



## Cambridge City Council Notice of Council

**Date:** Thursday, 25 May 2023

**Time:** 11.05 am

**Venue:** Council Chamber, The Guildhall, Market Square, Cambridge, CB2 3QJ

**Contact:** [democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk), tel:01223 457000

Dear Councillor,

A meeting of Cambridge City Council will be held in the Council Chamber, The Guildhall, Market Square, Cambridge, CB2 3QJ on Thursday, 25 May 2023 at 11.05 am and I hereby summon you to attend.

Dated 17 May 2023

Yours faithfully

Robert Pollock

Chief Executive

### Agenda

- 1 To Elect a Mayor for the Municipal Year 2023/24
- 2 To Elect a Deputy Mayor for the Municipal Year 2023/24
- 3 To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on the 23 February and 2 March 2023 (Pages 11 - 48)
- 4 To Note the Returning Officer's Report that the following have been elected to the Office of Councillor  
Abbey – Elliot Tong  
Arbury – Mike Todd-Jones

Castle – Antoinette Nestor  
Castle – Cheney-Anne Payne  
Cherry Hinton – Robert Dryden  
Coleridge – Tim Griffin  
Coleridge – Rosy Moore  
East Chesterton – Alice Gilderdale  
Market – Anthony Martinelli  
Newnham – Jean Glasberg  
Petersfield – Katie Thornburrow  
Queen Edith's – Karen Young  
Romsey – Mairead Healy  
Trumpington – Ingrid Flaubert  
West Chesterton – Rachel Wade

5 To Pass a Resolution of Thanks to the Outgoing Mayor

6 Mayor's announcements

7 To Elect from among the Members of the Council  
Four Bailiffs of the City for the Municipal Year  
2023/24

8 To elect a Leader of the Council

The Council is required to appoint a Leader of the Council. Article 7.3 of the Constitution states:

The Leader will be a councillor elected to the position by the Council and will remain as Leader until the day of the Annual Meeting of the Council in the year their term of office ends or until:

1. death or disqualification; or
2. resignation from the office; or
3. removal from office by resolution of the Council.

9 To consider the recommendations of Committees for adoption

9a Civic Affairs Committee - Committee Appointments (Pages 49 - 52)

10 Annual Statements

Group Leaders will each have the opportunity to speak for not more than 10 minutes on their Group's priorities for action and objectives for the forthcoming municipal year.

11 Public questions time

12 To deal with oral questions

13 To consider the following notices of motion, notice of

which has been given by:

13a Councillor Levien - New electric two wheeled scooters and mo-peds

Council notes:

1. The rapid expansion in the use of novel, primarily electrically powered, two-wheeled vehicles, using Cambridge's roads, shared use paths, public spaces and footpaths, many of significant size and weight and capable of high speeds;
2. That this innovation has the welcome potential to broaden travel opportunities;
3. But that this trend also has the potential of conflict with other users and an increased chance of accidents unless properly regulated
4. That apart from those vehicles expressly licensed by the Combined Authority, some of these types of vehicle remain illegal to use on the public highway, whilst there appears to be a lack of clarity of the status of others.

Council believes that a national regulatory approach needs urgently to be put in place to enable responsible use in appropriate places of vehicle classes assessed to be safe, and to prohibit irresponsible use, use in inappropriate places and of vehicle classes not assessed as safe, empowering local authorities and the Police to enforce accordingly. It requests the Chief Executive to write to the city's MPs, Combined Authority, Police Constabulary and Local Government Association seeking their active support in seeking this outcome.

In the meantime council requests the Chief Executive to facilitate a report to the Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee within the next 6 months on means by which the city council might exercise influence and potentially co-ordinate the best use of existing powers in a concerted fashion to mitigate the adverse, and channel the positive effects of the phenomenon, including but not limited to engagement with

- the Police on the use of existing enforcement powers
- the County Council as both the highways and trading standards authority in the city
- the city council's own services with responsibility for public open spaces, environmental enforcement and community safety

- the Combined Authority as local sponsor of the Voi licensed pilot in Cambridge
- delivery companies whose services utilise the novel vehicles
- interest groups in the city representing established users of spaces now also used by novel vehicles.

## 13b Councillor Glasberg - Rights of the River Cam

### **Introduction (not part of active motion)**

The Green and Independent Group proposes the following motion to address resident concerns over the state of our rivers and chalk streams. We regard the river as an integral part of the life of our city. Threats to our rivers are a threat to us all.

The purpose of this motion is to:

- state our city's aspirations for our river and chalk streams ("the declaration of the Rights of the River Cam")
- petition the organisations responsible for our river to improve their performance in order to help save our river and its tributaries.
- consider the limits placed by the depleted state of our river on future growth in buildings and infrastructure.

### **Active Motion**

#### **1 Declaration of the Rights of the River Cam**

This council declares that the River Cam and its tributaries should have the following rights arising from their existence in nature:

- The right to flow and be free from over-abstraction
- The right to perform essential functions of flooding, moving sediment, recharging groundwater and sustaining biodiversity
- The right to be free from pollution
- The right to feed and be fed by sustainable aquifers
- The right to native biodiversity
- The right to restoration
- The right to maintain connections with other streams and rivers

This council undertakes to assess the impact of all its decisions on the health of the river and ensure that all its decisions support these rights.

This council calls on all residents and organisations to act as

guardians of the River Cam and engage with the river in a relationship of respect and stewardship.

## **2 Responsibility**

This council notes that the responsible bodies are:

Environment Agency – general oversight

Cambridge Water - water supply

Anglian Water - sewage

The council proposes to write to all three bodies to share its concerns over the state of the river and call upon them for their assistance.

## **3. Interaction with the Council's own actions and the growth of the city**

The Council proposes to set up a small cross-party group to draw up a plan for the protection of the river. This will include considering the impact of future growth in buildings and infrastructure in the City on the depleted state of our river, and the limits that may be necessary to respect the rights of the river to report back to full council prior to updating the Local Plan. For the avoidance of doubt, it is intended that this group will supplement rather than displace the work of existing scrutiny committees.

### **End of Active Motion**

Background Notes (not part of active motion):

- 1 On Midsummer's Day in 2021, Friends of the River Cam made the first public declaration in the UK of the rights of the River at Jesus Green, linked to the Universal Declaration of River Rights: <https://www.rightsofrivers.org>
- 2 The declaration is repeated on Midsummer's Day each year and is repeated in the text of this motion.
- 3 This year the declaration will be at 6pm on 21<sup>st</sup> June with a celebration with short speeches, live music, choirs and poetry from 4pm to 9pm. All residents are welcome.
- 4 The declaration of rights is supported by many of our local environmental and community groups including CPRE, FeCRA, Cambridge Friends of the Earth, Save Honey Hill, Keep Waterbeach Rural, Friends of Logan's Meadow, Friends of

Cherry Hinton Brook, and many others.

- 5 Earlier this year, Lewes District Council passed a Rights of Rivers Motion to protect the River Ouse in East Sussex. Momentum has been growing globally to extend legal rights to nature and in some cases specifically to rivers.

<https://democracy.lewes>

[eastbourne.gov.uk/documents/s27490/Motion%20-%20Rights%20of%20the%20River.pdf](https://democracy.lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk/documents/s27490/Motion%20-%20Rights%20of%20the%20River.pdf)

- 6 Cllrs Glasberg and Tong wish to thank the Friends of the River Cam and representatives from a number of local environmental groups for their help in putting this motion together. Any errors or omissions are of course our own.

13c Councillor Carling - Tackling e-mopeds / scooters on pedestrian paths

The Council notes:

- The need to tackle growing antisocial behaviour in Cambridge from electric mopeds and a minority of electric scooters (as well as some cyclists) riding at speed on routes and pavements reserved for pedestrians, putting community safety at risk – particularly that of elderly and disabled people.
- That three-way partnership work is underway between the Council, Cambridgeshire Police and the County Council to tackle this on public paths and pavements.
- That a large number of electric moped drivers are employees of food and other delivery companies, working on zero-hours or other insecure contracts in a gig economy which does little to ensure good working conditions for employees, and that these drivers are therefore incentivised to cut corners in the interest of speed as a result of this model.

The Council resolves to:

- Welcome the work of the three way partnership, and agree to build on plans for 'Respect' signage on Midsummer Common plus the existing no cycling signage on Christ's Pieces.
- Consider increasing levels of signage across other central city green spaces, with a view to ending e-moped and scooter usage of paths.
- Ask that the Council enforcement team allocate time to undertake targeted patrols when enhanced signage is in place, following an assessment of the key times of day at which the issue of antisocial driving of electric mopeds and scooters

arises.

- Encourage our Cambridge Police Superintendent and County Road Safety team to initiate a serious dialogue with community and city-wide groups on increasing the safety and security of pedestrians and cyclists across the city, including giving greater priority to action on cutting close passes and near misses to cyclists on city roads by thoughtless drivers (while recognising the need for our police to focus on crimes causing greater harm, particularly in light of continued police cuts from central government); and address pavements and pedestrian areas where adults regularly cycle unnecessarily, passing close to – or even hitting – pedestrians.
- Request a report to the Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee from the three-way partnership on pedestrian and cyclist safety issues, particularly those associated with the misuse of e-mopeds and e-scooters, and the partnership actions being taken to address this – with prior consultation of relevant organisations that have an interest in the issue, who will also be able to contribute at the start of the committee meeting where it is considered.
- Instruct the Chief Executive to write to the relevant government minister in order to:
  - Lobby for legislation to increase the powers available to local authorities to take action on electric mopeds and scooters.
  - Express the Council's concerns about the gig economy model that incentivises drivers to cut corners with respect to public safety.
  - Request that central government consider legislation or other incentives to address this underlying cause.

