



## Cambridge City Council Notice of Council

**Date:** Thursday, 19 October 2023

**Time:** 6.00 pm

**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, 19 October 2023 at 6.00 pm and I hereby summon you to attend.

Dated 11 October 2023

Yours faithfully

Robert Pollock

Chief Executive

### Agenda

- 1 Minutes (Pages 13 - 56)
- 2 Mayor's announcements
- 3 Public questions time
- 4 To consider the recommendations of Committees for adoption
- 4a Civic Affairs Committee 18 October 2023  
As the Committee does not meet until the day before the Council meeting, the officer report will be circulated in the Information Pack and the recommendations will be published in the morning of 19

October 2023.

5 To deal with oral questions

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

6a Councillor Bick - A Unitary Council

Council notes its past interest in reform of local government structure in our area, reflected in the motion overwhelmingly supported by members in November 2014\* and the renewed public interest in it today.

Council notes that:

1. Although many important partnership relationships are in place between this and other councils, that the current fragmentation of responsibilities and decision-making presents an unhelpful hurdle to strategic focus on the big range of issues which bind the city of Cambridge and the south of the county, affecting lives and livelihoods of all our residents.
2. This fragmentation frequently leaves our residents confused about the location of responsibilities and accountability.
3. Past doubts about the critical mass required to justify unitary status are being dispelled by recent and projected population growth in our area.

Council re-affirms its belief that:

1. Power should reside as close to people as is consistent with effective decisions that impact them.
2. For purposeful, democratic government, we should aspire to a single tier council, framed around the logical community of interest within an economic subregion: a shared area of identity within which most people both live and work.
3. In our situation this would mean a unitary council for the southern part of Cambridgeshire.

In addition it affirms:

1. Its continue commitment to the many, complex partnership

arrangements of which it is a part as the best available current means of pursuing joined-up decision-making so long as local government structure remains as it is.

2. Its awareness that even with a unitary council, working co-operatively and supportively with our neighbours would remain mutually essential.
3. That the increasing expectations of change and economic growth that face us in this area make it no longer optimal that we have less dedicated local self-government than city areas such as Peterborough, York, Bedford, Reading or Bath.
4. Its belief that a unitary council would better connect our residents to their representatives and service providers, and improve joined-up decision-making, and strengthen our voice in dialogue with central government.

Accordingly, Council renews its call on the Leader and Chief Executive to participate in discussions with other Cambridgeshire authorities and government to build a consensus for a new single tier authority for the south of the county with appropriate solutions for the remainder.

\*Motion passed on November 6 2014 by 37 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions from the minutes

**Resolved** (by 37 votes to 0, with 3 abstentions) that:

Council notes:

- i. The urgent need to increase the relevance of public decision making to people's daily lives and to rejuvenate our local democracy.
- ii. The opportunity to tackle this in an appropriate way in England following the Scottish referendum and the commitments made there for increased devolution from Westminster.
- iii. The recent report of the RSA City Growth Commission presenting just the latest evidence that city regions, if empowered to do so, can serve to boost national economic

growth.

- iv. The groundswell of support in the local business community for a single council providing coordinated, accountable leadership for the Greater Cambridge area.
- v. The welcome debate opened up at the County Council for alternative approaches to local government in our area, to which the City Council will be asked to participate.

Council believes that:

- i. The survival of the proud tradition of municipal innovation and enterprise, which historically transformed social conditions and enabled strides in prosperity is under threat from the control tendencies of all recent governments.
- ii. There is much to do in our area, yet too often our locally elected representatives are circumscribed from taking actions that local people expect of them.
- iii. Both the unwieldy structure of local government covering the city of Cambridge and the centralisation of the vast majority of revenues arising from the area are major sources of frustration with the democratic process.
- iv. Power should reside as close to people as is consistent with making effective decisions that impact them.
- v. Irrespective of demarcations between councils, voluntary collaborations between them are being shown to offer economies of scale and critical mass where needed for cost effective service delivery.
- vi. For purposeful democratic, local government we should aspire to a single tier council framed around the logical community of interest within an economic sub region: a shared area of identity within which most people both live and work;

Council calls on the Leader and Chief Executive to:

- i. Participate in discussions with other Cambridgeshire authorities and Peterborough to seek a consensus for a single tier solution of several unitary authorities including one for greater Cambridge, and a local referendum if supported in principle, including full involvement of residents, local community organisations, the business community and Universities.
- ii. Seek in the interim negotiations with central Government on the Greater Cambridge City Deal acceleration of the already proposed legislation to enable a Greater Cambridge combined authority.
- iii. Develop and articulate the case for:
  - a. The retention without strings of a majority of the public revenues arising in this area from business rates and other property based taxation, allowing for the remainder to be redeployed nationally for equalisation.
  - b. Local accountability to local people for setting business rates and council tax levels.
  - c. Clear devolution of powers from Whitehall, working in partnership with Cambridgeshire councils, Peterborough and similar city regions, to remove obstacles to sustainable growth for Greater Cambridge including
    - i. Lifting the Housing Revenue Account cap and transferring related housing powers
    - ii. Addressing additional strategic transport infrastructure that is essential but not covered by the City Deal or already agreed
    - iii. Increasing capital and revenue funding for schools and skills development
    - iv. Removing barriers to enable councils to tackle

inequality, and

v. Strengthening local planning powers for Greater Cambridge.

iv. A proportional voting system within a newly empowered local government.

v. A national constitutional convention to provide the stimulus for a new mindset in Westminster and Whitehall and a general framework for progress in all these respects.

