yet this development was providing the opposite. This was not a grade II listed building where development would be restricted, the council had complete autonomy about what was provided. She understood there would be a cost and that

income would be lost from the loss of parking spaces. It was a cost that should be borne and should have been included at the outset.

- xiii. Asked for the public toilet provision to be reinstated as part of the development.

Councillors debated the issues raised for the allocated 15 minutes.

The Leader made the following comments in response to the debate:

- i. Councillors had been part of the liaison group and no comments had been made for how the toilet facilities could be accommodated.
- ii. Not all car parks in the city had public toilets.
- iii. Toilets which were built within car parks were vandalised. There were no staff on site in the car parks so they could not be protected. Public toilets in car parks were isolated.
- iv. For a city the size of Cambridge, there were far more public toilets than in other cities.
- v. Questioned whether councillors had visited other public toilets in the area. Quayside toilets were secure, staffed and in a visible public place.
- vi. Discussions had taken place with Camcycle regarding cycle parking provision at the Park Street development. There was a full floor for cycle parking.
- vii. The size of Park Street car park would be cut by a third.
- viii. All car parks would be assessed in the future to see whether the current capacity was required.
- ix. Public toilets were not open late at night.
- x. £100,000 was being invested in a quality changing places toilet because there were few across the city. There was one in the Lion Yard.
- xi. £10 million would be invested in affordable housing as a result of the Park Street development.

It was proposed that the issue should be referred back to the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee this was lost by 14 votes to 23.

3b Kings Parade Barrier

The Mayor exercised her discretion to permit a member of the public to ask a public question regarding the Kings Parade barrier petition in advance of Public Question Time.

The member of the public raised the following points:

- i. She had a background in teaching Bikeability to children and adults in Cambridge and also did guided rides for British cycling.

- ii. She was shocked when she cycled through the Kings Parade Barrier, if she had to do a risk assessment on it, it wouldn't pass. She questioned if a risk assessment had been undertaken.
- iii. She questioned if the risks to cyclists were greater than the risk behind the reason why the barrier was put into place.
- iv. Any cycling infrastructure should be a positive provision and should reduce delays and risks to cyclists.
- v. Any single cycle track should be 1.5m, she had measured the track and this was 1.16m. It had arrows going both ways which indicated it was a two-way track. A two-way track should be 2.5m, this was 1.16m. Of the 1.16m, 48cm were cobbles, a drainage grill and raised kerb. Therefore the workable space for cycling was 1.05m. If she had to take children through this barrier she would have to walk them through.
- vi. This route was part of the national cycling route 11, which was a big route through East Anglia and it was blocked by this barrier.
- vii. Cyclists had to queue to come through the barrier.
- viii. The council would have to respond if anyone had an accident, it would be dealt with under 'slips and trips'.
- ix. The barrier was dangerous.

A petition had been received containing over 500 valid signatures stating the following:

The new anti-terrorist barrier which has been installed in Kings Parade is a hazard for cyclists and pedestrians and a blot on one of Cambridge's most iconic streets. When it is closed, it blocks a major cycle route and will lead to more conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and drivers.

While there is much support for an extension to the city centre traffic-free area, this barrier is a clumsy and heavy-handed way to achieve it. The project has shied away from prior scrutiny and challenge, from which a robust but sensitive, safe and proportionate solution could have been adopted. Given the time taken in planning this barrier, a sympathetically designed and functionally safer installation should have been sought to avoid the major problems that are now visible to all.

We call on Cambridge City Council to conduct an immediate review of the Kings Parade barrier in order to urgently commission alternative arrangements and replace the current barrier without delay.

Mr Levy presented and spoke in support of the petition and made the following points:

- i. Was not objecting to the principle of closing off Kings Parade, making it traffic free was in many ways a desirable objective. Acknowledged the impact on neighbouring properties as well as St Marys Church, this was a problem already faced by nearby premises and solutions had been found.
- ii. Did not disagree with the security services basic conclusion about the risks of terrorism. It was difficult to know the extent of the threat or to assess the proportionality of the solution adopted as the assessment had not been shared outside of the ruling group on the council.
- iii. The security services identified a threat to one of the most popular tourist attractions in the country. This was why it should have been addressed in a sensitive and thoughtful fashion.
- iv. A solution was required for all who continue to pass through whether they are visitors, workers, or residents on foot or on bikes.
- v. When the access from Trinity Street was closed off some years ago these factors were considered and a suitable solution being the barriers between Great St Marys Church and the Senate House were put in place. This was effective and relatively unobtrusive. It blocked access to vehicular traffic without impeding access for pedestrians and cyclists. These barriers were designed to control the flow of traffic and not terrorist incidents, however they only need an additional bollard to achieve that objective as well.
- vi. It appeared that a lot of time was spent considering a solution, presumably to include design work and assessments, including a full health and safety assessment.
- vii. Consideration must have been given to the large crowds which gather in front of the Corpus Christi clock.
- viii. Consideration must have been given to pedestrians and two lanes of cyclists using the gaps in the barrier.
- ix. He would like to see the health and safety report which must have considered the above concerns which were raised at the time and were apparently deemed to be unimportant.
- x. On the face of things, it looked like time was taken to come up with a good solution. Must have been aware that suitable barrier designs existed nearby and in many other places.
- xi. The Government Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure had published an integrated security guide which covered this issue and offered guidance on solutions.
- xii. Questioned the design of barrier in the unique location that it is in.
- xiii. Asked for the barrier to be looked at before accidents occurred.

Councillors debated the issues raised for the allocated 15 minutes.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources made the following comments in response to the debate:

- i. The City Council were not the highway authority, this was Cambridgeshire County Council, the City Council had been working closely with them in preparing the installation. The County Council undertook a full road safety audit on the City Council's behalf and although concerns were raised regarding the unevenness of the road, the County Council said it was satisfactory.
- ii. He acknowledged that this was not the best solution and had already made a commitment to publicly engage on the long-term solution.
- iii. Other cities had installed this type of barrier particularly those with high numbers of tourists. This included York, Canterbury, Stratford, Windsor and Edinburgh because of the risk of a threat. The risk was of terrorists driving down pedestrians who were on pavements. This threat could not be ignored.
- iv. Inconvenience was not as important as public safety.
- v. Responding to the threat was the primary focus of action in installing the barrier.
- vi. Many local stakeholders wanted to see the protected area expanded. The area around the Corpus clock where crowds formed was a particular point which had been raised and was a valid point.
- vii. Removing the traffic travelling along Bennet Street, Trumpington Street to the junction of Silver street was a better ambition.
- viii. The needs of disabled drivers needed to be recognised. The delay in the installation of the barrier was due to the relocation of the parking bays on Kings Parade used by disabled drivers.
- ix. The barrier which had been installed was temporary, it was not embedded in the ground and because it was so big and strong it could withstand a terrorist attack.
- x. Committed to reviewing the need and design of the barrier.
- xi. The permanent barrier would have two gaps, one for each direction. The width of the barrier was limited to prevent vehicles being able to drive through it.
- xii. Were currently monitoring the impact of the barrier and were beginning to explore a permanent scheme with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP).
- xiii. Committed to working with residents, businesses, residents and other stakeholders to design a better solution.
- xiv. Would bring the issue back to the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee.

The member of the public raised the following supplementary points:

- i. Lived in a cycling city this was not Edinburgh.
- ii. She was not interested in the political debate she was interested in safe cycling.
- iii. 1.05m was dangerous and not adequate. There were four sets of cobbles, grill and raised curb.
- iv. She would be interested to see the safety audit and risk assessment.
- v. There was nothing to say that bicycles cannot go backwards and forwards. There was nothing to say who had priority. Could plaster over the gap so it wasn't dangerous. Could stop people parking altogether and could put up a sign to say no motorcycles can go through the barrier.
- vi. Asked that this would be made safe before someone had an accident.

The Executive Councillor confirmed:

- i. The road safety assessment was available and he would ensure that it would be sent to the member of the public.