13d Councillor Bick - Experience of new voter photo ID requirement

Members of the council note their experience of the recent election campaign as the first occasion where those without specific forms of photo ID were not permitted to exercise what was otherwise their democratic right. In addition to the data formally collected by polling station staff of those who were turned away in Cambridge, council also notes the potentially far greater number who were deterred from going to a polling station at all because they did not have any of the appropriate forms of photo ID, of which many of us will be individually aware.

This experience prompts re-affirmation of Council's demand of

Government to scrap the new voter ID requirement and return to the tried and tested, inclusive approach which has maximised turn-out whilst avoiding malpractice in elections over many years - and to scrap it before any further test of electoral opinion is suppressed in a similar way.

14

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

The public may record (e.g. film, audio, tweet, blog) meetings which are open to the public.

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](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk)
- Phone: 01223 457000

This Meeting will be live streamed to the Council's YouTube page. You can watch proceedings on the livestream or attend the meeting in person.

Those wishing to address the meeting will be able to do so virtually via Microsoft Teams, or by attending to speak in person. You must contact Democratic Services [democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk) by 12 noon two working days before the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

**COUNCIL**

23 February 2023

6.00 - 11.30 pm

**Present:** Councillors Ashton, Bennett, Bick, Bird, Carling, Collis, Copley, Davey, S. Davies, Divkovic, Flaubert, Gawthorpe Wood, Gilderdale, Hauk, Healy, Herbert, Howard, Lee, Levien, McPherson, Nethsingha, Payne, Porrer, Pounds, Robertson, Sheil, Smart, A. Smith, S. Smith, Sweeney, Swift, Thittala Varkey, Thornburrow and Todd-Jones

Also present (virtually) Councillors: Holloway, Moore and Scutt

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****23/1/CNL Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the 20 October 2022 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

**23/2/CNL Mayor's announcements**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Bird	23/5/CNLa	Personal: Member of Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) Board.
Councillor Davey	23/5/CNLa	Personal: Member of Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) Board.
Councillor Bird	23/4/CNLa	Personal: Is a tenant of Cambridge Housing Society (CHS).
Councillor Thittala Varkey	23/4/CNLa	Personal: Is a council tenant.
Councillor Ashton	23/5/CNLa	Personal: with reference to CAP5048 - Is Chair of Cherry Hinton Residents Association and Director of Cherry Hinton Benefits Society.

## **Cambridge Chinese New Year Celebrations**

The Mayor had been invited to three celebrations in various parts of the community and enjoyed the festive atmosphere of Chinese New Year and in being exposed to diverse Chinese culture.

## **Mayor's Charity Quiz**

This was taking place on Thursday 9 March and money raised would be donated to the Mayor's Charities Cambridge Aid and the Romsey Mill Trust.

## **Councillors personal safety**

Members were reminded about two on-line events covering member personal safety next month.

## **Mayor's reception**

The Mayor and their consort would be hosting the annual Mayors Reception on Friday 28 April. Penny MacDonald would be sending out invitations shortly.

## **Reach Fair**

Reach Fair would be taking place on Monday 1 May, invitations would be sent out in late March.

## **Honorary Councillor Evelyn Knowles**

On behalf of Councillors, the Mayor passed on condolences to the family of Evelyn Knowles who was a councillor for West Chesterton Ward 1987-2003, and Mayor 2000-2001. In addition to being a councillor, Evelyn was a Member of Cambridge Community Health Council, Trustee of Cambridge Folk Museum, Chair of Cambridge Refugee Support Group and a Trustee of Cambridge Citizens' Advice Bureau.

## **Turkiye/Syria earthquake, Ukraine war one year on**

Members observed a minutes silence to reflect on the Türkiye/Syria earthquake and to note the Ukraine war one year on.

## **23/3/CNL Public questions time**

Members of the public asked a number of questions/statements, as set out below. Councillors answers are included where given.

#### Question 1

- i. Was pleased that there would be no further development in Greater Cambridge in the next Local Plan period unless / until suitable infrastructure was put in place to provide for a sustainable water supply.
- ii. Questioned whether there was a sufficient water supply for development in the current Local Plan period.
- iii. Noted that the Environment Agency had advised that any further water extraction would cause environmental damage. Noted that the Greater Cambridge Planning Service had advised that this issue had been taken into consideration when the current local plan was adopted.
- iv. Noted that 600 people had objected to the development of housing at Northstowe due to issues regarding ground water and South Cambs District Council's decision was challenged.
- v. Raised concerns regarding a contract for environmental consultancy services, which were paid for but not delivered. Advised that when they raised concerns their organisation came under Police scrutiny. Expressed concerns about the way in which the Police conducted their enquiries and how concerns about this were handled.

#### Question 2

- i. Challenged failings in the Council's vision, commitment and actions for the city.
- ii. Asked for consideration to be given to what made Cambridge a world-renowned place to live and visit, its historic environment of building, spaces, trees and landscape setting. These qualities were not mentioned in the Council's vision for Cambridge and no reference was made to maintaining them.
- iii. These qualities did not feature in the 'Cambridge Rich Picture' current consultation 'Putting Residents and Communities at the heart of the Conversation'.
- iv. Expressed concern that the 'Cambridge Rich Picture' did not address as part of its vision the challenge of how to work within environmental limits.
- v. Felt the Cambridge Rich Picture and the Local Plan should explicitly address the challenge of reconciling current and projected growth with environmental capacity.
- vi. Questioned what had happened to the City Portrait.
- vii. Asked when the Council would recognise that sustainability was about more than just carbon and biodiversity, environmental capacity was

fundamental and that what made Cambridge special was a key element of sustainability.

- viii. Asked when the Council would consult on the draft City Portrait on the doughnut model and if a consultation was not going to be undertaken, why.

The Executive Councillor for Finance, Resources and Transformation responded:

- i. 'Our Cambridge' was the transformation programme for the City Council which needed to consider resident's views. The 'Cambridge Rich Picture' was a tool that the council was using, which was being delivered by external consultants and would contribute towards a new vision for the city.
- ii. The 'City Portrait' was being developed in conjunction with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority. Cambridge Econometrics was the company awarded the contract to undertake the City Portrait work. Confirmed that consultation would take place.
- iii. Agreed that sustainability was about more than just carbon and biodiversity, environmental capacity was fundamental and that what made Cambridge special was a key element of sustainability.
- iv. Noted that the Executive Councillor and Officers would be happy to meet with the public speaker outside of the meeting to discuss further.

#### Supplementary question

- i. William Morris set the pattern for the building conservation movement.
- ii. Wanted the historic environment to get recognition. The Arc project and the Oxford-Cambridge Partnership environmental principles did not mention the historic built environment.
- iii. Was pleased that the net zero pilot project had been awarded to the council in the Ross Street area and that the council had been successful in its bid for the social housing decarbonisation fund. Questioned to what extent the council would take on board the historic character of the buildings and particularly traditional construction methods. The Council's 'Retrofitting Your Home' guide did not mention the parts set out in PAS 2035 which covered traditional construction or the need to employ professionals with knowledge of traditional construction.
- iv. Wanted the council to use those projects to comply with PAS 2035 requirements to get people that were appropriately qualified and also

because of the skills shortage to use these projects to get training happening in traditional buildings repair, refurbishment and retrofit.

### Question 3

- i. Expressed concern that 4 of the 12 budget proposals would result in significant service change and involved housing, anti-poverty action, refugees and asylum seekers and the homeless. These budget proposals would affect the most vulnerable people in society.
- ii. Referred to budget proposal S5103 to reduce the homelessness prevention grant and noted that there could be a disproportionate impact on those from ethnic minority groups.
- iii. The Council committed to providing site provision with South Cambridgeshire District Council and other organisations.
- iv. Asked why there was no funding for a transit site for the Gypsy Roma Traveller community set aside in this year's budget.

The Executive Councillor for Equalities, Anti-Poverty and Wellbeing responded:

- i. Explained the difference between transit sites, negotiated stopping places and permanent sites. Felt that focus should be on permanent site provision alongside negotiated stopping provision. Transit sites were long-term temporary sites and required similar levels of investment and provision to permanent sites.
- ii. In partnership with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council, the City Council was leading on the establishment of two officer working groups to identify appropriate negotiated stopping sites. A member group involving all three authorities was also being established. The groups would also be looking at potential permanent sites, which would be informed by the Gypsy Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTANA) once published.
- iii. Acknowledged that the GTANA had been delayed but site provision options were being worked up in the Greater Cambridge area.
- iv. The Local Plan would look at appropriate Gypsy Roma Traveller policies and site provision.
- v. Felt it was difficult to develop a budget proposal until a site had been identified. Wanted to focus on site identification. Once site(s) were

identified, work could then be undertaken to develop a budget bid / proposal.

- vi. Discussions were taking place around identifying locations for potential transit sites and it may be that negotiated stopping places could be managed within existing resources.
- vii. Noted that the Executive Councillor would be happy to meet with the public speaker outside of the meeting to discuss further.
- viii. The Executive Councillor for Housing advised that the Homeless Prevention Grants had not been cut, £50,000 per annum had been ring fenced for the contract regarding winter provision for rough sleepers.

#### Supplementary question

- i. Had been raising the issue about transit site provision since 2020. Asked when a timeline for when a site, permanent or transit, would be provided.
- ii. Questioned if the Council could provide a traveller site as had experienced difficulties elsewhere when going through the planning process.
- iii. Also raised the issue of the change in the 2015 definition of traveller and the impact this would have on the number of people who needed to be provided for.