## 6b Councillor Young - Short Term Lets in Cambridge

### Council Notes:

Advertising a room on Air BnB and other similar platforms started off as a practical way to generate occasional income for a few, renting out a spare room or a whole dwelling for a few weeks of the year whilst on holiday, but the practice has grown hugely since the site was founded and is now enormously commercialised;

This has had the effect of taking out privately owned and rented property from the market for long term living, and putting it in the market for short term and holiday lets and other temporary use;

Currently, there are few or no proactive controls available to the Local Planning Authority or council to oversee such changes of use, particularly in smaller properties, and therefore no means by which neighbours can put forward their views on such changes, or where additional comings and goings from servicing of such properties can be properly assessed.

Uncontrolled changes of residential property to continuous short term lets have the effect of:

- Squeezing the housing market for people who want to live close to where they work;
- In particular, driving out young people at the lower end of the price range who want to live where they were brought up and raise children and thus reducing the long

term sustainability of communities;  
-in some cases enabling a source of neighbourhood nuisance by virtue of the use of inappropriate buildings or locations;  
- Turning Cambridge into a town with unsuitable or substandard accommodation for visitors to Cambridge;

Therefore, this council:

1. Calls on central government urgently to put in place regulation to enable local councils to control the practice of short term lets, as consulted on in the recent “Introduction of a Use Class for Short Term Lets and associated permitted development rights” (12 April 2023) and requests the Chief Executive to write to the Housing Minister to express this council’s support for this.

2. Calls on the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control & Infrastructure to work across the council to shape the emerging Local Plan to address these concerns, exploring the use of all the powers which are at our disposal now and in the future to improve the situation, such as:

-How best the Local Planning Authority could use current or future legislation to require a change of use permission to be obtained for any dwellings used as short terms lets on a permanent basis;

-Clarifying how many days a year a property could be let before reaching the definition of permanent (for example, 90 days per annum, as used in London);

-Applying minimum space and safety standards for short term lettings similar to those in use for existing HMOs (Houses of Multiple Occupation);

-Ensuring that impact on the long term sustainability of a neighbourhood is considered as part of any change of use application to a short term let;

-Ensuring that the comings and goings and associated deliveries and servicing of short term rented dwellings are considered as part of this change of use application to a short term let;

-Including a presumption that ancillary dwellings approved as such should not later be converted to short term lets;

-Considering whether it would be reasonable to include a condition for new build dwellings to require change of use permission for short term lets until national policy on this is clarified.

6c Councillor Flaubert - Inclusive play in Cambridge

This council notes:

Accessible and inclusive play provision is a vital part of any city. Under the current equality legislation, the council has to endeavour to make play areas facilities accessible and inclusive. In this context, inclusive means maximising opportunities for a range of differing children's abilities, especially children with disabilities;

That our Streets and Open Spaces team already work hard to ensure that any play equipment suppliers provide a range of inclusive play when bids are submitted and that bids are rejected if this criterion is not met;

That in the recent Cambridge Together Project's Resident and Community Engagement project, residents fed back that they would like to see a range of playground offers at free or low cost for families/children, young people and other adults;

That Streets and Open Spaces already provide listings of parks and their locations on the city council website but as yet, this does not state which inclusive play equipment is located at each park or playground. However, according to a recent national study playgrounds continue to be inaccessible for many disabled children because they are not designed for their needs and have limited choices;

That as yet, there is no city wide map of inclusive play equipment and a structured means of engagement with families when designing inclusive playgrounds;

That as yet, there is no city wide map of the play equipment suitable for different age groups;

That as yet there is no data on distances to travel for residents for inclusive and age appropriate play equipment.

Council calls for:

An addition to the existing city map of play areas



(<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/>) to include a function to allow residents to search for types of inclusive play equipment and different age ranges of equipment across the city so they can identify easily where they may wish to play with their families. This should include a function to allow families to understand layout, play equipment overall space facilities and possible barriers to ensure safety, as well as photographs of the site;

A gap analysis to identify areas in the city lacking inclusive play equipment and types of age ranges of play equipment;

Engagement with families of disabled children when making adaptations to increase accessibility and to identify areas with a lack of choices;

A commitment to secure facilities for those children that need to remain seated in their wheelchairs to tackle a current lack of choices;

Provision of sensory opportunities in playgrounds;

Scrutiny of play equipment infrastructure so it meets a variety of play needs for all children;

The council's future play strategy to ensure that these gaps are considered when play equipment is being updated or where S106 or other contributions to development are being agreed, to ensure that reducing the travel times to inclusive and age appropriate play is a priority.

6d Councillor Tong - Towards greater transparency and closer co-operation in Local Government

There have been public calls for replacement of our current governance structures by a small number of unitary authorities.