Members unanimously resolved that the Kings Parade barrier would be referred back to the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee.

20/53/CNL Public questions time

Members of the public asked several questions, as set out below.

Question 1

Friends of St Albans Road Rec raised the following points:

- i. Expressed concern at the loss of green open space concerning the Council's plans to build three blocks of flats and a new community centre on the recreation ground.
- ii. Referred to the Cambridge Local Plan (CLP) 2018 and Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011 which noted how the green open spaces were to residents, particularly to those in the north of the city.
- iii. Quoted that in 2009 Arbury had a population of 9280 (taken from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy), with a total 7.55 hectares of protected space and that this was the lowest in the city. The population had since grown.
- iv. By comparison, Abbey Ward with a population of 9360 (taken in 2009), had 116.39 hectare of protected open space.
- v. Queried why an area with such limited open space had been chosen for development.

- vi. Policy 67 of the CLP stated that open spaces were protected; open spaces should be looked after and protected regardless of ownership.
- vii. A petition was currently circulating with residents to keep the open space which had over 1400 signatures to date and 549 members in the friends' group, demonstrating a strength of support.
- viii. If protected open space was being removed from residential areas, the space had to be enhanced. However, the proposed development did not enrich the area in any way.
- ix. Private amenities for the proposed flats and shared amenity areas were not being provided.
- x. The play area was being downgraded.
- xi. Asked if the Council could explain how the proposed scheme would enhance the area.

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded:

- i. The Council acknowledged and were aware of the concerns raised. Changes to the proposed scheme had been made in response to public comments.
- ii. As the proposed scheme was an active planning application which would be put forward to the Planning Committee for consideration no further comment could be made.

The following supplementary points were put forward:

- i. Reiterated that the development would be built on protected space.
- ii. The protected space had been agreed by Cambridge City Council when adopting the CLP.
- iii. Questioned why there was a need for the CLP if the strategies in the Plan were ignored.
- iv. Changes to the proposed scheme meant the flats were now higher.
- v. Acknowledged less protected space was being built on but the green open space being taken away was classed as a 'needy' space.
- vi. The planning consultation response acknowledged there was a requirement to address the potential negative impact of having many small single households with potentially high levels of need.
- vii. The area did not require any additional housing.

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded with the following:

- i. The Council could not predetermine the planning application so no further comment would be made.

- ii. Would encourage members of the public to make their written representations to the planning department.
- iii. The proposed scheme would bring much needed affordable housing to city.

Question 2

The Pubs Officer for Cambridge & District CAMRA raised the following points regarding the Hopbine public house.

- i. In February 2019 the Hopbine public house on Fair Street closed, even though the landlord and landlady had run the pub for seven and a half years and were keen to continue running it.
- ii. Since the pub had closed there has been at least one attempt to break into the building.
- iii. A private individual bought the Admiral Taverns in 2011, they had no interest in running it as a public house themselves and instead leased it to the licensees of the Portland Arms on a rolling six-month lease.
- iv. The Hopbine was turned into a successful, thriving pub with a fine reputation for its food as well as its beer and won various awards. In 2012 it won CAMRA Most Improved City Pub Award, in 2016 and 2018 CAMRA City Local Ale Award for selling well kept, locally brewed beers. In 2018 it was also the Cambridge University Real Ale Society Pub of the Year.
- v. The landlord and landlady also took on the Alexandra Arms on Gwydir Street and have made a success too as they have been able to make significant investment in both the Portland Arms and the Alexandra Arms.
- vi. The landlord and landlady spoke with the owner of the Hopbine to ask for a reasonable length lease so they could investment money into the pub if this was not possible then they would have to close the pub. The request was refused so the pub closed.
- vii. Stated it was a ridiculous situation with a much-loved pub in a busy part of Cambridge sitting empty but not because it wasn't viable, or that no one was willing to run it or invest in it but because the owner was only willing to offer six-month leases.
- viii. Asked what the Council could do to resolve this situation?

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces said the following:

- i. The Hopbine was a safeguarded public house; therefore, had some level of protection, the building and the function and amenity it provided was important to residents.
- ii. Believed that protected public houses were an asset to the community when there was a landlord/ landlady who wanted to invest in the public house over a longer lease.
- iii. There was evidence that the Hopbine was viable despite the fact it had been shut down.
- iv. The planning policy position protected the use of the building but could not require its occupation. If a planning application was put forward for a change of use it would have to be considered against planning policy and would have to show that it had not been viable as a public house.
- v. The Council did not have the power to instruct the owner to bring the pub back into use.
- vi. If the building fell into a bad condition which impacted the local area officers could serve a notice under Section 215 of the Town and Planning Act. This would be used for occupation, insistence to open the public house or for the building to be resold.
- vii. Advised would be willing to meet the Ward Councillors on site to investigate the exterior.
- viii. Supported the campaign to keep the building as a protected public house and to get the Holbine reopened.

The following supplementary points were raised:

- i. Asked again if the Council representatives or the Executive Councillor could talk to the owner to resolve this issue.
- ii. Water ingress had been an issue for a number of years with no pump to clear the cellar out of water; therefore, the interior was probably deteriorating as the building had been left for a year.

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces responded:

- i. The Council did not have the means for their officers to speak with the owner; but suggested this could be done by a Ward Councillor with the support of the Executive Councillor.
- ii. As the building was privately owned the Council could not interfere with how that individual chose to lease the building.
- iii. If the building was being damaged and causing loss of amenity, then this could be looked into.
- iv. Offered to meet with the public speaker on site.

Question 3

The following points were raised on private rented housing in the City:

- i. Suggested that the Council offers financial support to those landlords who could not afford to bring their property up to the required Council standard.
- ii. Believed he had experienced abuse of procedure from council staff when inspections had taken place and he no longer rented out his property to private individuals.
- iii. The Cambridge Evening News (03/02/20) reported that 271 city council houses had category one hazards (immediate risk to personal health and safety); who was prosecuting the Council on this matter?
- iv. As a landlord, he had kept the rent low for public sector workers who worked at Addenbrookes hospital and not exploited the system.

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded with the following:

- i. Thanked the public speaker for his time and the issues put forward.
- ii. He could not comment with regards to council staff as there was a pending court case with the public speaker and the Council and did not wish to prejudice the proceedings at a future hearing.
- iii. The Cambridge Evening News article was incorrect with the categorisation in terms of decent homes and those in category one.
- iv. The City Council appreciated those landlords who provided good quality homes in the private sector; there were many ways the Council engaged with private landlords such as the landlord forum and events throughout the year.

The following supplementary points were made:

- i. Asked if it was likely that the Council would consider financial support to those landlords who provided low rents to those working in the public sector.
- ii. Stated that the individual who had rented out the public speaker's property was now paying double the rent having had to move out.
- iii. The Council were creating unattainable high standards.

The Executive Councillor said the following:

- i. Agreed it was fact there were some private rentals which were unattainable to people in Cambridge.

- ii. The City Council were planning on building 500 Council homes with 1500 people on the Council waiting list.
- iii. Acknowledged there were some people who were not eligible for Council housing due to their net income but could not afford to get on the housing ladder. The City Council were working on this issue with a city housing company which had several properties for affordable rent.
- iv. Demand exceeded supply and there was a variety of rental options throughout the city.

Question 4

The following points were made regarding the Castle Mound and the grassed forecourt area between Shire Hall and Castle Mound to be made a town and village green.

- i. Noted that Suffolk County Council, had been delegated the decision by Cambridgeshire County Council as to whether Castle Mound should be designated as a town and village green. They had advised that they would be advertising the application and calling for submissions or objections this week (second week of February).
- ii. The mound was integral to the history of Cambridge; was of scientific, botanical and archaeological significance.
- iii. The space should be kept as a public space for residents and visitors to the area.
- iv. Asked if the City Council would be making a submission to Suffolk County Council in support of the town and village green application?
- v. Enquired if the area was declared a town green, and if at some point Cambridgeshire County Council sought to make an arrangement with Cambridge City Council for it to maintain and upkeep the town green, whether the City Council would be prepared to enter into discussions with the County Council in this regard?