#### Question 4

- i. Just over two years ago over 7000 people called for the re-opening of the wonderful, busy, thriving eclectic 7 day a week market. A market which contained traders who had continued to work during the covid 19 pandemic.
- ii. Traders set up their own delivery service in addition to working on the market so that people who were not able to get to the market could still be supplied with fresh fruit and vegetable and fish.
- iii. The market was busy on Saturday and Sundays but during the week stalls were empty.
- iv. Expressed concern regarding budget proposal II5138 to remove the traders' rebate.
- v. Felt the Council should do more to pro-actively support and promote the market or else the traders would go elsewhere.
- vi. Felt the council should remove the current requirement on weekend traders to take a pitch during the week. Weekday stalls which were paid



for but not filled were a blight on the market. The reduced charges on Mondays and Tuesdays had not been effective in attracting new traders, because weekend traders had taken up the spaces.

vii. Asked the Council to:

- a. put money into cleaning and re-furbishing the market
- b. promote the market via an inviting and informative web site
- c. discuss with the traders what they need for our market to thrive again.

The Executive Councillor for Environment, Climate Change and Biodiversity responded

- i. Did not feel that the market was failing and noted that as well as the project to renovate the market/market square to ensure the long-term future of the market, the council had been investing in the market recently e.g. each stall had a new canopy, there was a project to improve the electrics and the health and safety of the market during the day and when it was closed.
- ii. Noted there had always been difficulties to fill all the stalls throughout the week and noted that Mondays to Wednesdays were the quietest days.
- iii. One of their first decisions as an Executive Councillor was to lower fees at the beginning of the week to try and attract more traders.
- iv. The requirement for weekend traders to also have a stall during the week was to help increase occupancy on the quieter days.
- v. Acknowledged that since the pandemic, occupancy numbers had not picked up and Monday - Wednesday were still the quietest days. The Market Team had been exploring other options to increase occupancy.
- vi. Noted that there had been a move generally across the city centre to move away from retail to hot food businesses. There was a self-imposed limit for hot food stalls on the market and this was due to be reviewed.
- vii. The market was promoted on the radio, in posters and by local media. Officers would look into the suggestion of a web site.
- viii. The market was cleaned throughout the day, 7 days a week by the Streets and Open Spaces Team.
- ix. It was proposed as part of the market square project to re-lay the flooring which would make it more accessible and easier to clean.
- x. Acknowledged that relations between the council and traders had become strained followed the temporary closure of the market for public

health reasons just before the second lockdown. Felt that relations were now improving.

xi. Noted that work was being undertaken on an updated Litter Strategy.

#### Supplementary questions

- i. Noted reference by the Executive Councillor to the number of hot food stalls which had helped the market on Saturdays and Sundays but this also created problems as the fat from the hot food stalls spread.
- ii. Felt the eclectic nature of the market had been lost due to the number of hot food stalls.
- iii. Clarified that they did not mean that the market was failing now but with the Council's attrition and when traders went elsewhere that was when the market may fail.
- iv. Felt the litter issue was related to the number of hot food stalls.
- v. Referred to Ely's website for their market and thought something similar could be done for Cambridge.

### **23/4/CNL To consider the recommendations of the Executive for adoption**

#### **4a Executive Councillor for Housing: HRA Budget Setting Report (BSR) 2023/24**

An amended version of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget Setting Report (BSR) was presented to Council on the 23 February 2023 following a number of key changes which arose since Housing Scrutiny Committee met on the 24 January 2023. The changes are set out in the Housing Revenue Account Budget Setting Report (BSR) 2023/24 to Council. [Agenda for Council on Thursday, 23rd February, 2023, 6.00 pm - Cambridge Council](#). The report amended some of the Executive Councillor for Housing decisions which had previously been taken on 24 January 2023 and the Executive Councillor for Housing recommendations to Council on 23 February 2023.

#### **Decision of the Executive Councillor for Housing**

- i. Approved the Revised Budget identified in Section 4 and Appendix D (1) of the HRA Budget Setting Report, which reflects a net reduction in the use of HRA reserves for 2022/23 of £4,327,200.

- ii. Approved any Non-Cash Limit items identified in Section 4 of the HRA Budget Setting Report or shown in Appendix D (2) of the HRA Budget Setting Report.
- iii. Approved any Savings, Increased Income, Unavoidable Revenue Bids, Reduced Income Proposals and Bids, as shown in Appendix D (2) of the HRA Budget Setting Report.
- iv. Approved the resulting Housing Revenue Account revenue budget as summarised in the Housing Revenue Account Summary Forecast 2022/23 to 2027/28 shown in Appendix J of the HRA Budget Setting Report.

**Council Resolved (by 30 votes to 0) to:**

- i. Approve the revised need to borrow over the 30-year life of the business plan, with the first instance of this anticipated to be in 2023/24, to sustain the proposed level of investment, which includes ear-marking funding for delivery of the 10 Year New Homes Programme.
- ii. Recognise that the constitution delegates Treasury Management to the Head of Finance (Part 3, para 5.11), with Part 4F, C16 stating; 'All executive decisions on borrowing, investment or financing shall be delegated to the Head of Finance, who is required to act in accordance with CIPFA's Code of Practice for Treasury Management in Local Authorities.
- iii. Recognise that the decision to borrow significantly to build new homes impacts the authority's ability to set-aside resource to redeem the HRA Self-Financing debt at the point at which the loan portfolio matures, with the need to re-finance debt in the latter stages of the business plan.
- iv. Approve capital bids, as detailed in Appendix D (3) and Appendix E of the HRA Budget Setting Report.
- v. Approve the latest Decent Homes and Other HRA Stock Investment Programme, to include re-phasing of elements of the programme into later years, as detailed in Appendix E of the HRA Budget Setting Report.
- vi. Approve the latest budget sums, profiling and associated financing for all new build schemes, as detailed in Appendices E and H, and summarised in Appendix K, of the HRA Budget Setting Report.
- vii. Approve the allocation of £10,964,000 of funds from the budget ear-marked for the delivery of new homes into a scheme specific budget for East Road, in line with the scheme specific report presented as part of the committee cycle.
- viii. Approve the allocation of £11,387,366 000 of funds from the budget ear-marked for the delivery of new homes into a specific budget to allow the acquisition or development of a minimum of 30 homes for Ukrainian and Afghan refugees in 2023/24, subject to final award of DLUHC grant of

£4,968,683, with the original funding for new homes replaced in later years of the programme.

- ix. Approve the allocation of £2,000,000 of funds from the budget earmarked for the delivery of new homes into a specific budget for the acquisition of existing homes on potential future development sites.
- x. Approve the revised Housing Capital Investment Plan as shown in Appendix K of the HRA Budget Setting Report.
- xi. Approve inclusion of Disabled Facilities Grant expenditure and associated grant income from 2022/23 onwards, based upon 2022/23 net grant awarded, 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 any year, 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.
- xii. Approve delegation to the Head of Finance, as Section 151 Officer, to determine the most appropriate use of any additional Disabled Facilities Grant funding, for the wider benefit of the Shared Home Improvement Agency.
- xiii. Approve delegation to the relevant 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 recommendations made by the Shared Home Improvement Agency Board.
- xiv. Approve delegation to the relevant Director, in consultation with the Head of Finance, as Section 151 Officer, to draw down resource from the earmarked reserves 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 deadlines for the use of retained right to buy receipts or to facilitate future site redevelopment.
- xv. Approve delegation to the Head of Finance, as Section 151 Officer, to make any necessary technical amendments to detailed budgets in respect of recharges between the General Fund and the HRA, with any change in impact for the HRA to be reported and incorporated as part of the HRA Medium Term Financial Strategy in September 2023.
- xvi. Note the result of the Homes England Compliance Audit in respect of rough sleeper property acquisitions at confidential Appendix M, recognising there is no corrective action to be taken.

**4b** Executive Councillor for Finance, Resources and Transformation: Capital Strategy 2023/24

**Resolved (by 34 votes to 0):**

- i. Agree the capital strategy as set out in the officer's report and note the summary capital programme

**4c Executive Councillor for Finance, Resources and Transformation: Treasury Management Strategy Statement Report 2023/24 to 2025/26****Resolved (by 34 votes to 0) to:**

- i. Approve the report, including the estimated Prudential and Treasury Indicators for 2023/24 to 2026/27 (inclusive) as set out in Appendix C of the officer's report.

**23/5/CNL To consider Budget Recommendations of the Executive for adoption****5a Budget Setting Report (General Fund) 2023/24 to 2027/28**

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

The Liberal Democrat Group Members presented the Liberal Democrat Group's alternative budget as published on the City Council's website.

The Green and Independent Group Members presented the Green and Independent Group budget amendment and comments as published on the City Council's website.