This motion does not call for the establishment of new unitary authorities.

However, it seeks to take some simple steps to allay some of the resident concerns behind those calls.

Residents find our convoluted local government system confusing. It makes it harder for them to find the help they need quickly and easily.

We propose that the council explores the possibility of establishing a

common smart portal, “localCamgov.org.uk” to provide a single internet front door to the main local government structures.

This simple step would make it easier for residents to access the services they need and provide a better resident experience.

We also propose that the leader of the council invites the chairs and chief executives of key local government bodies including but not limited to the Greater Cambridge Partnership, the Combined Authority and the Cambridge Delivery Group to address full council and answer councillor questions at least once a year.

We believe that greater transparency will help to restore public confidence in local institutions and help to dispel concerns over the perceived democratic deficit.

#### 6e Councillor A.Smith - Debate not hate

This council notes the intimidation and abuse of councillors, in person or otherwise, undermines democracy; preventing elected members from representing the communities they serve, deterring individuals from standing for election, and undermining public life in democratic processes.

This council further notes that increasing levels of toxicity in public and political discourse is having a detrimental impact on local democracy and that prevention, support and responses to abuse and intimidation of local politicians must improve to ensure councillors feel safe and able to continue representing their residents.

This council therefore commits to challenge the normalisation of abuse against councillors and uphold exemplary standards of public and political debate in all it does. The council further agrees to sign up to the Local Government Association’s (LGA) Debate Not Hate campaign.

The campaign aims to raise public awareness of the role of councillors in local communities, encourage healthy debate and improve the response to and support for local politicians facing abuse and intimidation.

In addition, the council resolves to:

- Write to the local Members of Parliament to ask them to support the campaign

- Write to the Government to ask them to work with the LGA to develop and implement a plan to address abuse and intimidation of politicians
- Regularly review the support available to councillors in relation to abuse and intimidation and councillor safety
- Work with the local police to ensure there is a clear and joined-up mechanism for reporting threats and other concerns about the safety of councillors and their families
- Take a zero-tolerance approach to abuse of councillors and officers

## 7 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.

**COUNCIL**20 July 2023  
6.00 - 11.21 pm

**Present:** Councillors Ashton, Baigent, Bennett, Bick, Bird, Carling, Davey, Dryden, Flaubert, Gawthrope Wood, Gilderdale, Glasberg, Griffin, Hauk, Healy, Holloway, Hossain, Howard, Lee, Levien, Martinelli, McPherson, Moore, Nestor, Nethsingha, Payne, Porrer, Pounds, Robertson, Sheil, Smart, A. Smith, S. Smith, Thornburrow, Todd-Jones, Tong, Wade and Young

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****23/35/CNL Minutes**

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

**23/36/CNL To Note the Returning Officer's Report that the following have been elected to the Office of Councillor**

It was noted the following had been elected to the Office of Councillor:

Kings Hedges – Delowar Hossain

**23/37/CNL Mayor's announcements**

Members were reminded that the annual Mayor's Day out to Great Yarmouth was taking place on Wednesday 16 August. The Chevin Sermon and Harvest Festival Civic Service would take place at Great St. Mary's Church.

Councillor Ashton and his consort Barbara Ashton were presented with the Resolution of Thanks for his Mayoral year.

Members were informed of the sad passing of former Councillor Valerie Holt of Castle Ward 2015-19. Amongst other things Valerie made a significant contribution as a trustee of Cambridge Live during the transference back in-house to the Council.

A minutes silence was held to reflect on the sad event at Sackville Close, Members thoughts were with those left behind.

## Business of the Council

Apologies were received from Councillors S Davies, Divkovic, Swift and Thittala Varkey.

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Levien.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Bird	23/45/43/CNL	Personal: Member of Cambridge Investment Partnership
Councillor Bird	23/45/44/CNL	Personal: Cambridgeshire County Council Councillor
Councillor Davey	23/45/44/CNL	Personal: Member of Cambridge Investment Partnership
Councillor Glasberg	23/45/43/CNL	Personal: Member of Newnham Riverbank Club
Councillor Gilderdale	23/45/46/CNL	Personal: Member of Newnham Riverbank Club
Councillor Nethsingha	23/45/44/CNL	Personal: Leader of Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor Ashton	23/39/CNL	Personal: Chair of the Cherry Hinton Residents Association. Personal: Director of Cherry Hinton Community Benefit Society.

### **23/38/CNL Public questions time**

All public questions were published in advance of the meeting.

The Mayor (as Chair of the meeting) explained that for all 10 questions to receive a response from the relevant Executive Councillor in the public forum there would be no supplementary questions. All questions and the responses would therefore be minuted, otherwise it was likely that only half of the questions submitted were likely to be answered in the thirty minutes allocated.

All those who had submitted public questions were advised that they could also contact the relevant Executive Councillor outside of the meeting.

The Mayor advised that that questions 1 and 3 and would be taken first as all other questions related to agenda item 8e, Stop Dumping Sewage in our River and Chalk Streams motion.