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

- i. The City Council had no objection to the application and would be willing to make this representation to the Suffolk County Council when invited to do so.
- ii. Confirmed the Council was prepared to enter into discussions with the County Council regarding the maintenance of the area on a non-prejudicial basis if asked to do so.

The following supplementary points were made:

- i. Asked if the Council would include a request that a public meeting or hearing take place in Cambridge before any decision was made.

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

- i. The City Council would not be able to follow up with the supplementary request.
- ii. The registration authority was required to follow a legal process which included formally advertising the application and notifying interested parties.
- iii. The Council would support Suffolk County Council and assist with local communication around Cambridge.

Question 5

A representative from Extinction Rebellion put forward the following points:

- i. Stated there were issues in the City and the wider area which needed to be addressed concerning the climate emergency.
- ii. While the City Council had met with Extinction Rebellion representatives on previous occasions the work agreed had not been undertaken; there had been offers of public engagement, but these should have been voluntary.
- iii. Stated the Council had not given the public enough of a voice; and had not excluded those who had a vested interest in the destruction of the environment or the oppression of workers.
- iv. The Council needed to hold a citizen's assembly on climate change that was representative and was able to use devolved powers to make changes as time had run out.
- v. People were dying now due to the impact of the climate emergency which had not been addressed; time had run out.
- vi. Climate justice was needed not just for the city but across the world.
- vii. Stated the Council had shown they were not capable of decision making as they did not have the power required to make the changes needed.

Due to the continued disruption by some members of the public that followed the Mayor declared the meeting was adjourned at 7.45pm.

Members of the Council met at another location within the Guildhall at 8.20pm. the membership concluded that the meeting would not formally re-convene, and the Mayor reaffirmed the adjournment to a future date which would be confirmed in due course.

This meeting reconvened on the 25 February 2020, please follow this link to minutes for the rest of the meeting.

<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=116&MId=3896&Ver=4>

The meeting ended at 8.45 pm

MAYOR

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL

25 February 2020
6.00 - 10.50 pm

Present: Councillors Ashton, Baigent, Barnett, Bick, Bird, Chadwick, Collis, Dalzell, Davies, Gehring, Green, Hadley, Herbert, Hipkin, Johnson, Martinelli, Massey, Matthews, McGerty, Moore, O'Reilly, Payne, Pippas, Porrer, Robertson, Sargeant, Sheil, Smart, Smith, Summerbell, Thornburrow, Todd-Jones and Tunnacliffe

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL
20/54/CNL Apologies and Declaration of Interests
Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Cantrill, Dryden, Lord, McPherson, McQueen, Davey, Thittala, Page-Croft and Price.

Councillor Gehring gave apologies for lateness.

Declarations of Interest

Member	Item	Interest
Baigent	20/58/CNL	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign and a member of Extinction Rebellion.
Green	20/56/CNL	Is a private landlord.
Moore	20/58/CNL	Member of Extinction rebellion.
Bick	20/56/CNL	Is a private landlord.
Todd-Jones	20/58/CNL	Member of Friends of the Earth

20/55/CNL To consider the recommendations of the Executive for adoption

20/55/CNLa Executive Councillor for Housing: HRA Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2020/21

In the absence of Councillor Cantrill, Councillor Matthews proposed the following amendment to paragraph (I) of the recommendation (additional text underlined):

Treasury management

l) Approve the need to borrow over the 30 year life of the business plan, with the first instance of this anticipated to be in 2022/23, to

- a. Undertake a significant investment in the existing housing stock, with a specific focus on those homes that do not meet the Decent Homes standard especially the dwellings that fail the category 1 hazards assessment with a clear goal to achieve a zero position in the short term (note: 799 houses failed to meet the Decent Homes Standard in March 2019)
- b. Sustain the current level of investment of £10,000,000 per annum for the delivery of new homes

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 12 votes to 20.

Resolved (by 20 votes to 0) to:

- i) Approve the need to borrow over the 30-year life of the business plan, with the first instance of this anticipated to be in 2022/23, to sustain the current level of investment, which includes £10,000,000 per annum for the delivery of new homes.
- ii) Recognise that any decision to borrow further will impact the authority's ability to set-aside resource to redeem 25% of the value of the housing debt by the point at which the loan portfolio matures, with the approach to this to be reviewed before further borrowing commences.
- iii) Approve of capital bids and savings, shown in Appendix D (3) of the HRA Budget Setting Report, to include funding to begin to improve the energy efficiency of the existing housing stock.
- iv) Approve of the latest Decent Homes Programme, to include an updated recharge of capitalised officer time and timing of decent homes expenditure for new build dwellings, as detailed in Appendix E of the HRA Budget Setting Report.
- v) Approve of the latest budget sums, profiling and associated financing for all new build schemes, including revised scheme budgets for Akeman Street, Meadows and Buchan Street and Campkin Road, based upon the latest cost information from the Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) or direct procurements, as detailed in Appendices E and H, and summarised in Appendix K, of the HRA Budget Setting Report.
- vi) Approve re-phasing of budget for the Estate Improvement Scheme, to also include reallocation of the resource between capital and revenue based upon the projects identified to date, as detailed in Appendix E, and summarised in Appendix K, of the HRA Budget Setting Report.

- vii) Approve the revised Housing Capital Investment Plan as shown in Appendix K of the HRA Budget Setting Report.
- viii) Approve inclusion of Disabled Facilities Grant expenditure and associated grant income from 2020/21 onwards, based upon 2019/20 grant levels, with approval of delegation to the Head of Finance, as Section 151 Officer, to approve an in year increase or decrease in the budget for disabled facilities grants, in direct relation to any increase or decrease in the capital grant funding for this purpose, as received from the County Council through the Better Care Fund.
- ix) Approve delegation to the Strategic Director to review and amend the level of fees charged by the Shared Home Improvement Agency for disabled facilities grants and repair assistance grants, in line with any decisions made by the Shared Home Improvement Agency Board.
- x) Approve delegation to the Strategic Director, in consultation with the Head of Finance, as Section 151 Officer, to draw down resource from the ear-marked reserve for potential debt redemption or re-investment, for the purpose of open market land or property acquisition or new build housing development, should the need arise, in order to meet quarterly deadlines for the use of retained right to buy receipts or to facilitate future site redevelopment.
- xi) Approve delegation to the Head of Finance, as Section 151 Officer, to make the necessary technical amendments to detailed budgets in respect of the outcome of the review of recharges between the General Fund and the HRA and the outcome of the review of the pension fund deficit contribution, with any net impact for the HRA to be incorporated as part of the HRA Medium Term Financial Strategy in September 2020.

20/55/CNLb Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources: Capital Strategy 2020/2021

Resolved (by 20 votes to 0) to:

- i. Approve the capital strategy; and
- ii. Note the summary capital programme

20/55/CNLc Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources: Treasury Management Strategy Statement Report 2020/21 to 2022/23

Resolved (by 21 votes to 0) to:

- i. Approve the Officer's report, including the estimated Prudential & Treasury Indicators for 2019/20 to 2023/24 (inclusive) as set out in Appendix C of the officers report.

20/56/CNL To consider Budget Recommendations of the Executive for Adoption

20/56/CNLa Budget Setting Report (General Fund) 2020/21

The Executive presented its budget recommendations as set out in the Council Agenda and published on the City Council's website.

Members were asked to note the updated Land Charge Fees which had been included on page 11 of the Information Pack and also the amended Appendix A(b), which had been circulated round the chamber and published on the council's website which corrected an error with the County Council precept.

20/56/CNLb Liberal Democrat Group Amendment to the Executive Budget Recommendations

The Liberal Democrat Group presented its alternative budget, as set out in the Council Agenda, on the amendment sheet circulated around the Chamber and published on the City Council's website.