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

8 votes in favour: Bick, Flaubert, Hauk, Lee, Levien, Nethsingha, Payne, Porrer

To 22 votes against: Ashton, Bennett, Bird, Carling, Collis, Davey, Divkovic, Gawthorpe Wood, Gilderdale, Healy, Herbert, McPherson, Pounds, Robertson, Sheil, Smart, A.Smith, S.Smith, Sweeney, Swift, Thornburrow, Todd-Jones

3 Abstentions: Copley, Davies, Howard

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 - the deletion of S5118 – Closing some Public Conveniences (see agenda item 5b - Liberal Democrat Group Amendment to the General Fund Budget p3)

The amendment was lost by:

12 votes in favour: Bennett, Bick, Copley, Davies, Flaubert, Hauk, Howard, Lee, Levien, Nethsingha, Payne, Porrer

To 21 votes against: Ashton, Bird, Carling, Collis, Davey, Divkovic, Gawthrope Wood, Gilderdale, Healy, Herbert, McPherson, Pounds, Robertson, Sheil, Smart, A.Smith, S.Smith, Sweeney, Swift, Thornburrow, Todd-Jones

Reference – the deletion in 2023/24 of – S5102 Cancel Big Weekend City Event (see agenda item 5b - Liberal Democrat Group Amendment to the General Fund Budget p3)

The amendment was lost by

8 votes in favour: Bick, Flaubert, Hauk, Lee, Levien, Nethsingha, Payne, Porrer

To 22 votes against: Ashton, Bennett, Bird, Carling, Collis, Davey, Divkovic, Gawthrope Wood, Gilderdale, Healy, Herbert, McPherson, Pounds, Robertson, Sheil, Smart, A.Smith, S.Smith, Sweeney, Swift, Thornburrow, Todd-Jones

3 Abstentions: Copley, Davies, Howard

In accordance with the Council's budget procedure, Councillor Bennett moved separately the following proposals, which formed part of the Green and Independent Group's budget amendments.

Reference A To reallocate the proposed £35k saving from the unused tourism budget (S5104) and the proposed £25k increased income from the cessation of the market traders Direct Debit reduction (II5138) to enable the recruitment of further staff to the central market team (see agenda item 5c – Green and Independent Group Budget Submission for General Fund p2)

The amendment was lost by:

4 votes in favour: Bennett, Copley, Davies, Howard

To 21 votes against: Ashton, Bird, Carling, Collis, Davey, Divkovic, Gawthrope Wood, Gilderdale, Healy, Herbert, McPherson, Pounds, Robertson, Sheil, Smart, A.Smith, S.Smith, Sweeney, Swift, Thornburrow, Todd-Jones

8 Abstentions: Bick, Flaubert, Hauk, Lee, Levien, Nethsingha, Payne, Porrer

Reference B To note and to reflect upon of the recommendations in section 3 and convene a cross party group to meet at regular intervals with a view to placing final proposals before full council in early 2024 (see agenda item 5c – Green and Independent Group Budget Submission for General Fund p2)

The amendment was lost by:

4 votes in favour: Bennett, Copley, Davies, Howard

To 21 votes against: Ashton, Bird, Carling, Collis, Davey, Divkovic, Gawthrope Wood, Gilderdale, Healy, Herbert, McPherson, Pounds, Robertson, Sheil, Smart, A.Smith, S.Smith, Sweeney, Swift, Thornburrow, Todd-Jones

8 Abstentions: Bick, Flaubert, Hauk, Lee, Levien, Nethsingha, Payne, Porrer

Unless otherwise stated, all references in the recommendations to sections, pages and appendices relate to Version 4.0 (Council) of the Budget Setting Report (BSR). This can be found via: [Agenda for Council on Thursday, 23rd February, 2023, 6.00 pm - Cambridge Council](#)

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

24 votes in favour: Ashton, Bennett, Bird, Carling, Collis, Copley Davey, Davies Divkovic, Gawthrope Wood, Gilderdale, Healy, Herbert, McPherson, Pounds, Robertson, Sheil, Smart, A.Smith, S.Smith, Sweeney, Swift, Thornburrow, Todd-Jones

To 9 Abstentions: Bick, Flaubert, Hauk, Howard Lee, Levien, Nethsingha, Payne, Porrer

To approve the following:

- i. Revenue Pressures and Bids shown in Appendix C(b) and Savings shown in Appendix C(c).
- ii. Non-Cash Limit items as shown in Appendix C(d).
- iii. Bids to be funded from External Funding sources as shown in Appendix C(e).
- iv. Delegate 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) which is set out in Appendix A(a).
- v. The level of Council Tax for 2023/24 as set out in Appendix A (b) and Section 2, page 2
- vi. Delegate to the Head of Finance authority to finalise changes relating to any further 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. The proposals outlined in Appendix D(a) for inclusion in the Capital Plan.
- viii. Subject to vii above, the revised Capital Plan for the General Fund as set out in Appendix D(c) and the Funding as set out in Section 5, page 17.
- ix. The impact of revenue budget approvals and the resulting contribution to reserves [Section 6, page 21].
- x. The creation of an Energy Cost Earmarked Reserve as set out in Section 6, page 21.
- xi. The resulting level of reserves [Section 6, page 21].
- xii. The Chief Finance Officer's Section 25 Report included in Section 8 of the BSR [page 32].
- xiii. The schedule of proposed fees and charges for 2023/24 in Appendix F.

**Under Council Procedure Rule 28 on the Mayor's proposal and Council agreement the meeting was adjourned until 6pm on Thursday 2 March.**

The meeting ended at 11.30 pm

**CHAIR**



# Public Document Pack

Council	Cnl/1	Thursday, 2 March 2023
---------	-------	------------------------

## COUNCIL

2 March 2023  
6.00 - 10.00 pm

**Present:** Councillors Ashton, D. Baigent, Bennett, Bick, Bird, Carling, Collis, Davey, S. Davies, Divkovic, Dryden, Flaubert, Gawthroe Wood, Gilderdale, Hauk, Healy, Herbert, Holloway, Howard, Levien, McPherson, Moore, Nethsingha, Pounds, Robertson, Scutt, A. Smith, Smart, S. Smith, Swift, Thittala Varkey, Thornburrow and Todd-Jones

Also present virtually Councillors Porrer and Sheil

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### 23/6/CNL Apologies

Apologies for the continuation of the adjourned meeting were received from Councillors S Baigent, Copley, Lee, Page-Croft, Payne and Sweeny.

Councillor Robertson and Thittala Varkey provided apologies for lateness.

### 23/7/CNL Declarations of Interest

Item	Councillor	Interest
All	D Baigent	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
23/16/CNL	Bird	Personal: Board Member of Cambridge Investment Partnership
23/16/CNL	Davey	Personal: Board Member of Cambridge Investment Partnership
23/12/CNL	Dryden	Personal: Is a Magistrate
23/12/CNL	Thittala Varkey	Personal: Occupation - Lawyer

### 23/8/CNL Public questions time

A member of the public asked the following question:

- i. Can you please confirm whether Labour Councillors will be whipped into voting for the congestion charge, proposed in the Greater Cambridge

Partnership's Making Connections public consultation, or will they be allowed a free vote and will residents know if the Council will be in favour or against the charge?

The Leader of the Council responded with the following.

- i. No decision had been made with regards to the Making Connections Survey in terms of the final scheme or if the scheme will go ahead.
- ii. A total of 24,000 people had completed the survey and hundreds of stakeholder groups; would be disrespectful to comment and make assumptions while the responses were being analysed.
- iii. There were negative connotations to the role of a party whip but the Labour group were a democratic socialist party and the whip was about the collective decision as a group.
- iv. Decisions were discussed robustly, and it was up to the Group to determine what the collective position was.
- v. There would not be a formal council vote on this issue as Cambridgeshire County Council as the Highways Authority would have the final vote.
- vi. The City Council held a seat on the GCP Board through Councillor D.Baigent. Once the consultation results were published the Labour Group as the ruling group would instruct the GCP Board representative on how to vote once a group decision had been made.

Supplementary public question:

- i. Members of the public were looking to the Council for their position on the matter of the congestion charge. It mattered to residents to know their Councillor's opinions and if residents were being supported in their own decision making.

The following statement was read out by the Head of Legal Services on behalf of a member of the public:

- i. We are seeing increasing numbers of privately owned e-scooters and illegally modified bicycles in the city.
- ii. I see dangerous use of these vehicles daily, numerous near misses, and several accidents.
- iii. It is illegal to ride an e-scooter anywhere on the road or in public spaces - apart from the Voi hire scooters. The privately owned ones often aren't speed limited, don't have two independent braking mechanisms, ability to indicate etc.
- iv. The modified bikes are more scary - often travelling at 40+ mph on footpaths and on 20mph limited roads.

- v. I'm not sure if the people buying and using these vehicles know that what they are doing could result in them getting 6+ points on their driving license and a fine (although those who obscure their faces when riding probably do). They are certainly becoming more socially acceptable, for example on the school run.
- vi. Could the Council run an information campaign, spelling out that the use of privately owned e-scooters in public spaces/roads is still illegal, and that there are regulations around modifying bicycles for use on the road?
- vii. There were plenty of [examples](#) of information leaflets from other councils online.

The Executive Councillor for Recovery, Employment and Community Safety responded with the following:

- i. Acknowledged there was a vast array of e-scooters being used around the city and was aware of several issues raised by residents concerning these vehicles.
- ii. The matter was regularly discussed at Area Committee meetings with the relevant officers.
- iii. Appreciated the comments made by the member of public concerning safety, particularly at night.
- iv. The Council promoted safe, sustainable, and legal travel but it was clear that there were serious issues which needed to be addressed.
- v. It was not just an issue for Cambridge but across the country.
- vi. Welcomed the suggestion of a publicity campaign which the Council could commit to. For the campaign to be effective, the Council needed to work with external agencies such as the Cambridge Vision Zero Road Safety Partnership, the Combined Authority, Cambridgeshire County Council, and the Police.
- vii. The Council had held an officer meeting in November 2022, with all relevant organisations which reviewed issues arising from e-scooters and mopeds and assigned actions to tackle these issues. Would go back to the group to suggest an engagement and information campaign.
- viii. Important to note that those drivers delivering food were paid on the number of deliveries which encouraged unsafe driving; needed to be careful when singling people out, needed to look at the businesses behind them and their terms and conditions.