The list of public questions were as follows:

**Q1: There were several developments in progress or proposed (Hartree, Cambridge East, Spingstead and Marleigh etc.) which cross City/ South Cambs areas. Concerned about investment property being left empty on some of these sites.**

**Why are these being marketed to international buyers as an investment before local residents, given that one of the main reasons for building them is to satisfy the local need for housing? Is there anything the Council can do to ensure local sales marketing is conducted in advance or at least in tandem with any international marketing?**

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

- i. The City Council had no plans to restrict the sale of residential units on the open market, whether the sale was local, national, or international.
- ii. There were some over sea buyers who were UK passport holders who had the same rights as those residing in the UK. No one was discriminated against.
- iii. To discourage owners leaving their properties vacant the Council limited the council tax exemption on unoccupied properties to one month.
- iv. The Council nominated people with a local qualifying housing need for tenancies and the affordable housing elements for all new housing developments in the city.
- v. For developments on Council owned land the marketing and sales of dwellings were focused on local and national marketing; limited marketing on one purchase per buyer.

**Q2: I quote from the Council's statement : ".....this Council calls on everyone to engage with the River Cam and its associated chalk streams and tributaries with respect, accepting our stewardship of this vital natural resource, and asks all residents and organisations of Cambridge to act as guardians of the river and be mindful of the impact of our own actions and those of others that threaten its health and survival."**

**Please consider the enormous adverse impact a Designated Bathing Area at Lammas Land would have on the highly sensitive environment of**

**this stretch of river. Three nature reserves meet here (Paradise, Sheep's Green and Coe Fen) and protected wildlife have their home. Snob's brook, which is where Cam Valley Forum proposes swimming lessons, houses water voles - it is illegal to disturb them. At least 12 species of fish have been found here and in the river Cam and the Rush stream. Vicar's Brook is a pure chalk stream which enters the Cam just above the proposed area. Otters have returned in the last few years. Paradise is home to huge numbers of species, including 64 bird species. Ancient willows, where Charles Darwin collected beetles, house numerous invertebrate species. Already, thoughtless picnickers can be seen using fallen wood for fires. Attracting more people from across the county to come and swim here would be irresponsible and contrary to the Council's Biodiversity Emergency Policy. I personally think this would be an environmental disaster.**

**Given the expressed concern of many local residents and of the Friends of the Cam, together with the highly doubtful benefits of a DBA, should the council not be considering the overriding adverse ecological impact of a DBA at Lammas Land and not supporting the CVF in this venture?**

In response the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure said the following:

- i. Agreed about the ecological importance of the river, the riverbanks and the local nature reserves along the whole stretch of the river within the city boundary.
- ii. The ecology was extremely important and the bioblitz information that had been collected along Hobson's Brook and at Logan's meadow was important baseline information. Hoped to continue to learn more and improve the waterways every day, and month, and year ahead.
- iii. However, was concerned about sewage and other pollutants going into the river and the harm that had been done to animals and plants in and around the waterways, and the danger to people who swum in, punt, kayak, or row on the whole length of the river.
- iv. Sewage effluent could be a whole concoction of micro plastics, chemicals, nutrients, oil, bacteria, all of which could be extremely bad for river health, and for those who use the river.
- v. There was much to be learnt about the negative impacts on the river and had to consider and learn from what others have done to endeavour to reduce pollution in the water ways.
- vi. If there was information that the levels of sewage in the water could be harming the ecology and people who swum in or use it, and if there are ways to get the water companies to clean up, then the Council must



consider what we could be done improve things, having a badly polluted river flowing past ancient willows was not acceptable.

- vii. The motion proposed to Council was important because pollution levels needed to be reduced. Believed that asking Defra for a stretch along the River Cam within Cambridge City Council boundary to be designated as a bathing water site was one way to achieve this, but we do not want to create division. Rather wanted to focus on how the Council could collaborate to find solutions, working with external partners at local level to look at how to deal with the pollution problems for the whole catchment on all possible solutions.

**Q3: A recent newsletter from Coleridge Labour states that the Fanshawe Road Flats Redevelopment will provide between 84 - 86 "much needed new homes" (note, not 93, as initially stated) and, at a minimum, 44 of these homes are designated for council rents replacing the 22 council homes that are currently being emptied of local residents. We need to be clear what is meant by council homes. Council homes do not mean council rents. The Coleridge Labour newsletter states that the number of homes available for council rents hinges on a Homes England grant so this could mean "60% of market rent or a mix of social rent (below 50% of market rent) and affordable rent (80% of market rent)".**

**How then can the Labour Council ensure that the brand new estate - after the old one, recently retrofitted at the taxpayer's expense and next to a public park and allotments, has been demolished and rebuilt, in the process permanently destroying local biodiversity, including pipistrelle bats and their habitats - will definitely provide even 22 homes for individuals on the same income as those forced to leave? How can the council claim that this project is about providing the people of Cambridge with "much needed" affordable homes and not chiefly a way of generating revenue from lucrative land close to the train station?**

The Executive Councillor for Housing and Homelessness said the following:

- i. Acknowledged there had been changes to the scheme with the proposal now for 84 homes, a significant gain on the existing 33 homes of which 22 were rented.
- ii. The new scheme would deliver a minimum of 22 rented council homes at 60% of the market rent or local housing allowance, whichever was lower.
- iii. The original report for the approval of Fanshawe noted that if there was an issue around grants the Council would need to consider a mix tenure

scheme of affordable housing and market housing for sale. The best approach to tenure was still under review.