On a show of hands the Liberal Democrat Group's alternative budget was lost by:

12 votes in favour: Councillors Bick, Chadwick, Dalzell, Gehring, Martinelli, Matthews, McGerty, Payne, Pippas, Porrer, Summerbell and Tunnacliffe

To 20 votes against: Councillors Ashton, Baigent, Barnett, Bird, Collis, Davies, Green, Hadley, Herbert, Johnson, Massey, Moore, O'Reilly, Robertson, Sargeant, Sheil, Smart, Smith, Thornburrow and Todd-Jones.

In accordance with the Council's budget procedure, Councillor Bick moved separately the following proposals, which formed part of the Liberal Democrat Group alternative budget:

Reference	Details
B0014	Civic Bee Keeper (p333 of agenda pack)

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by:

12 votes in favour: Councillors Bick, Chadwick, Dalzell, Gehring, Martinelli, Matthews, McGerty, Payne, Pippas, Porrer, Summerbell and Tunnacliffe

To 19 votes against: Councillors Ashton, Baigent, Barnett, Bird, Collis, Davies, Green, Hadley, Herbert, Johnson, Massey, Moore, O'Reilly, Robertson, Sargeant, Sheil, Smart, Smith and Todd-Jones.

1 abstention: Councillor Thornburrow

Reference	Details
B0021	Support for lone parents in / at risk of poverty (p334 of agenda)

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by:

12 votes in favour: Councillors Bick, Chadwick, Dalzell, Gehring, Martinelli, Matthews, McGerty, Payne, Pippas, Porrer, Summerbell and Tunnacliffe

To 20 votes against: Councillors Ashton, Baigent, Barnett, Bird, Collis, Davies, Green, Hadley, Herbert, Johnson, Massey, Moore, O'Reilly, Robertson, Sargeant, Sheil, Smart, Smith, Thornburrow and Todd-Jones.

Reference	Details
CAP0009	Chesterton Rec Public Toilet Rebuild (p337 of agenda)

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by:

12 votes in favour: Councillors Bick, Chadwick, Dalzell, Gehring, Martinelli, Matthews, McGerty, Payne, Pippas, Porrer, Summerbell and Tunnacliffe

To 20 votes against: Councillors Ashton, Baigent, Barnett, Bird, Collis, Davies, Green, Hadley, Herbert, Johnson, Massey, Moore, O'Reilly, Robertson, Sargeant, Sheil, Smart, Smith, Thornburrow and Todd-Jones.

Reference	Details
CAP0010	Scotland Road play equipment (p337 of agenda)

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by:

12 votes in favour: Councillors Bick, Chadwick, Dalzell, Gehring, Martinelli, Matthews, McGerty, Payne, Pippas, Porrer, Summerbell and Tunnacliffe

To 20 votes against: Councillors Ashton, Baigent, Barnett, Bird, Collis, Davies, Green, Hadley, Herbert, Johnson, Massey, Moore, O'Reilly, Robertson, Sargeant, Sheil, Smart, Smith, Thornburrow and Todd-Jones.

Reference	Details
CAP0012	Succession Tree Planting on Parkers Piece (p338 of agenda)

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by:

12 votes in favour: Councillors Bick, Chadwick, Dalzell, Gehring, Martinelli, Matthews, McGerty, Payne, Pippas, Porrer, Summerbell and Tunnacliffe

To 20 votes against: Councillors Ashton, Baigent, Barnett, Bird, Collis, Davies, Green, Hadley, Herbert, Johnson, Massey, Moore, O'Reilly, Robertson, Sargeant, Sheil, Smart, Smith, Thornburrow and Todd-Jones.

Reference	Details
CAP0017	'Happy to chat' benches - (p338 of agenda)

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by:

12 votes in favour: Councillors Bick, Chadwick, Dalzell, Gehring, Martinelli, Matthews, McGerty, Payne, Pippas, Porrer, Summerbell and Tunnacliffe

To 20 votes against: Councillors Ashton, Baigent, Barnett, Bird, Collis, Davies, Green, Hadley, Herbert, Johnson, Massey, Moore, O'Reilly, Robertson, Sargeant, Sheil, Smart, Smith, Thornburrow and Todd-Jones.

Unless otherwise stated, all references in the recommendations to sections, pages and appendices relate to Version 2 of the Budget Setting Report (BSR).

This can be found via:

<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/g3896/Public%20reports%20pack%2025th-Feb-2020%2018.00%20Council.pdf?T=10>

It was **RESOLVED** to agree the Executive's budget proposals by:

19 votes in favour: Councillors Ashton, Barnett, Bird, Collis, Davies, Green, Hadley, Herbert, Johnson, Massey, Moore, O'Reilly, Robertson, Sargeant, Sheil, Smart, Smith, Thornburrow and Todd-Jones.

To 0 votes against

12 abstentions: Councillors Bick, Chadwick, Dalzell, Gehring, Martinelli, Matthews, McGerty, Payne, Pippas, Porrer, Summerbell and Tunnacliffe

To approve the following:

- i. Revenue Pressures shown in Appendix C (b) and Savings shown in Appendix C (c) of the officer's report.
- ii. Non-Cash Limit items as shown in Appendix C (d) of officer's report.
- iii. No bids to be funded from External or Earmarked Funds (which would be included as Appendix C (e) of the officer's report).
- iv. Delegation to the Chief Financial Officer (Head of Finance) of the calculation and determination of the Council Tax taxbase (including submission of the National Non-Domestic Rates Forecast Form, NNDR1, for each financial year) set out in Appendix A (a) of the officer's report.
- v. The level of Council Tax for 2020/21 as set out in Appendix A (b) as amended.
- vi. Delegation to the Head of Finance to finalise changes relating to any corporate and/or departmental restructuring and any reallocation of support service and central costs, in accordance with the CIPFA Service Reporting Code of Practice for Local Authorities (SeRCOP).
- vii. Any recommendation in respect of the proposals outlined in Appendix D(a) of officer's report for inclusion in the Capital Plan including any additional use of revenue resources required.
- viii. The revised Capital Plan for the General Fund as set out in Appendix D (c) of the officer's report, and the Funding as set out in Section 6, page 25 of the BSR.
- ix. The impact of revenue and capital budget approvals and approved the resulting level of reserves to be used to support the budget proposals as set out in the table in section 8, page 46 of the BSR.
- x. The creation of an earmarked reserves to be called the Transformation Fund and its associated remit on page 19 of the BSR.
- xi. The updated Corporate Plan 2019-2022 attached as Appendix B to the officer's report.

20/57/CNL To consider the recommendations of Committees for adoption

20/57/CNLa Civic Affairs: Pay Policy Statement 2020/21

Resolved (unanimously) to:

- i. Approve the draft Pay Policy Statement 2020/21 attached as Appendix 1 of the Officer's report.
- ii. Delegate authority to the Head of Human Resources to update the Pay Policy Statement 2020/21 should a chief executive and/or chief officer and/or NJC pay award be agreed.
- iii. Introduce a pay award mechanism with effect from 1 April 2020 for staff on Cambridge Live terms and conditions of employment, based on

comparison to the NJC pay award and authority is delegated to the Head of Human Resources to implement any future pay awards, following consultation with the Chief Executive and Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources.

20/57/CNLb Civic Affairs: Amendment to Council Procedure Rules

Resolved (unanimously) to approve a change to Council Procedure Rule 10 and the Scheme for Annual Statements as set out in the officer's report.

20/58/CNL To deal with oral questions

1. Councillor Porrer to the Leader

Could the Executive Councillor confirm that Cambridge City Council will continue to display the European flag at the Guildhall in future to show our support for our European residents and visitors and to highlight our city's ongoing strong connections to the rest of Europe?

The Leader responded that in addition to the Guildhall being lit up blue and yellow on the day the UK would be leaving the EU, the European flag would be flown on 9 May and would continue to be flown in perpetuity on 9 May.