## **23/9/CNL    Leader of the Council - Senior Management Review**

**Resolved (unanimously) to approve:**

- i. the deletion of the following posts at Director level: Director of Communities and Neighbourhoods; and Director of Enterprise and Sustainable Development; and
- ii. the creation of the following new posts at Director level: Director, Communities; Director, City Services; Chief Operating Officer.
- iii. the deletion of the following posts at Head of Service level: - Head of Commercial Services, Head of Community Services, Head of Corporate Strategy / Assistant Chief Executive, Head of Environmental Services, Head of Housing Maintenance and Assets, Head of Housing Services, Head of Human Resources, Head of Property Services, Head of Transformation
- iv. the creation of the following new posts at Assistant Director level, which will be composed of 2 levels: - Assets and Property (AD2) - Assistant Chief Executive (AD2) - Housing and Homelessness (AD1)
- v. noted that the following posts will be subject to slotting-in arrangements with new post titles: - Head of Finance to Chief Finance Officer (AD1) - Head of Housing Development Agency to Assistant Director, Development (AD1)
- vi. the creation of a new Head of People and a Head of Transformation on 2-year Fixed Term contracts at Band 11, while future leadership arrangements for 'Transformation, Digital and HR' are considered.
- vii. the Chief Executive is given delegated powers to take all steps necessary to implement the new structure (other than those delegated to the ESOC) including final determination of the Council's staffing structure below Director level, and
- viii. where specific changes to the Constitution are required the Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer should make such changes.

That the Council noted:

- i. the Head of 3C Shared Legal Services (Head of Service) and Council's Monitoring Officer becomes an Assistant Director grade (AD1) in the new grade structure.
- ii. the Head of Building Control (Head of Service) post will be reviewed once the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service management restructure has been fully implemented.
- iii. changes proposed to the senior officer Leadership Behaviours following feedback from the consultation (Annex B).
- iv. that the transitional Group structure will provide staff with certainty about line management arrangements and are a starting point for each Group organisational redesign (Annex C).

**23/10/CNL To consider the recommendations of Committees for adoption****7a Civic Affairs Committee: Pay Policy Statement 2023/24****Resolved (unanimously) to approve:**

- i. the draft Pay Policy Statement 2023/2024 attached to the officer's report as Appendix 1.
- ii. the pay proposals for Chief Executive, Director and Assistant Director level pay bands following the 2022 review of senior officer salaries and as they relate to the senior management review.
- iii. to delegate authority to the Head of Human Resources to update the Pay Policy Statement 2023/24 following consideration and approval of the proposed changes to the pay bands for the roles of Chief Executive, Director and Assistant Director

**7b Recommendations of Employment Senior Officer Committee 1 March 2023****Resolved (unanimously) to approve:**

- i. individual statutory and contractual termination costs over £100k (the posts described in the officer's report) arising from the SMR due to contractual severance.
- ii. delegate authority to the Chief Executive to implement termination of employment by reason of redundancy, arising from the SMR, where individual statutory and contractual costs are greater than £100k.

**23/11/CNL To deal with oral questions**

Question 1: Councillor Copley (moved by Councillor Bennett) to the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Infrastructure.

- i. The Government has announced "the environmental improvement plan" and in this that every household will be within a 15-minute walk of a green space or water. What will Council do to assess if we are meeting this for existing and new communities, and to ensure we deliver this access to green space if there are any residents denied this?

Executive Councillor response:

- i. Enhancing and developing Biodiversity and Green Spaces was one of the big themes for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan and set out in the First Proposals how policies would be developed seeking to increase and improve the network of habitats for wildlife, and green spaces for

- people, ensuring that development left the natural environment better than it was before.
- ii. It was vital to measure how well the Council was doing In terms of assessing those areas which had been identified if the needs were being met.
  - iii. The First Proposals was accompanied by the Green Infrastructure Opportunities mapping project, which used information gathered to identify priority areas. The report was available on the Greater Cambridge Planning website.
  - iv. A further study had been commissioned to inform the draft Local Plan looking at open space standards and how new spaces should be delivered, including being informed by Natural England's new Green Infrastructure Framework.
  - v. Officers were updating evidence looking at more formal open space types, such as updating the Council's playing pitch and courts strategies. The Council should therefore have a comprehensive set of information available to help plan to meet the needs of our communities, ensuring that any gaps would be filled.

Question 2: Councillor Bick to the Executive Councillor for Recovery, Employment and Community Safety.

As national planning controls have been relaxed, and patterns of retail behaviour and demands for space change, what can the council do to ensure that those retail stores that continue to constitute important local amenity remain at the centre of local communities?

Executive Councillor response:

- i. Our District, local, and neighbourhood centres are important to our communities, and help ensure services are available locally to where people live.
- ii. The adopted Cambridge Local Plan includes a policy that seeks to maintain thriving centres by controlling changes of use. As referenced in the question, these controls have been impacted by the new national land use class E which provides greater flexibility for certain changes to take place without planning permission.
- iii. Retail habits were changing, not just in the city centre, but across the city. The Council commissioned evidence to explore this and would be considering what new retail and centres policies were needed in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan so the Council could continue to support our centres through the planning decisions that were made.

- iv. Beyond planning, work was being undertaken to determine how to support local and small-scale businesses impacted by factors such as the cost-of-living crisis and the pandemic, with several grants available.

Question 3: Councillor Carling to Executive Councillor for Recovery, Employment and Community Safety.

With Sexual Abuse and Sexual Violence Awareness Week earlier in the month, please can you update on work that's going on to support and protect victims of sexual violence and abuse.

Executive Councillor response:

- i. The Council's work to support and protect victims of sexual violence and abuse was extremely important.
- ii. Work takes place on a continuous basis through partnership working, such as Cambridge BID, various charities, students, and police, on several areas, such as working to eliminate the sexual violence in the city centre.
- iii. Cambridge night-time economy was of a purple flag standard, ensuring that the City was safe place at night. The Council was part of the purple flag group providing taxi marshals through grant funding, running vulnerability and welfare training to night-time staff such as bouncers, bar staff or porters in the colleges.
- iv. The Council was also working to accredit licenced businesses and pubs to endorse establishments that had good practices.
- v. The Council also run an annual domestic violence conference which members of the public were invited to attend.

Question 4: Councillor McPherson to the Leader.

In the leader's role as board member for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, can she comment on why it was necessary to have a mayoral precept?

The Executive Councillor's response:

- i. The mayoral precept allowed an additional charge to council tax.
- ii. It was a huge responsibility to exercise the mayoral precept for the first time.
- iii. Public transport for the east of England continued to be chronically underfunded, the Government was spending £16 per head, half of what similar areas were receiving. The precept would fill some of the gap.

- iv. The addition of the mayoral precept would mean a further £1 a month on a band D home.
- v. The additional £3.5 million would be spent on public bus services which would allow the Combined Authority to support for a year eighteen full and five partial routes that had been cut by Stagecoach. These routes covered the whole of the Combined Authority area and included routes in and out of the city.

Question 5: Councillor Divkovic to Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Food Justice and Community Development.

With the herbicide free trial in Arbury and Newnham approaching an end, can the Executive Councillor give an update on any findings from the trial and next steps?

The Executive Councillor response:

- i. A report on the matter was due to be presented at the next Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee towards the end of the March.
- ii. The report would provide an update on the work that had been undertaken since the trial had begun in January 2022. This included an evaluation of the two trial wards, an appraisal of the happy bee street scheme and recommendations on further reduction or a complete stop of the use herbicides in the city.
- iii. There had been two ward walkabouts with local councillors highlighting areas of interest; remained concerned about accessibility issues that could arise (not yet occurred).
- iv. Early indications showed the trial had been positive, learning from collaborations from residents, councillors, and community groups.
- v. Looked forward to being able to go into further detail at the next Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee meeting.

Question 6: Councillor Flaubert to the Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Food Justice and Community Development.

Could the Executive Councillor please confirm progress on installing electricity to Hobson's Square in Trumpington?

The Executive Councillor's response:

- i. Since Hobson Square had been transferred to the Council, the Council has supported the use of trading, managed by the streets and open spaces team using the application of hire process.



- ii. There were a range of businesses operating in the permanent retail units around the Square. Now these businesses were paying rates and rent the original position that the square could be used for intermittent trading opportunities needed to be re-evaluated.
- iii. Many of the units offered food which if trading was allowed from the Square itself could have an impact on those businesses and this currently was not permitted.
- iv. The original design brief and the intended use was for community-based activities, and this should not be changed unless there was an impact to those permanent business units.
- v. The post transfer of power issues to the lamp columns in the square had been resolved. This could allow the potential to explore further provision of electric supply points to support events. An update would be provided to Council in the very near future.

Question 7: Councillor Sweeny (asked by Councillor Dryden) to the Leader.

With reference to item 11a, what are the leader's reflections on her first 3 months on the board and the value that the CPCA has for Cambridge city.

The Executive Councillor's response:

- i. The last three months had been a positive experience on underlining the work of the Combined Authority. Recent projects that they had supported were as follows:
  - The chalk stream project
  - Waterbeach solar farm
  - Cambridge south station
  - City Council's retro fit programme
  - Money to support inclusive economy projects across the city
  - 500 Cambridge City council homes across the city due the original devolution deal.
- ii. The Combined Authority brought a collective voice on a range of issues.
- iii. As acting Mayor had been invited to attend Parliament to address ministers on the needs to the region (including Cambridge).
- iv. Worked with other metro mayors to lobby on issues vital to communities across the country such as putting pressure on supermarkets to address the cost-of-living crisis.
- v. Struck by the words of Councillor Herbert (former Leader of the Council) 'Cambridge can't go it alone' when debating the introduction of a Combined Authority.
- vi. Cambridge was a city that attracted a lot of investment, and that investment should be shared with residents, not just a privileged few.