- iv. Any recommendations and delegations would be considered at the next meeting of the Housing Scrutiny Committee in September 2023.
- v. Whatever the decision on the tenure the Council remained committed to achieving 20% net biodiversity gain across the development.

**Q4: We are told that the creation of a Designated Bathing Area (DBA) will create a legal requirement for monitoring, the results of which will apparently allow the authorities to 'apply pressure' to Anglian Water to take action to reduce or eliminate sewage discharges to the river Cam. Can we ask exactly how Anglian Water will be compelled to reduce sewage discharges to the river, given that they have ignored their obligations (agreed at Privitisation) for over 30 years and are now some £6.6 billion in debt and presumably lack the financial resources to upgrade their outdated infrastructure.?**

**Furthermore, won't the creation of a DBA before sewage discharges into the river have ceased, by its very name, encourage people to swim in contaminated water, regardless of the fact that a DBA only defines 'use' and associated infrastructure, such as the availability of toilets and parking? Would it be fair to say that people's health is being put at risk to create the impression of a clean, healthy river?**

**Surely no part of the river can be considered 'clean' until all of the river is?**

The Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure responded:

- i. The Council could and should call out the water company dealing with sewage and wastewater treatment for some of the pollution of the city's river and streams where there was evidence. If bathing water designation for a section of the river leads to securing the funds and investment to clean up the river, then consideration should be given to supporting such a local initiative.
- ii. Did not want to wait another 30 years for the source of the pollution to be reduced or removed.
- iii. Agreed that no part of the river could be considered 'clean' until all the river was and was interested in the feasibility study being done at South Cambridgeshire District Council for a designation within the river catchment just beyond the city. But that did not mean the Council stepped away from measures that could help in the city.

- iv. Important to note that giving a stretch of river a bathing water designation did not mean many more people would swim there. When a section of the River Wharfe used for swimming in Ilkley was designated the council saw little change in the number of bathers and river users

**Q5: Bearing in mind that:**

**The preamble to the motion from the Labour Group appears to support the notion that rivers have rights. Yet a river rights perspective on pollution requires us to work actively to free all parts of all rivers in the UK from all sources of pollution.**

**The campaigns against sewage pollution have led to media and political pressure on government and political parties for water companies to be run according to a different business model that does not include fines for continued regular illegal sewage dumping.**

**The water companies already know, and DeFRA and the EA should know, where and when sewage is illegally dumped in rivers. So the DBA (designated bathing area) policy allows a slowing of effective regulation and a commitment to put the necessary infrastructure in place.**

**The DBA efforts on the Wharfe in Ilkley Yorkshire have already shown that they do not bring rapid improvements in water quality as was hoped. Water companies have said that any new infrastructure will be paid for by an increase in bills rather than reductions in dividends and executive pay so any infrastructure money that benefits the Cam will be paid for in bills across the region.**

**The Labour Group must be scrupulously careful about a potential conflict of interest as a co-beneficiary in the shifting of Anglian Water's sewage works from a brownfield to a greenfield site to release land for development.**

**Why then, is the Labour Group pushing a DBA policy that will reduce pressure on water companies at a time when national campaigns have been having an effect; a policy supported by a regulation averse DeFRA and a many times fined illegal sewage dumping Anglian Water whose directors should be facing custodial sentences according to a former chair of the Environment Agency?**

The Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure responded:

- i. The use of a designated bathing water area as one path to improvement was being considered outside of the city, and it was right that the Council also considered it for the waterways with our city.
- ii. Did not agree that pushing for designation would reduce the

- pressure on water companies, nor that a designation would have no impact. Did not see the link between knowing where there was sewage outfall and designation, or why that should slow things down. Indeed, the view was that designation and the raised awareness of the poor quality of the water in the city would be one factor in putting pressure on water companies and other polluters to improve things.
- iii. Did not accept there was a conflict of interest in supporting improvements to Anglian Water's facilities and calling for cleaner water in the Cam.
  - iv. The revulsion felt towards untreated waste in the rivers with sanitary waste along the riverbanks and chalk streams had motivated and mobilised public opinion, it has united environmental groups around a common cause and goal, and all councillors should acknowledge this, as well as the water companies themselves.
  - v. Finally, it was not just about the water companies, there needed to be an integrated and collaborative approach to water management, as called for here, built into the Emerging Local Plan.