2. Councillor Collis to the Executive Councillor for Communities

Could the Executive Councillor provide an update on the anti-poverty strategy?

The Executive Councillor responded that the Anti-Poverty Strategy was introduced in 2014. As part of the strategy a Living Wage Officer had been introduced as well as the Anti-Poverty Fund. Hundreds of thousands of pounds had been granted to community groups and homelessness prevention projects. Support and advice had also been offered to universal credit claimants. Cambridge was the most unequal city in the country and the council and residents wanted to challenge poverty and inequality. The Anti-Poverty Strategy was regularly reviewed, and the council was currently undertaking a review of the strategy. The Food Poverty Hub was a plan included in the budget which sought to distribute food across the city to help deal with food poverty.

3. Councillor Dalzell to the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

Following significant delays to the completion of the Council's statutory audit last year, which is still yet to be completed, can the Executive Councillor confirm what steps the Council are taking to prevent these problems recurring?

The Executive Councillor responded there was a delay in the audit of the Council's accounts due to Central Government's move to require a short timetable for all council's to have their audits of accounts completed. The pressure on councils had been immense but it has also been immense on auditors themselves. Both CIPFA and the Institute for Chartered Accountants had complained to Central Government about the pressure which has been put on everyone. The pressures had led to many firms of auditors losing staff because of the pressure that the staff were put under to complete the work in such a short period of time. The Council's auditors were unable to complete the Council's audit in the reduced timescales.

Increased expectations arising from high profile corporate failures had also added pressure on auditors. The council was involved in complex activities, and additional requirements regarding disclosure were also imposed on the council.

The Executive Councillor acknowledged changes within the Council's Finance Team had also created problems. Preparations were being put in place to ensure the 2020/21 year's audit of accounts could be completed by October.

4. Councillor Todd Jones to the Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre

Can the Executive Councillor update us on what is known about Extinction Rebellion's plans for the city centre next week?

The Executive Councillor responded that she was aware of some of Extinction Rebellion's plans which had taken place the previous week but was not aware of what any future plans might be.

5. Councillor Pippas to the Leader of the Council

Given Cambridge's large and peace-loving Chinese community, does the leader share my concern at reports of hate crimes against Chinese people in this area related to coronavirus?

The Leader responded that he shared the concerns expressed by Councillor Pippas. It was outrageous that Chinese residents and students had been targeted by hate crimes. Some blame lay with the media who had whipped up

un-necessary fears regarding the Coronovirus. He understood why there was a need for the World Health Organisation to react. The council needed to work with and support the Chinese community.

6. Councillor Gehring to the Leader

Given that Brexit is far from being done, what are the City doing to prepare?

The Leader responded that the Council had made various preparations in readiness for a no-deal Brexit and its impacts on the council and communities the council supports. The Council would continue to work to protect the rights of EU citizens. It was known that they would be able to vote and stand in the elections this year. The Government had made no statement to date whether that is an on-going commitment. There were 23,000 EU citizens in Cambridge, we need to protect their rights. He feared that the UK would leave the EU with no deal in place.

7. Councillor Bick to the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces

Now the 5-year contract with the ice rink and fun fair on Parker's Piece has ended, what are the Executive Councillor's plans for the future?

The Executive Councillor responded that officers from the Streets and Open Spaces Team were currently considering a range of options and were re-evaluating the impact of events as part of the review process. She was expecting officers to make recommendations in the next few weeks

8. Councillor O'Reilly to the Executive Councillor for Communities

What measures are being taken to make the Folk Festival as green as possible?

The Executive Councillor responded that the Cambridge Folk Festival had been working for some time to be as ethical as it could be. Some of the things addressed included the efficient use of renewable energy, seasonal sustainable ethically sourced food, getting rid of single use plastic bottles and having freely available drinking water. There were also festival water bottles available. The Folk Festival also used (almost) 100% renewable energy, tried to do as much recycling as possible and provided compost toilets. Food donations were also made to Cambridge Community Lunches.

For the second year running the Folk Festival had been declared outstanding in the International Greener festival awards. This award assessed events and

festivals which have demonstrated a strong commitment to sustainability and a reduction in environmental impacts. The Executive Councillor congratulated all of the Folk Festival Team and Cambridge Live staff in achieving this award.

9. Councillor Matthews to the Leader

Does the Leader support his group's strategy to address sustainability?

The Leader responded that he was very proud of everything that the Council was doing and recognised that a lot more could be achieved on sustainability. He would highlight the following measures which had not been recognised in the budget debate. A Corporate Energy and Carbon Reduction Manager post had been created. The Council had focussed on tackling biodiversity and making climate change a priority in the local plan. He thought there was a need to move towards passivhaus provision. The Council had received funding from Europe for trees. The Council had also worked in partnership with the Climate Change Commission. He also highlighted the strategic implementation of the Biodiversity Emergency Strategy.

10. Councillor Ashton to the Executive Councillor for Housing

Can the Executive Councillor inform Council of how many days the Severe Weather Emergency Protocol (SWEP) has been in operation during the last few months, how many rough sleepers have taken shelter under this provision since October 2019, and what steps the local authority takes, in concert with stakeholders, in promoting the provision in times of bad weather?

The Executive Councillor responded that the SWEP protocol has been in operation for 40 nights from the beginning of October 2019 and 12 February 2020. This had provided emergency shelter for 100 individuals. It would be invoked again from tomorrow until 2 March 2020 due to the predicted cold weather. The Council's promotion of SWEP has developed significantly over the last 2 winters includes an email distributed to over 100 local partners (3 days in advance of SWEP) who can distribute it to people who will come into contact with rough sleepers. A Streets Outreach Service operated 3 shifts, 5 nights a week to encourage rough sleepers into accommodation. A new SWEP weekend outreach service which is an extension of the Street Outreach service which operates on weekend evenings when SWEP is triggered. Promotions on the Council's social media sites and on the new Street Support website and app.

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 been covered.

11. Councillor Cantrill to Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre

Does the Executive Councillor agree with me that we should do everything possible to encourage residents to recycle?

12. Councillor Martinelli to the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Open Spaces

Is the Executive Councillor satisfied with the progress of the resurfacing works on Parker's Piece?

13. Councillor McQueen to the Executive Councillor for Communities

Could the Executive Councillor advise what is being planned for LGBT+ History month?

14. Councillor Chadwick to the Executive Councillor Planning Policy and Open Spaces

Does the Executive Councillor worry about the number of hotels in Cambridge?

15. Councillor Payne to the Executive Councillor for Housing

Can the Executive Councillor comment on whether the recent claims in the Cambridge News that hundreds of Cambridge Council houses fail to meet basic living standards are justifiable?

16. Councillor Summerbell to the Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre

Can the Executive Councillor please outline the plans and targets in place to improve the recycling rate in Cambridge, particularly with respect to plastic recycling?"

17. Councillor Smart to the Executive Councillor for Communities

What is being planned to support non-UK EU citizens in Cambridge?

18. Councillor Davies to the Executive Councillor for Communities

What activities are being planned for young people over Half Term?

19. Councillor Barnett to the Executive Councillor for Housing

Could the Executive Councillor for Housing detail the significance of the Council recently being awarded the Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance (DAHA) accreditation?

20/59/CNL Written questions

Members were asked to note the written questions and answers that had been placed in the information pack circulated around the Chamber.

The meeting ended at 10.50 pm

MAYOR

This page is intentionally left blank

CIVIC AFFAIRS

18 May 2020
5.30pm - 6.08 pm

Present: Councillors McPherson (Chair), Dalzell, Davey Chadwick, Sargeant and Thornburrow

FOR ADOPTION BY THE COUNCIL

20/14/Civ – Civic Affairs: Nominations for Committees for the Municipal Year 2020/21

The Committee considered a paper setting out the proposed Committee allocations by party and the nominations received. The Committee considered the rules on political balance set out in the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 in developing the recommendations set out below.

The Committee noted the nominations.