- vii. Huge benefit in working together better to address issues in Cambridge and the surrounding area.

Question 8: Councillor Todd-Jones to the Executive Councillor for Environment, Climate Change and Biodiversity

How is the council using its leadership role in the city to achieve our ambition of Cambridge to become a net zero carbon city.

The Executive Councillor's response:

- i. The Council was providing leadership on tackling the climate crisis, not just in the City but through the county.
- ii. In 2020/21 the Council launched Cambridge carbon training for council staff and councillors.
- iii. The Council were in partnership with Cambridge Carbon Footprint working on a project to offer Cambridge carbon literacy training to residents.
- iv. The retro fit guide had been launched in Autumn 2022.
- v. In the summer the new Green Business Programme would be launched in partnership with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Huntingdonshire District Council.
- vi. The new trusted contract framework would help push retro fit to homeowners and landlords.
- vii. The district heat project was also running,
- viii. The Council was part of the Climate Leaders conference, the next conference would be hosted by Cambridge University. The target was to create solutions to address the barriers of decarbonisation.
- ix. Funding had been obtained to explore the financial barriers of decarbonisation on several different work streams working with external partners.
- x. There was also the Cambridge Climate Forum bringing together all the environmental groups in the city.

Question 9: Councillor S Smith to the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Infrastructure.

The Cambridge Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) is delayed. How does this affect our emerging Local Plan schedule?

The Executive Councillor response:

- i. The draft Cambridge Water WRMP was published on 24th February. This was considerably later than anticipated.
- ii. Officers would now be looking into what it means for the plan, as discussed in the reports to the January Planning and Transport Scrutiny committee.
- iii. In terms of the overall programme for the local plan work continued with the preparation of draft plan to be reported to members later this year.

Question 10: Councillor Lee (moved by Councillor Bick) to the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport.

Could the Leader of the Council advise us whether the Voi scooter scheme is going to be extended? While the scheme is not entirely without hiccups, it's been a benefit to many across the city especially those who can't drive and don't know how to cycle and so some clarity on the future of the scheme would be wonderful for them

The Executive Councillor response:

- i. The scheme had been extended until 31 May 2024 as managed by CPCA under new provisions from the Department of Transport.
- ii. These provisions were introduced to allow more time to monitor and appraise the effectiveness of the existing national trials (including Cambridge).
- iii. The extensions would allow time to bring forward new legislation of a new vehicle category covering the use of low speed zero admissions vehicles including e-scooters on public roads.
- iv. This would be the third extension by the Department of Transport.
- v. The extension would allow a valuable addition to the urban transport scene and encourage the move away from polluting alternatives and the scheme offers affordable transport for those without other transport choices.
- vi. Currently there were 900 e scooters and 150 e bikes, Voi had asked for an increase to 1400, officers felt this would be too many but ultimately it would be the Combined Authority's decision.

**23/12/CNL To consider the following notices of motion, notice of which has been given by:**

Councillor Ashton - Appointment to the post of Honorary Recorder of Cambridge

Councillor Ashton proposed and Councillor McPherson seconded the following motion:

- i. To appoint His Honour Judge Mark Bishop to the post of Honorary Recorder of Cambridge for as long as they hold the position of Resident Judge at Cambridge Crown Court.

**Resolved (unanimously)** to support the motion.

### **23/13/CNL Councillor Gilderdale & Councillor Pounds -Protecting Workers' Right to Strike**

Councillor Gilderdale proposed, and Councillor Pounds seconded the following motion:

The council acknowledges:

- i. The vital work that trade unions play in workplaces in Cambridge and beyond;
- ii. That the right to strike is a fundamental human right;
- iii. That without unions, we would not enjoy many of the workplace rights we have today.

The council notes:

- i. That unionised workplaces are more likely to have better terms and conditions, higher wages, improved maternity, paternity and carer leave policies, better job stability for staff, as well as stronger health and safety arrangements.
- ii. That the UK has the most restrictive anti-union laws and some of the tightest regulations on strikes in Europe.
- iii. That the Government intends to introduce the Minimum Service Levels Bill covering six service sectors, which the TUC has described as an 'attack' on the right to strike.
- iv. That the intention of this legislation would require Unions and employers to agree minimum levels of service during times of strike action, and in the event of no agreement Government Ministers could impose these limits, with Unions then liable to be sued and workers potentially dismissed if they don't comply.
- v. This legislation has raised many concerns with some legal experts noting that there are likely to be legal challenges raised.

The council believes:

- i. That industrial disputes are best resolved through negotiation not measures designed to undermine and potentially outlaw industrial action.

The council resolves to:

- i. Stand in solidarity with striking workers who are fighting for better pay and conditions.
- ii. Continue to work alongside the local Trades Council on relevant work such as the TUC's 'Stay Safe, Join a Union' Campaign and 'Heart Unions Week'.
- iii. Write a letter from the leader of the council to the Prime Minister and Business Secretary Kemi Badenoch, outlining this council's **concerns and opposition to the Minimum Service Levels Bill**.

**Resolved (unanimously)** to support the motion.

### **23/14/CNL Councillor Howard & Councillor Bennett - Cost of Living Emergency and Making Connections**

Councillor Howard proposed and Councillor Bennett seconded the following motion:

This Council resolves to write to the CEO of the Greater Cambridge Partnership ("GCP") and advise her that Cambridge City Council has declared a Cost of Living Emergency in Cambridge.

The Council requests that the GCP considers the Cost of Living Emergency when reviewing the Making Connections consultation and preparing proposals for review by the County Council at a later date.

The Council requests that the GCP gives particular consideration to the economic impact on city residents, city businesses and city commuters.

The council requests that the GCP gives particular consideration to the primary impact on small business and the secondary impact on residents' cost of living.

The council requests that the GCP considers reliefs and exemptions for small businesses and other organisations in the city including but not limited to a corresponding discount or exemption for businesses and any other organisations in receipt of small business rates relief or any other business rates reduction in force at the start of the financial year in which any congestion charge is made.

The council notes that the current Making Connections consultation draft includes unspecified reliefs and exemptions for individuals on low incomes and requests that the GCP reviews these to ensure that exemptions and discounts are sufficient to avoid financial hardship. The council notes that a number of

proposals for such exemptions have already been submitted to GCP during the public consultation and accordingly does not wish to put forward new proposals at this stage.

The council requests that the GCP publishes a formal socio-economic impact on the city of Cambridge of the effect of any “Making Connections” proposal before it is put before the County Council and that the workings and modelling behind that socio-economic impact be published and independently audited.

Notes:

1 The GCP “Making Connections” consultation which currently includes a congestion charge proposal closed on 23 December 2022

2 It is the intention of the GCP to place a proposal based on the responses to that consultation before the County Council in June 2023.

3 The GCP do not require the approval of the city council or any other district council for their proposals.

4 On Thursday 21 July 2022, the city council unanimously voted to declare a Cost of Living Emergency.

5 Among other provisions, this committed the council to:

- a. Ensure that council decisions are not disproportionately impacting on residents who are struggling the most,
- b. through introducing a socio-economic duty and separately considering socio-economic impacts in all our equality impact assessments.

6 There can be no doubt that the cost of living emergency continues and that Cambridge is not immune.

7 Cost of living pressure on residents is expected to continue for three years (at the date of this motion) and still be of concern to residents on the proposed congestion charge introduction date.

8 The full impact on cost of living from the national government Conservative mini budget maxi shambles last Autumn and subsequent interest rate rises has yet to be felt. This is because of the high proportion of mortgage loans financed by fixed term fixed rate mortgages. Until the fixed term runs out, the mortgage payments stay the same.

9 Shop and hospitality business closures are running at the highest rate for 5 years.

10 Cllrs Howard and Bennett propose to publish an updated note on 2 March 2023 if any of the economic indicators published before that date show any material change.

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor A. Smith seconded the following amendment to motion (deleted text ~~struckthrough~~, additional text underlined)

~~This Council resolves to write to the CEO of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (“GCP”) and advise her that Cambridge City Council has declared a Cost of Living Emergency in Cambridge.~~

~~The Council requests that the GCP considers the Cost of Living Emergency when reviewing the Making Connections consultation and preparing proposals for review by the County Council at a later date.~~

~~The Council requests that the GCP gives particular consideration to the economic impact on city residents, city businesses and city commuters.~~

~~The council requests that the GCP gives particular consideration to the primary impact on small business and the secondary impact on residents’ cost of living.~~

~~The council requests that the GCP considers reliefs and exemptions for small businesses and other organisations in the city including but not limited to a corresponding discount or exemption for businesses and any other organisations in receipt of small business rates relief or any other business rates reduction in force at the start of the financial year in which any congestion charge is made.~~

~~The council notes that the current Making Connections consultation draft includes unspecified reliefs and exemptions for individuals on low incomes and requests that the GCP reviews these to ensure that exemptions and discounts are sufficient to avoid financial hardship. The council notes that a number of proposals for such exemptions have already been submitted to GCP during the public consultation and accordingly does not wish to put forward new proposals at this stage.~~

~~The council requests that the GCP publishes a formal socio-economic impact on the city of Cambridge of the effect of any “Making Connections” proposal~~

before it is put before the County Council and that the workings and modelling behind that socio-economic impact be published and independently audited.