**Q6: On the basis that the water companies show no respect for their legal obligations (to the point of the Environmental Agency stating that water company CEOs should be in jail for their legal infringements and that water companies routinely pay fines rather than make the necessary infrastructural improvements)....**

**Knowing that bathing area designation requires only partial river water testing (between May and September; once weekly; discounting exceptional events; and testing only for e-coli and intestinal enterococci - nitrates, phosphates, microplastics, viruses and antibiotic resistant bacteria are NOT required to be monitored)...**

**Knowing that DB status was designed for open sea bathing waters, and not rivers, and that river water (and the pollution it carries) flows continuously from source to sea...**

**Bearing in mind that the motion is internally contradictory in that it both specifies an 'environmental destination' anticipating upwards of 100 people swimming in a narrow river with a nature rich bank, and subsequent protection as a site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); and that the infrastructure to support such numbers swimming (toilets, waste management and necessary access; catering outlets expected) cannot be consistent with such levels of nature protection...**

**...how, then, can the City Council be confident at the outset - and therefore without a risk to bathers' health - that a level of 'good' or 'excellent' water quality along the River Cam can be achieved, and without detriment to the river and surrounding environment?**

In response the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure said the following:

- i. Confident that the source of the sewage pollution could be reduced or eliminated, to achieve good or excellent level, but it was important that the Council considered all options to get there.
- ii. The water companies had let residents down, but that was not a reason to do nothing or just accept that people should go swimming in a heavily polluted river.
- iii. Believed that designation would help to provide evidence needed to support action against polluters, including water companies. Needed to know the sources of the pollution, so we can decide how best to protect the local ecology as well as make the water safer for people. This would not change things overnight, but designation could be part of the wider plan to improve water quality.

**Q7: The inspirational town planner Jan Gehl advocates that to build communities that work well, the evidence needs to be shown and environmental capacity issues need to be addressed. So one should count all the punts, rowers, swimmers and canoes using the river just as highway planners have long tallied up road users.**

**Where is the evidence that this has been done in the proposal for the DBA?**

**How many punts, swimmers, canoeists can this small stretch of the Cam safely take as a “riverscape” visitor destination?**

**What kind of health and safety analysis has there been?**

In response the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure said the following:

- i. The motion put forward was to consider the sewage pollution in the river and streams, and also how a bathing water designation would provide evidence gathering about the levels of the pollution and help find ways to reduce it.
- ii. Acknowledged how heavily used the river was. There was a history of swimming and river use for recreation at least from the sixteenth century and could easily imagine Saxon swimmers too.
- iii. Knew from personal observation that during the opening up in the summer after the first pandemic lock down, the river use increased greatly. The joy of many people being out on the river, was very clear.

- Indeed, the river did not belong to a few people, but was a precious place for all who choose to use it.
- iv. However, limited by the regulations, understood the application for a bathing water directive was for a section of a water way already used for bathing only, and that the level of bathing was stipulated by Defra in the application.
- Survey information was required with the application. Of course, if the sewage pollution could be reduced all river users would benefit, not just swimmers and not just in the designated length of the river.
- v. To wider the point about how many people could safely use a stretch of the Cam, if there was evidence that designation was increasing numbers then would have to address the health and safety issues, but do not imagine that things would change significantly just because the water was being assessed by the Environment Agency.

**Chair of the Friends of Sheep's Green Learner Pool and, Chair of the Friends of Sheep's Green and Lammas Land**

**Q8: Speaking as the Chair of the Friends of Sheep's Green Learner Pool, and the Chair of the Friends of Sheep's Green and Lammas Land, and our joint question relates to item 8e on the Agenda, 'Stop dumping sewage in our River and Chalk Streams'.**

**While we support all the other actions recommended to reduce threats to the Cam and its tributaries, we do not agree that a Designated Bathing Area in the area proposed by Cam Valley Forum would benefit the river or Cambridge residents.**

**The level of pollution in the river is very high, and there is no evidence that monitoring it as part of a DBA would reduce pollution or put the necessary pressure on the water companies to do so, especially as Anglia Water already undertake weekly water quality tests. Promoting the river as a bathing area without addressing the real issue of why water treatment companies are permitted to discharge sewage into our river – which they should not do whether people swim in the river or not – puts people, and especially children, at risk from swimming in poor quality water. We have heard from multiple sources that there was a mass outbreak of illness following a recent 'Cam Slow Swim' event. This is very worrying.**

**Councillor Thornburrow suggests that the designation of a water bathing site by Defra would impose a legal obligation on Anglia Water to reduce sewage pollution until the level of 'good' or 'excellent' is reached. However, this legal obligation, as far as we can see, is not mentioned by Defra on what to expect if a site is designated**

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bathing-waters-apply-to-designate-or-de-designate/designate-a-bathing-water-guidance-on-how-to-apply>. The only stipulations concern the frequency of water monitoring and the signs required to be displayed during the bathing season. It does not say that any water company is legally obliged as a result of the DBA to improve the water quality.

The Council already has a wonderful paddling pool by the playground at Lammas Land which is enjoyed by hundreds of Cambridge children every summer. It is approaching its 100th birthday and is in desperate need of having money spent to renovate it to ensure its continued longevity. Likewise, Sheep's Green Learner pool, built in 1977 for children to learn to swim, is still enjoyed by many today. However, it too is in desperate need for the Council to spend money on it, by reinstating the heating system that was removed previously, and installing showers so that it can once again be used by local schools for swimming lessons. A DBA would require the Council to spend money on facilities that would still not make it safe for people, especially children, to swim in the river. We would therefore like to ask the Council to consider allocating the funding for the DBA towards much-needed improvements to the Lammas Land paddling pool and Sheep's Green Learner pool, facilities that already exist and enable Cambridge children to learn to swim and enjoy playing in the water safely. Investing now in this life-saving infrastructure would mean that once the River Cam is eventually clean enough to swim in, the children of Cambridge would be better equipped to swim safely once again in the river.