Resolved (unanimously) to:

Recommend to Council to agree the number and size of committees, depart from proportionality on the Planning Committee and to note the nominations listed below:

Ordinary Committee

Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee 8 (5 Labour + 3 Lib Dem)

Smart, Davies, Hadley, Collis, Barnett

Summerbell, Matthews, Payne

Alternates – O'Reilly, Sheil, McGerty, Gehring

Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee 8 (5 Labour + 3 Lib Dem)

Smart, Bird, Collis, Green, Baigent

Bick, Porrer, Chadwick

Alternates – McQueen, Lab TBC, Matthews

Housing Scrutiny Committee 8 (5 Labour + 3 Lib Dem)

Todd-Jones, Bird, Thittala, Hadley, Sheil

Martinelli, Porrer, McGerty

Alternates – Barnett, Smart, Cantrill, Page-Croft

Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee 6 (4 Labour + 2 Lib Dem)

Davey, Barnett, Green, Davies

Bick, Dalzell

Alternates – O'Reilly, Collis, Cantrill, Payne

Civic Affairs Committee 6 (4 Labour + 2 Lib Dem)

Sargeant, Thornburrow, Davey, O'Reilly

Dalzell, Chadwick

Alternate – Moore, Martinelli

Employment (Senior Officer) Committee 6 (4 Labour + 2 Lib Dem)

Sargeant, Thornburrow, Herbert, Sheil

Bick, Porrer

Alternates - Massey, Dalzell

Licensing Committee 11 (7 Labour+ 4 Lib Dem)

Bird, Thittala, McQueen, Massey, Moore, McPherson, Lab TBC

Gehring, Pippas, Page-Croft, Summerbell

Alternates - Johnson, Cantrill

Planning Committee 9 (5 Labour+ 3 Lib Dem +1 Independent)
Smart, Baigent, Green, Thornburrow, McQueen
Tunnacliffe, Lord, Porrer
Hipkin
Alternates – Bird, Price, Page-Croft

Cambridge City Joint Area Committee (with County Council) 6 (4 Labour + 2 Lib Dem)
Sargeant, Smart, Massey, Robertson
Martinelli, Tunnacliffe
Alternates – Bird, McGerty

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority - 1 seat
Herbert
Alternate - Davey

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee 1 Labour + 1 Lib Dem
Price
Gehring
Alternates – McQueen, Summerbell

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Audit and Governance Committee 1 Labour + one alternate
Davey
Alternate – Price

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly 3 (2 Labour + 1 Lib Dem)
--

Davey, Massey
Bick

Joint Development Control Committee - Cambridge Fringes 6 (4 Labour+ 2 Lib Dem)
Sargeant, Baigent, Thornburrow, Smart
Tunnacliffe, Matthews
Alternates – Price, Moore, Porrer, Page-Croft

Item

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS AND CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES FOR ANNUAL COUNCIL



To:

Civic Affairs Committee 18/05/2020

Report by:

Gary Clift, Democratic Services Manager

Tel: 01223 - 457011 Email: gary.clift@cambridge.gov.uk

Wards affected:

All

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The report details the issues to consider and decide for recommendation to Council on 28 May 2020. An update paper will be published on 18 May when additional information from the political groups will have been received.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 To recommend to Council:

- (i) The city council committees and the nominations to the joint and partner bodies (as current) in paragraph 3.2 and updated in a paper to be circulated on 18 May.
- (ii) The nominations for Chairs and Vice Chairs (as current) in paragraph 3.3 and updated in a paper to be circulated on 13 May.
- (iii) Constitutional updates required as part of the Annual Meeting process.

3. Background

Appointing Committees

- 3.1 City Council all-out elections scheduled for 7 May were cancelled under the Coronavirus Act 2020. Following on, The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 which came into force on 4 April, permit local authorities to carry over appointments made at Annual Meetings in 2019. Therefore, Civic Affairs Committee is to consider any departure from the current committees (ie. status quo) and make recommendations to the Annual Meeting of the Council accordingly.
- 3.2 The rules on political balance set out in the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 still apply to both scrutiny and regulatory committee composition so that, once the size of committees has been determined, the division of seats among the political groups on the Council will be automatic and the Council must appoint those members which each political group puts forward for its seats.

In considering the allocation of committee places to political groups, the Council is legally required to take into account the following principles:

- i) That the controlling group should have a majority of seats on each committee.
- ii) That the total number of committee places allocated to each political group must be in proportion to the number of members of that group on the Council.
- iii) That on each committee the number of places allocated to each political group must be in proportion to the number of members of that group on the Council.

The order of precedence of these principles is the order in which they are given - i.e. (i) takes highest priority, then (ii) then (iii). If you choose to depart from proportionality, Full Council must not only agree, but no single Member must dissent.

- 3.2 The existing city council committees and size are listed below. The

Council (or committees in respect of sub-committees) will appoint one alternate member in respect of each political group represented on that committee or sub-committee and two in the case of the major Scrutiny Committees for groups with more than one committee member. Unlike a substitute system, the city council's own committees use an Alternate Member where the councillor is a named member from a political group and preferably unchanged for the municipal year who will sit in for any committee member of the same political group who is unable to attend any meeting in the year that they are scheduled to attend.

- 3.3 The proportionality for both the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Audit and Governance Committee should not change but we will be notified if so.

Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee
Current Numbers- 8 (5 Labour + 3 Lib Dem)
Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee
Current Numbers- 9 (5 Labour + 3 Lib Dem+1 Ind)
Housing Scrutiny Committee
Current Numbers- 8 (5 Labour + 3 Lib Dem)
Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee
Current Numbers- 5 (3 Labour+ 2 Lib Dem)
Civic Affairs Committee
Current Numbers- 6 (4 Labour +2 Lib Dem)
Licensing Committee
Current Numbers- 11 (8 Labour+ 4 Lib Dem)
Planning Committee
Current Numbers- 8 (5 Labour+ 3 Lib Dem)
Employment (Senior Officer) Committee
Current Numbers- 6 (4 Labour +2 Lib Dem)
Employment Appeals Sub-Committee

Current Numbers- 6 (4 Labour +2 Lib Dem)
--

Cambridge City Joint Area Committee (with County Council)*
Current Numbers- 6 (4 Labour +2 Lib Dem)

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
Current Numbers- 1 (Leader of the Council) + 1 substitute (Deputy Leader)

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Current Numbers- 1 Labour + 1 Lib Dem

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Audit and Governance Committee
Current Numbers 1Labour + 1 alternate member

Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly
Current Numbers- 3 (2 Labour + 1 Lib Dem)

Joint Development Control Committee - Cambridge Fringes*
Current Numbers- 6 (4 Labour+ 2 Lib Dem)

*Nb - Cambridgeshire County is to consider at its Full Council on 19 May 2020 disbanding the Cambridge Joint Area Committee and also withdrawing from the Joint Development Control Committee with effect from July 2020.

Chairs and Vice Chairs

- 3.3 The Civic Affairs Committee is requested to make nominations for any changes to the current Chairs and Vice Chairs . A paper listing any nominations will be circulated at the committee:

Strategy and Resources
 Environment and Community Services
 Planning and Transport
 Housing (note - Chair is a Councillor, the Vice Chair is a tenant/leaseholder)

Civic Affairs
 Licensing
 Planning

Committee working parties and appointments to outside bodies

- 3.4** Procedural meetings of the relevant scrutiny and regulatory committees are usually held at an adjourned point during the Annual Meeting of the Council to confirm working parties and to note the membership of them. Executive Councillors also agree appointments to outside bodies. Officers will table proposals on 18 May on how this could work in a virtual meeting.

Constitutional Changes

- 3.4** The Committee will receive an update at its meeting of any constitutional matters requiring consideration. Although none are anticipated at the time of publication, this exists to afford the committee the opportunity to consider any.

4. Implications

(a) Financial Implications

None.