Notes:

- ~~1 The GCP "Making Connections" consultation which currently includes a congestion charge proposal closed on 23 December 2022~~
- ~~2 It is the intention of the GCP to place a proposal based on the responses to that consultation before the County Council in June 2023.~~
- ~~3 The GCP do not require the approval of the city council or any other district council for their proposals.~~
- ~~4 On Thursday 21 July 2022, the city council unanimously voted to declare a Cost of Living Emergency.~~
- ~~5 Among other provisions, this committed the council to:~~
  - ~~**a. Ensure that council decisions are not disproportionately impacting on residents who are struggling the most,**~~
  - ~~**b. through introducing a socio-economic duty and separately considering socio-economic impacts in all our equality impact assessments.**~~
- ~~6 There can be no doubt that the cost of living emergency continues and that Cambridge is not immune.~~
- ~~7 Cost of living pressure on residents is expected to continue for three years (at the date of this motion) and still be of concern to residents on the proposed congestion charge introduction date.~~
- ~~8 The full impact on cost of living from the national government Conservative mini budget maxi shambles last Autumn and subsequent interest rate rises has yet to be felt. This is because of the high proportion of mortgage loans financed by fixed term fixed rate mortgages. Until the fixed term runs out, the mortgage payments stay the same.~~
- ~~9 Shop and hospitality business closures are running at the highest rate for 5 years.~~



~~10 Cllrs Howard and Bennett propose to publish an updated note on 2 March 2023 if any of the economic indicators published before that date show any material change.~~

- The GCP 'Making Connections' consultation, which closed before Christmas, has received over 24,000 responses. No decisions about whether or how to proceed with the proposals will be made until the responses have been fully analysed.
- The City council has previously declared cost of living<sup>1</sup>, climate and biodiversity emergencies, and its representatives on the GCP board and assembly have been consistently clear that any scheme must reflect this and avoid disproportionately disadvantaging the most vulnerable; and it is satisfied these will be considered in the preparation of any proposals.
- The GCP scheme in its current form has proposed a wide range of mitigations for medical reasons, disabilities and low incomes. Its ultimate aim is to provide outstanding public transport. For any scheme to be endorsed after the consultation responses have been analysed, it is a key principle that any charge is contingent on the provision first of new and improved bus routes which will be more affordable, more extensive and more frequent than has previously been possible.
- Those on lowest incomes are often disproportionately affected by climate change, and are often the most reliant on public transport<sup>2</sup>. The high cost of fuel will only exacerbate this problem.
- Public transport in the East of England is chronically under-funded, with many residents, students and workers having no option currently but to drive a car to enter the city, assuming that they are able to drive at all.
- In Cambridge, public transport's performance and viability as an alternative to the private car is also hampered by the same congestion experienced by all road users.

---

<sup>1</sup> On Thursday 21 July 2022, the city council unanimously voted to declare a Cost of Living Emergency. Among other provisions, this committed the council to:

a. Ensure that council decisions are not disproportionately impacting on residents who are struggling the most,  
b. through introducing a socio-economic duty and separately considering socio-economic impacts in all our equality impact assessments.

<sup>2</sup> The ONS reports that only 35% of the lowest income households in the UK own at least one car compared to 94% in higher income groups ([Percentage of households with cars by income group, tenure and household composition: Table A47 - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](#))

- The 'Making Connections' proposals have never been designed as punitive. The Sustainable Travel proposals seek to find solutions to our public transport problem, such as reducing bus fares, increasing routes and providing greater hours and frequency of operation, in order to provide people with viable and affordable alternatives to driving a private car and to enable as many as possible to avoid needing to pay to use a private car.
- Our small and medium-sized businesses play a crucial role in the economy of our city. They experience both the problems caused by congestion and poor public transport, and their input is invaluable in addressing these issues.
- The consultation period has been about listening to the needs of residents, students, workers and businesses which will be carefully analysed to ensure that any scheme that is put forward, takes account of the needs of the people who live and work in our city.
- The council notes that the GCP has published draft 'Social and Distributional Impact Assessment', draft 'Equality Impact Assessment', draft 'Health Impact Assessment', and that these documents will be updated and republished alongside the proposals expected this summer.

-

This council therefore:

- Reiterates its commitment to the consultative process by listening to the responses of the 24,000+ people who have responded, and considers it is only right that council does not pre-empt the results of that consultation by making a decision on the future of any scheme until the responses have been analysed.
- Believes that any scheme put forward must consider the overall balance of environmental, economic and social impacts on our residents, students, workers and businesses.
- Supports the GCP board and assembly in giving particular consideration to the future economic and social impact of any proposals on city residents, businesses, workers and students, including the impacts on small businesses and residents' cost of living.
- Requests that the GCP continues to consider appropriate reliefs and exemptions for all those who may be disproportionately affected by any scheme.
- Continues to acknowledge the need lying behind the Making Connections proposals, and supports the overall objectives to provide

better, greener, cheaper public transport for all, as originally laid out by the Citizens' Assembly. "

The amendment was carried by 22 votes to 1.

**Resolved (by 24 votes to 0) that:**

This Council

- The GCP 'Making Connections' consultation, which closed before Christmas, has received over 24,000 responses. No decisions about whether or how to proceed with the proposals will be made until the responses have been fully analysed.
- The City council has previously declared cost of living<sup>3</sup>, climate and biodiversity emergencies, and its representatives on the GCP board and assembly have been consistently clear that any scheme must reflect this and avoid disproportionately disadvantaging the most vulnerable; and it is satisfied these will be considered in the preparation of any proposals.
- The GCP scheme in its current form has proposed a wide range of mitigations for medical reasons, disabilities and low incomes. Its ultimate aim is to provide outstanding public transport. For any scheme to be endorsed after the consultation responses have been analysed, it is a key principle that any charge is contingent on the provision first of new and improved bus routes which will be more affordable, more extensive and more frequent than has previously been possible.
- Those on lowest incomes are often disproportionately affected by climate change, and are often the most reliant on public transport<sup>4</sup>. The high cost of fuel will only exacerbate this problem.
- Public transport in the East of England is chronically under-funded, with many residents, students and workers having no option currently but to drive a car to enter the city, assuming that they are able to drive at all.
- In Cambridge, public transport's performance and viability as an alternative to the private car is also hampered by the same congestion experienced by all road users.

---

<sup>3</sup> On Thursday 21 July 2022, the city council unanimously voted to declare a Cost of Living Emergency. Among other provisions, this committed the council to:

a. Ensure that council decisions are not disproportionately impacting on residents who are struggling the most,  
b. through introducing a socio-economic duty and separately considering socio-economic impacts in all our equality impact assessments.

<sup>4</sup> The ONS reports that only 35% of the lowest income households in the UK own at least one car compared to 94% in higher income groups ([Percentage of households with cars by income group, tenure and household composition: Table A47 - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](#))

- The 'Making Connections' proposals have never been designed as punitive. The Sustainable Travel proposals seek to find solutions to our public transport problem, such as reducing bus fares, increasing routes and providing greater hours and frequency of operation, in order to provide people with viable and affordable alternatives to driving a private car and to enable as many as possible to avoid needing to pay to use a private car.
- Our small and medium-sized businesses play a crucial role in the economy of our city. They experience both the problems caused by congestion and poor public transport, and their input is invaluable in addressing these issues.
- The consultation period has been about listening to the needs of residents, students, workers and businesses which will be carefully analysed to ensure that any scheme that is put forward, takes account of the needs of the people who live and work in our city.
- The council notes that the GCP has published draft 'Social and Distributional Impact Assessment', draft 'Equality Impact Assessment', draft 'Health Impact Assessment', and that these documents will be updated and republished alongside the proposals expected this summer.

This council therefore:

- Reiterates its commitment to the consultative process by listening to the responses of the 24,000+ people who have responded, and considers it is only right that council does not pre-empt the results of that consultation by making a decision on the future of any scheme until the responses have been analysed.
- Believes that any scheme put forward must consider the overall balance of environmental, economic and social impacts on our residents, students, workers and businesses.
- Supports the GCP board and assembly in giving particular consideration to the future economic and social impact of any proposals on city residents, businesses, workers and students, including the impacts on small businesses and residents' cost of living.
- Requests that the GCP continues to consider appropriate reliefs and exemptions for all those who may be disproportionately affected by any scheme.
- Continues to acknowledge the need lying behind the Making Connections proposals, and supports the overall objectives to provide better, greener, cheaper public transport for all, as originally laid out by the Citizens' Assembly. "

**23/15/CNL Councillor Nethsingha - Türkiye and Syria**

Councillor Nethsingha proposed and Councillor Herbert seconded the following motion which had been altered under Council Rules no:26 (alteration of motion), additional text underlined:

- i. This Council notes with horror the shocking scale of devastation and loss of life following the earthquake in southern Türkiye and northern Syria.
- ii. This Council expresses its profound support for and solidarity with all those suffering as a result of the earthquake, both those facing trauma and loss in the region, and those here in the UK who grieve for family and friends and the damage to communities. We commit to work closely with the Turkish and Syrian communities here in Cambridge to understand how we can best support the relief and recovery effort.
- iii. This Council also calls upon the UK government, parliamentary representatives, and spokespeople to explore whether a scheme similar to the Ukraine Family Scheme could be set up to allow those who have been made homeless and who have family in the UK to travel here and remain in safety while recovery in the region takes place.