In response the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure said the following

- i. The motion to Stop Dumping Sewage in our River and Chalk Streams, if supported, would result in consideration at the Environment and Community Committee, and possible approval by the Executive Councillor. If designation did go forward, understood that the cost to the Council would be to continue to support existing facilities, plus notify the public each year on the results of water testing and the implications for bathers. Had considered how the designation at Ilkley and Oxford had been put in place, but each location was unique and must be considered on their own merits.
- ii. Clause 13 of the Bathing Water Regulation 2013, sets out the legal obligation where the "appropriate agency classifies a bathing water as "poor" under regulation 11. Could provide a link to this

legislation and to other links about guidance on how to comply with the legislation.

- iii. Regarding points about funding for the two pools that the statement refers to, were not dependent on the DBA going ahead or not. Supporting swimming lessons for children was important and there were quite a few learner pools across the city. It would be a separate exercise to carry out a feasibility study for the requirements and costs to improve these learner pools and others around Cambridge. This was important and the Executive Councillor for Communities had confirmed this as a priority and that the Council would be looking into this later this year or next year.

**Q9: I am aware that there are many people who strongly support a dba because they are convinced it will deliver a healthier river.**

**The reason I am worried and have NOT joined in supporting a DBA at Sheep's Green, is because the criteria that need to be met are totally unsuitable for our river. These criteria demand access, public toilets, changing facilities, parking, lifeguards, first aid service, kiosks and shops. I have recently read DEFRA have raised the bar to 100 swimmers per day in peak season.**

**To meet these criteria, Sheep's Green will need to be transformed from a magical mediaeval meadow into a major honey pot destination, and potentially become a Bournemouth on Cam. Is this what the council want at Sheep's Green?**

**By voting for this motion, is the council committing to delivering the infrastructure that the criteria demand? What size car park that must support 100 swimmers per day? How will access change? How many kiosks/shops? How will lifeguards and first aid be funded? All this must be in place for Sheep's Green to qualify for dba status.**

The Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure responded:

- i. Would not support changes to access, public toilets, changing facilities, parking, lifeguards, first aid service, kiosks and shops in the vicinity of any location currently used for swimming in the city.
- ii. If a DBA application was made, the application required that there are toilet facilities within 500m from the proposed site, but only asks that information was provided about parking facilities, public transport, easy access (including disabled access), changing facilities, lifeguards, first aid, litter bins, and cafes, shops or kiosks. There were no specific requirements for these.



- iii. Also, for the application the zone must be used by an average of at least 100 existing bathers a day during the bathing season (15 May to 30 September). This must be surveyed before an application can be made. Depending on the area of the river chosen, may find that the criteria would not be met.

**Q10: Cam Valley Forum wants to apply for designated bathing water status for Sheep's Green, because this is the most powerful way we have to improve the water quality in the Cam, for the benefit of swimmers, punters, kayakers, our rowing crews, other river users and our wonderful natural habitats.**

**It is important to note that designation is about protecting the health of existing "bathers" not attracting new ones. The experience of other inland river groups, such as at Ilkely in Yorkshire is that designation results in no change in visitor numbers, not least because it highlights the "poor" water quality (as we currently have in the Cam)**

**This "poor" classification then creates statutory obligations under the Bathing Water regulations 2013 that should accelerate the much-needed improvements in Haslingfield sewage works. This is why councils and community groups across the country are applying. 11 inland river sites have already achieved designation, including Oxford, Ilkely, and 4 in London. 100s of coastal sites have of course, had designated bathing water status for years.**

**Do you agree with Cam Valley Forum, that the environmental and health benefits of designation make a powerful case for the city council to support our application?**

The Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure responded

- i. Felt the Cam Valley Forum arguments for a designation were compellingly and would continue to watch Ilkley and Oxford to see how their designations proceed. The debate, discussion and voting on the Motion submitted, along with the two amendments would be interesting.
- ii. Finally, by saying that the idea that designation meant that part of the river that was bordered by an area rich in plant and animal variety with local nature reserves would suddenly turn into an overflow for Parkside Pool was simply not the case, and the apparent willingness to tolerate a sewage-laden river flowing past the homes of water voles seemed to be rather self-defeating.
- iii. As a Council want natural chalk streams and a river that was not damaged by human action and believed the improved monitoring and

awareness that a bathing water designation brings would help significantly as part of a wider range of measures. It would not solve the problem alone, but without it would be a harder job, which is why the motion had been brought to Council today.

**23/39/CNL To consider the recommendations of the Executive for adoption**

**a) Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Outturn Report 2022/23 (Executive Councillor for Housing and Homelessness)**

**Resolved (by 25 votes to 1) to:**

Approve carry forward requests of £15,880,000 in HRA and General Fund Housing capital budgets and associated resources from 2022/23 into 2023/24 and beyond to fund re-phased net capital spending, as detailed in Appendix D of the officer's report and the associated notes to the appendix.