(b) Staffing Implications

None

(c) Equality and Poverty Implications

None

(d) Environmental Implications

None

(e) Procurement Implications

None

(f) Community Safety Implications

None

5. Consultation and communication considerations

None

6. Background papers

No background papers were used in the preparation of this report.

7. Appendices

None

8. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact Gary Clift, Democratic Services Manager, tel: 01223 - 457011, email: gary.clift@cambridge.gov.uk.

CIVIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE-18 MAY 2020

UPDATE REPORT

As referred to in para 2 of agenda item 6, information received today updates what was published on 7 May.

Recommendation 2.1(i)

Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee 8 (5 Labour + 3 Lib Dem)
--

Smart, Davies, Hadley, Collis, Barnett
--

Summerbell, Matthews, Payne

Alternates – O'Reilly, Sheil, McGerty, Gehring
--

Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee 8 (5 Labour + 3 Lib Dem)

Smart, Bird, Collis, Green, Baigent

Bick, Porrer, Chadwick

Alternates – McQueen, Lab TBC, Matthews

Housing Scrutiny Committee 8 (5 Labour + 3 Lib Dem)
--

Todd-Jones, Bird, Thittala, Hadley, Sheil

Martinelli, Porrer, McGerty

Alternates – Barnett, Smart, Cantrill, Page-Croft

Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee 6 (4 Labour + 2 Lib Dem)

Davey, Barnett, Green, Davies

Bick, Dalzell

Alternates – O'Reilly, Collis, Cantrill, Payne
--

Civic Affairs Committee 6 (4 Labour + 2 Lib Dem)

Sargeant, Thornburrow, Davey, O'Reilly
--

Dalzell, Chadwick

Alternate – Moore, Martinelli

Employment (Senior Officer) Committee 6 (4 Labour +2 Lib Dem)
--

Sargeant, Thornburrow, Herbert, Sheil

Bick, Porrer

Alternates: Massey, Dalzell

Licensing Committee 11 (7 Labour+ 4 Lib Dem)

Bird, Thittala, McQueen, Massey, Moore, McPherson, Lab TBC
--

Gehring, Pippas, Page-Croft, Summerbell

Alternates – Johnson, Cantrill

Planning Committee 9 (5 Labour+ 3 Lib Dem +1 Independent)
--

Smart, Baigent, Green, Thornburrow, McQueen

Tunnacliffe, Lord, Porrer

Hipkin

Alternates – Bird, Price, Page-Croft

Cambridge City Joint Area Committee (with County Council) 6 (4 Labour + 2 Lib Dem)
--

Sargeant, Smart, Massey, Robertson

Martinelli, Tunnacliffe

Alternates – Bird, McGerty

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority - 1 seat
--

Herbert

Alternate - Davey

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee 1 Labour + 1 Lib Dem
--

Price

Gehring

Alternates – McQueen, Summerbell

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Audit and Governance Committee 1 Labour + one alternate
--

Davey

Alternate – Price

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly 3 (2 Labour + 1 Lib Dem)
--

Davey, Massey

Bick

Joint Development Control Committee - Cambridge Fringes 6 (4 Labour+ 2 Lib Dem)
--

Sargeant, Baigent, Thornburrow, Smart

Tunnacliffe, Matthews

Alternates – Price, Moore, Porrer, Page-Croft

Recommendation 2.1 (ii)

Nominations for Chairs and Vice Chairs 2020/21

	Chair	Vice Chair
Environment and Community Services	Smart	Davies
Planning and Transport	Smart	Bird
Housing	Todd-Jones	Bird (nb. Tenant/Leaseholder is Chair of Part 1 of the meeting)
Strategy & Resources	Davey	Barnett
Civic Affairs	Sargeant	Thornburrow
Licensing	Bird	Thittala
Planning	Smart	Baigent
JDCC	Sargeant as Lead Cllr	

CIVIC AFFAIRS

18 May 2020
5.30pm - 6.08 pm

Present: Councillors McPherson (Chair), Dalzell, Davey Chadwick, Sargeant and Thornburrow

FOR ADOPTION BY THE COUNCIL

20/13/Civ – Civic Affairs: Nominations for Chairs and Vice Chairs for the Municipal Year 2020/21

The Committee received nominations for Chairs and Vice Chairs of Scrutiny and Regulatory Committees.

The Committee were asked to note a correction to the Vice-Chair of Civic Affairs Committee.

Resolved (unanimously) to:

- i. Agree the nominations for Chairs and Vice Chairs as below:

	Chair	Vice Chair
Environment and Community Services	Smart	Davies
Planning and Transport	Smart	Bird
Housing	Todd-Jones	Bird (nb. Tenant/Leaseholder is Chair of Part 1 of the meeting)
Strategy & Resources	Davey	Barnett
Civic Affairs	Sargeant	Davey
Licensing	Bird	Thittala
Planning	Smart	Baigent
JDCC	Sargeant as Lead Cllr	

This page is intentionally left blank

CIVIC AFFAIRS

18 May 2020
5.30pm - 6.08 pm

Present: Councillors McPherson (Chair), Dalzell, Davey Chadwick, Sargeant and Thornburrow

FOR ADOPTION BY THE COUNCIL

20/13Civ – Virtual Meetings-conventions

The Committee received a report detailing the conventions to apply to virtual meetings. In response to a question, the Committee was advised that there would be a way for audio public contributions from the public were the MS Teams environment incompatible. This was one of the reasons for requiring two days notice from the public so that any technical issues could be resolved prior to a meeting.

Resolved (unanimously) to recommend:

- i) The conventions for virtual meetings are adopted as appended to the minute
- ii) The conventions are reviewed after one month of operation and that the Civic Affairs Committee is authorised to make any changes following the review and at any time until 7 May 2021 taking into account any advice from the Council's Monitoring Officer.

This page is intentionally left blank

Item

VIRTUAL COUNCIL MEETINGS-CONVENTIONS



To:

Civic Affairs Committee 18/05/2020

Report by:

Gary Clift, Democratic Services Manager

Tel: 01223 - 457011 Email: gary.clift@cambridge.gov.uk

Wards affected:

All

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The report proposes local conventions on how council meetings will operate in a virtual way arising from the provisions in the Coronavirus Act 2020 and associated Regulations.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 To recommend to Council that:
- (i) The conventions for virtual meetings are adopted.
 - (ii) The conventions are reviewed after one month of operation and that the Civic Affairs Committee is authorised to make any changes following the review and at any time until 7 May 2021 taking into account any advice from the Council's Monitoring Officer.

3. Background

- 3.1 Following on from the Coronavirus Act 2020, the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority

Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 came into force on 4 April 2020. These regulations make provision for remote attendance at, and remote access to, council meetings held on or before 7 May 2021. **The Regulations override any existing procedure rules or standing orders or other rules that local authorities have relating to the governance of meetings.** The main effects of the regulations are as follows:

- Regulation 4 (1) empowers local authorities to alter the frequency of meetings, move or cancel meetings without notice. It should be noted however that there is no change to the requirement to publish notice of a meeting 5 working days prior to a meeting.
- Regulation 5 provides that local authority meetings may take place through digital means. A meeting summons does not need to specify a physical location and a meeting may take place entirely online or by conference call, subject to certain conditions set out below.
- Councillors may participate in meetings remotely. There is no requirement for a quorum of councillors to be present in the meeting room because the regulations make it clear that a councillor “attends” the meeting if they are able to participate remotely. The following conditions must be met for a councillor to be defined as participating remotely:
 - o The councillor must be able to hear and, where possible, see other councillors attending the meeting. The councillor must also be heard and, where possible, seen by those other councillors;
 - o The councillor must be able to hear and, where possible, see members of the public who are attending the meeting to exercise their right to speak. The councillor must also be heard and, where possible, seen by those members of the public; and
 - o The councillor must be heard and, where possible, seen by other members of the public who are attending the meeting (remotely).