**Resolved (unanimously)** to support the motion.

**23/16/CNL Councillor Payne & Councillor Bick - Murketts Garage Site**

Councillor Levien proposed (in Councillor Payne's absence) and Councillor Bick seconded the following motion:

The Council welcomes the recent city council-funded acquisition of the former Murketts Garage site on Histon Road through the Cambridge Investment Partnership, the joint venture between the City Council and private developer Hill. It notes the intention to develop it for a mixture of market and social housing, similar to the Ironworks and Timberworks developments.

At the outset of this new scheme, Council calls for a clear commitment that, unlike Ironworks and Timberworks, overseas property investors will not be targeted for sales, which inflates the local housing market for all, and that marketing will focus on purchasers planning to live or work in Cambridge whether they be from the UK or elsewhere.

Councillor Davey seconded and Councillor Bird proposed the following amendment to the motion (deleted text ~~struck through~~, additional text underlined):

The Council welcomes the recent city council-funded acquisition of the former Murketts Garage site on Histon Road through the Cambridge Investment Partnership, the joint venture between the City Council and private developer Hill. It notes the intention to develop it for a mixture of market and social housing, similar to the Ironworks and Timberworks developments.

At the outset of this new scheme, Council wishes to make clear ~~calls for a clear commitment that, unlike Ironworks and Timberworks, overseas property investors will not be targeted for sales, which inflates the local housing market for all, and that~~ marketing will continue to focus on purchasers planning to live or work in Greater Cambridge, whether they be from the UK or elsewhere.

The amendment was carried by 27 votes to 5.

**Resolved (by 27 votes to 5) that:**

- i. The Council welcomes the recent city council-funded acquisition of the former Murketts Garage site on Histon Road through the Cambridge Investment Partnership, the joint venture between the City Council and private developer Hill. It notes the intention to develop it for a mixture of market and social housing, similar to the Ironworks and Timberworks developments.
- ii. At the outset of this new scheme, Council wishes to make clear that marketing will continue to focus on purchasers planning to live or work in Greater Cambridge, whether they be from the UK or elsewhere.

**23/17/CNL Councillor A Smith- Mandatory Voter ID**

Councillor A. Smith proposed, and Councillor Nethsingha seconded the following motion which had been altered under Council Rules no:26 (alteration of motion), deleted text ~~struck through~~, additional text underlined:

This Council notes that:

- The Government intends to implement mandatory photo voter ID at the local elections in May 2023.

- Over 2 million voters are estimated to need the government-issued voter ID cards<sup>5</sup>.
- Only 10,000 people have applied so far for these, representing just 0.5% of those who might need the new cards<sup>6</sup>.
- Parliament's Joint Committee on Human Rights have said that the impact of the proposals may fall disproportionately on those with protected characteristics<sup>7</sup>.
- The Electoral Reform Society has called the project 'an expensive distraction' which may disproportionately disadvantage already disadvantaged groups. They say that the Government's own figures suggest that this project will cost £180,000,000 a decade.<sup>8</sup>
- The electoral commission have been given a budget of £5,650,000 to spend on advertising, resources and research for this project<sup>9</sup>.
- The Local Government Association has expressed serious concerns about the implementation of this project for May 2023 and is calling for a delay<sup>10</sup>.
- The Chief Executive of the Association of Electoral Administrators has raised concerns about the safety of staff in polling stations.<sup>11</sup>

This Council believes that:

- Any democratic deficit could be better addressed by reaching out to the estimated 9 million people who are currently not on the electoral roll at all, or by seeking to raise electoral turnout, rather than putting up barriers to voting.
- The Government should abandon this costly project which will undermine, not enhance, democracy.
- At the very least, the Government should delay implementation, to avoid the risk of significant disenfranchisement.

### **This Council resolves to:**

- call upon the Government to:

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://committees.parliament.uk/committee/93/human-rights-joint-committee/news/157247/voter-id-law-must-be-shown-to-be-necessary-and-proportionate/>

<sup>66</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2023/jan/31/only-10000-people-in-uk-have-applied-for-government-issued-voter-id>

<sup>7</sup> <https://committees.parliament.uk/committee/93/human-rights-joint-committee/news/157247/voter-id-law-must-be-shown-to-be-necessary-and-proportionate/>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.electoral-reform.org.uk/campaigns/voter-id/>

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/angela-rayner-britain-sarah-olney-labour-government-b2258668.html>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.local.gov.uk/about/news/lga-statement-parliamentary-vote-plans-introduce-voter-id>

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2022/dec/10/council-leaders-urge-ministers-to-delay-plans-for-photo-id-at-may-elections>

- delay the requirement for photo ID in the May 2023 elections
- Review the entire project, with a view to scrapping it ~~give serious consideration to scrapping the project entirely and focussing on other actions more likely to improve democratic engagement~~
- undertake to cover fully the additional costs arising for councils due to the implementation of the Elections Act 2022
- Ask the leader to write to our Cambridge MPs informing them of this motion and asking them to share our concerns with Central Government, and ask the leader to write to Michael Gove asking him to act.
- Publicise this motion and do all it can locally to urge voters to make sure they have the necessary voter ID.

**Resolved (unanimously)** to support the motion.

### **23/18/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.

### **23/19/CNL Officer Urgent Decisions**

**23/19/CNLa** Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority- Appointment of the Council's Board member and substitute member

The decision was noted.

**23/19/CNLb** Approval of Additional Energy Investment 2023/24

The decision was noted

**23/19/CNLc** Approval of funding to Cambridge Investment Partnership for a land purchase (former Murketts Garage Site, Histon Road Cambridge)

The decision was noted

**23/19/CNLd** £500M Local Authority Housing Fund Refugee Scheme – Approval to Deliver Longer Term Humanitarian Scheme Accommodation Through the 22-32 New Build Housing Programme, Partly Funded by Central Government

The decision was noted.

The meeting ended at 10.00 pm

**CHAIR**



## CIVIC AFFAIRS

15 May 2023  
5.30pm - 5.42 pm

**Present:** Councillors McPherson (Chair), Bennett, Carling, Davey, Hauk and Thornburrow

Councillor Bick was also in attendance.

## FOR ADOPTION BY THE COUNCIL

### 23/15/Civ – Civic Affairs: Committee Appointments

The report detailed the issues to consider following the local elections on 4 May 2023 and make recommendations to the Annual Meeting of the Council on 25 May 2023. The Democratic Services Manager advised that an updated paper which was circulated at the meeting confirmed the size of committees and known appointments, further information would be provided at the Annual Meeting.

**Resolved** (unanimously) to recommend to Council:

i. Appointments to city council committees and joint partner bodies below:

**Environment and Communities Scrutiny Committee 8** (5 Labour + 2 Lib Dem + 1 Green and Independent)

Divkovic, Nestor, Swift, Wade, Pounds

Payne, Hauk

Glasberg

Alternates – Sheil, Griffin, Flaubert, Levien, Howard

**Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee 8** (5 Labour + 2 Lib Dem + 1 Green and Independent)

Nestor, Baigent, Swift, TBC, TBC

Porrer, Bick

Davies

Alternates – Griffin, Lab TBC, Lee, Payne, Glasberg

**Housing Scrutiny Committee 9** (6 Labour + 2 Lib Dem + 1 Green and Independent)

Pounds, Robertson, Thittala-Varkey, Wade, Holloway, Griffin

Martinelli, Lee

Tong

Alternates: Swift, Lab TBC, Howard, Porrer, Levien

**Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee 8** (5 Labour + 2 Lib Dem + 1 Green and Independent)

Robertson, Baigent, Holloway, Gawthroe Wood, TBC

Bick, Young

Bennett

Alternates – Divkovic, Sheil, Payne, Nethsingha, Davies

**Civic Affairs Committee 6** (4 Labour + 1 Lib Dem +1 Green & Independent)

McPherson, Davey, Sheil, Healy

Young

Bennett

Alternate – Moore, Davies, Bick

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

Healy, Moore, Davey, Carling

Bick, Porrer

Alternates: TBC

**Licensing Committee** 10 (7 Labour + 2 Lib Dem + 1 Green and Independent)

McPherson, Bird, Moore, Griffin, Carling, Pounds, Wade

Levien, Nethsingha

Bennett

Alternates – Davey, Hauk, Tong

**Planning Committee** 9 (6 Labour + 2 Lib Dem + 1 Green and Independent)

Smart, Baigent, Thornburrow, Carling, S.Smith, Dryden

Porrer, Levien

Bennett

Alternates – Gilderdale, Nestor, Flaubert, Nethsingha, Howard

**Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority** - 1 seat

A.Smith

Alternate - TBC

**Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee** 2 Labour

TBC, TBC

Alternates – Gawthrope Wood

**Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Audit and Governance Committee** 1

Labour + one alternate

S.Smith

Alternate – Pounds

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

S.Smith, Thornburrow, Bick

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

S.Smith, Baigent, Smart, Thornburrow

Porrer, Flaubert

Alternates – Gilderdale, Nestor, Levien, Nethsingha

ii. Nominations for Chairs and Vice-Chairs 2023/24

**Environment and Communities Services**

Chair - Divkovic

Vice-chair – Nestor

**Planning and Transport**

Chair – Nestor

Vice-chair – Baigent

**Housing**

Chair – Pounds

Vice-chair (nb. Tenant/Leaseholder is Chair of Part 1 of the meeting) - Robertson

**Strategy and Resources**

Chair-Robertson

Vice-chair - Baigent

**Civic Affairs**

Chair - McPherson

Vice-chair - Davey

**Licensing**

Chair - McPherson

Vice-chair - Bird

**Planning**

Chair - Smart

Vice-chair – Baigent

**JDCC**

Vice-Chair – S.Smith