Regulation 5 also empowers local authorities to make standing order or rules governing remote attendance, which may include provision for:

- o voting;
- o member and public access to documents; and
- o remote access of public and press to a local authority meeting to enable them to attend or participate in that meeting by electronic means, including by telephone conference, video conference, live webcasts, and live interactive streaming.

This means that councils can hold meetings regardless of any existing restrictions and to match facilities to suit their circumstances.

- Regulation 6 allows a notice of a meeting to be published on the Council's website as though it were published at the offices. The publication, posting or making available of agendas, reports and supporting information may be via the Council's website instead of at the offices or via post.

4. Proposed conventions

- 4.1 The Council is to hold virtual meetings using the Microsoft Teams function which is the 3C ICT solution for all three councils in the shared service and the conventions have been drafted taking these technical capabilities into account. They have also been drafted to reflect an expressed preference by Group Leaders for both live video and audio public participation in council meetings.
- 4.2 Virtual meetings are new for all local authorities. Councils are choosing different technical solutions and commencing virtual meetings at different times. The conventions have been based on examples of good practice provided by the Local Government Association, Association of Democratic Services Officers and the Centre for Public Scrutiny. It is sensible to review how these conventions work and where they can be improved after one month and as required.

4. Implications

(a) Financial Implications

There may be some small savings on not publishing agenda and not booking external venues for Area Committees depending on the choices that Members make in the longer term.

(b) Staffing Implications

Running virtual meetings will require more democratic service officers (initially 3 per meeting) as there is more than one role to perform.

(c) Equality and Poverty Implications

An EQIA has been undertaken.

(d) Environmental Implications

There will be less travel to the Guildhall or another meeting place. There should be less printed matter in the long term.

(e) Procurement Implications

None

(f) Community Safety Implications

None

5. Consultation and communication considerations

None

6. Background papers

Association of Democratic Services Officers/Lawyers in Local Government
Guidance note on Regulations No.392 April 2020

7. Appendices

None

8. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact Gary Clift, Democratic Services Manager, tel: 01223 - 457011, email: gary.clift@cambridge.gov.uk.

Interim proposals for Cambridge City Council conventions for virtual meetings in accordance with the [Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels \(Coronavirus\) \(Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings\) \(England and Wales\) Regulations 2020](#)

1.1 Access to documents

- (i) Democratic Services will publish the agenda and reports for committee meetings on the Council's website and will notify councillors by email. Papers will not be available for inspection at the Council's offices. Printed copies will not normally be circulated to councillors [an exception will be made for Planning Committee councillors (who wish paper copies) and any other councillor with specific requirements].
- (ii) Before the meeting, any document to be referred to during the meeting should be shared with participants and published (where appropriate) in advance on the council's website, and ensure that every page and slide is numbered, wherever possible.

1.2 General etiquette about councillors joining and participating in a remote meeting

- (i) Councillors are encouraged to join the meeting 15 minutes before the scheduled start time in order to avoid disrupting or delaying the official start of the meeting. If a councillor needs to leave the meeting at any point, then they must draw that to the Chair's attention.
- (ii) Apologies for absence should be submitted in advance and the councillor should advise Democratic Services if an Alternate will be attending.
- (ii) Councillors should leave their cameras on (as long as bandwidth for streaming permits)
- (iv) The Chair will introduce the meeting and will check which councillors are present by roll-call. The Chair will remind councillors to mute their microphones when not speaking. This is done in order to reduce feedback and background noise. Democratic Services Officers may use this mute function as well.

1.3 Protocol for councillors speaking at meetings

- (i) The Chair will determine who may speak, as well as the order, frequency and priority of speakers. (Through Teams this may be that councillors may use the 'chat' message function to indicate a wish to speak). The Chair may instruct the Democratic Service Officer to assist them in carrying out any of these functions. The Chair's ruling at any meeting on how this will be managed shall be final.
- (ii) Councillors will speak when invited to do so by the Chair with only one person to speak at a time.
- (ii) When referring to reports or making specific comments, councillors should refer to the report and page number so that all councillors have a clear understanding of what is being discussed at all times.
- (iii) Ward Councillors and Parish Councillors (latter re. JDCC) will be able to speak (e.g. speaking on behalf of constituents) at a virtual meeting with the permission of the Chair which should be gained in advance.
- (iv) Any councillor with a disclosable pecuniary interest or other declarable interest which would usually require them to leave the room, must leave the remote meeting and the officer will confirm they have left and will invite them back to re-join at the appropriate time.

1.4 Voting

- (i) Where a vote is required, the Chair will ask each councillor to vote in turn. Councillors should express their vote verbally, either for, against or abstain.
- (ii) The Democratic Services Officer will announce the outcome of the vote to the meeting. Names will not be recorded in the Minutes, unless requested under Council Procedure Rules (32 and 46)

1.5 Public participation at virtual committee meetings

The following conventions will supplement public speaking rights in Part 4b of Council Procedure Rules in the context of a virtual council or committee meeting of Cambridge City Council

- (i) The public who wish to observe/hear the proceedings of a committee are able to do so by a live stream. The public who wish to speak will contact democratic services by noon two working days before the meeting and will be provided with a link to participate in the meeting.
- (ii) The public participating will be able to be heard (and ideally be seen) by other participants and will be able to hear (and ideally see) other participants.

- (iii) Representations should be submitted in writing as well. This is as a back-up in case of a technical failure preventing the video or audio representation at the meeting being made. If a public speaker loses connection, the officer will attempt to bring the speaker back into the meeting, they will try to: a) invite the speaker back to the Teams platform; b) if unsuccessful then telephone the speaker (if provided with a number); c) or read out any written submission (sent in advance) on the speaker's behalf. If a speaker is unable to either join, or re-join a meeting, the Chair may still permit the meeting to determine the business to be transacted.
- (iv) Once the public contribution has ended, they will be muted by the officer/Chair.
- (v) The Chair's decision on how this process operates will be final.

1.6 Disruption

While the Council welcomes input from the public, it is important for the integrity and orderly management of the meeting that the public who join the meeting follow the direction of the Chair.

The Chair will warn a member of the public if they are disrupting proceedings. If the member of the public ignores the Chair's warning then they will be muted and/or removed from the (virtual) meeting. The Chair's action taken in relation to disruption is final.

1.7 Dealing with exempt items of business

- (i) There are times when council meetings are not open to the public, when confidential, or "exempt" information – as defined in Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 – is under consideration. The Chair and Democratic Services Officer must ensure that there are no members of the public at remote locations able to hear or see the proceedings during such meetings or parts of meetings.
- (ii) Any councillor in remote attendance who fails to disclose that there are other persons present, such as those who may be able to see and/or hear the meeting, who are not so entitled will be in breach of the Council's Code of Conduct.

1.8 Dealing with technical difficulties

- (i) In the event that the Chair or Democratic Services Officer identifies a technical failure of the virtual meeting, the Chair may need to declare an adjournment while the fault is addressed.
- (ii) If it is not possible to address the fault and the meeting is inquorate, the meeting will be abandoned until such time as it can be reconvened. If the meeting is quorate,

the meeting will continue. Those Councillors affected and attending remotely would be aware and have to accept that the meeting would continue and a vote would be taken without their attendance.

- (iii) If it is not possible for general public access to the virtual meeting because of a technical failure by the Council, the meeting cannot proceed.
- (iv) If the meeting was due to determine an urgent matter or one which is time-limited and it has not been possible to continue because of technical difficulties, the Chief Executive, in consultation with the relevant Executive Councillor/Chair and spokes shall explore such other means of taking the decision as may be permitted by the Council's constitution.

1.9 Interpretation of Conventions and Council Procedure Rules

Where the Chair is required to interpret the Council's existing practices in light of the requirements of remote participation which are provided for under the Regulations, they shall take advice from a senior legal officer or senior democratic officer prior to making a ruling. The Chair's decision in all cases shall be final.

2.0 Review

These conventions will be reviewed as soon as practicable by the Civic Affairs Committee after one month from the first virtual meeting as agreed by Full Council on 28 May 2020.