**b) Greater Cambridge Impact Fund- (Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources)**

**Resolved (unanimously) to:**

- i. Approve the allocation of £200,000 development funding to support the establishment of Greater Cambridge Impact ('the Fund') and enable fundraising over the next year.
- ii. Agree 'in principle' a further £800,000 contribution to the Fund once it is established, subject to progress made to secure funding commitments of £5m from other parties, and that officers should provide advice in relation to this decision at a later date.
- iii. Note that i) and ii) are one-off financial contributions from Reserves with the objective of leaving a lasting legacy from additional business rates collected due to the growth of the Cambridge economy.
- iv. Note that activity to establish the Fund will be overseen by a Fund Development Board; that the £200,000 development funding will be managed by Jemma Little, Economic Development Manager, Cambridge City Council in line with council policies; and that progress will be reported by the Fund Development Board on a regular basis to the Executive Cllr for Finance and Resources and may be brought back to the Strategy & Resources Committee to provide updates at key stages over the next year.

**c) Place Group Resource for Key Projects - (Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources)**

**Resolved (unanimously) to:**

Approve funding for additional resource as set out in Section 4 (a) of the officer's report as detailed below:

The basis of funding for these posts is to be from General Fund Reserves initially but with the expectation that the posts will be up to 100% funded from capital resources once capital plan items are brought forward and approved.

Additional funding costs are:-

- GF Retrofit Project Manager - £64,000 p.a.
- GF Retrofit Project Officer– £56,750 p.a
- GF Retrofit Project Clerk of Works 0.5 FTE – £28,375 p.a.
- Senior Development Manager– £86,000 p.a.
- Corporate Space Manager 0.6 FTE - £46,000 p.a.
- External consultancy support for Corporate Space Strategy – £75,000 in 2023/24 to establish approach, procurement and then make further recommendations for delivery and cost.

<b>Role</b>	<b>2023/24</b>	<b>2024/25</b>	<b>2025/26</b>
Retrofit Project Manager	£37,350	£64,000	£64,000 ongoing
Retrofit Project Officer	£33,060	£56,750	£56,750 ongoing
Retrofit Project Clerk of Works	£0	£14,190	£28,375 ongoing
Senior Development Manager	£57,370	£86,000	£86,000 ongoing
Development Project Manager	£15,396	£46,000	£46,000 ongoing
External consultancy		£75,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>£218,176</b>	<b>£266,940</b>	<b>£281,125</b>

**5d Annual Treasury Management Outturn Report 2022/23 - (Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources)**

**Resolved (37 votes to 1 ) to:**

i. Approve this report, including the Council's actual Prudential and Treasury Indicators for 2022/23.

e) 2022/23 General Fund Reserve and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances - (Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources)

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor Porrer seconded the following amendment to the recommendation (additional text underlined)

a) Carry forward requests totalling £1,391,800 of revenue funding from 2022/23 to 2023/24, as detailed in Appendix C. These are carry forward requests in excess of £50k. Requests up to and including £50k which total £176,070 are approved via delegated authority to the Chief Financial Officer.

b) Approve additional budget in 2023/24 of £80k to the Climate Change Fund funded from reserves, as detailed in Paragraphs 3.6 to 3.8 below.

c) Approve the allocation of £200k from the General Fund reserve to establish Greater Cambridge Impact (GCI) as detailed in Paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10 below.

d) Approve the allocation of £218k in 2023/24 from the General Fund reserve to fund the additional resource required to enable the delivery of key programmes and projects within the Place Group. The allocation required will increase to £267k in 2024/25 and £281k 2025/26 onwards as detailed in Paragraphs 3.11 below.

e) To carry forward requests of £81,444,000 of capital resources from 2022/23 to 2023/24 to fund rephased net capital spending, as detailed in Appendix D.

f) Note the handing back to the government of the majority of the recent Sustainable Warmth Grants - unspent - which was intended to insulate private sector homes and request a detailed review at the relevant scrutiny committee of the contributory factors to this situation and courses of action to improve take-up of future iterations of this government funding source for the very important climate change-related objective of retrofitting existing homes.

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 14 votes 24.

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

- i. Approve carry forward requests totalling £1,391,800 of revenue funding from 2022/23 to 2023/24, as detailed in Appendix C. These are carry forward requests in excess of £50k. Requests up to and including £50k which total £176,070 are approved via delegated authority to the Chief Financial Officer.
- ii. Approve additional budget in 2023/24 of £80k to the Climate Change Fund funded from reserves, as detailed in Paragraphs 3.6 to 3.8 of the officer's report.
- iii. Approve the allocation of £200k from the General Fund reserve to establish Greater Cambridge Impact (GCI) as detailed in Paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10 below.
- iv. Approve the allocation of £218k in 2023/24 from the General Fund reserve to fund the additional resource required to enable the delivery of key programmes and projects within the Place Group. The allocation required will increase to £267k in 2024/25 and £281k 2025/26 onwards as detailed in Paragraphs 3.11 below. e) To carry forward requests of £81,444,000 of capital resources from 2022/23 to 2023/24 to fund rephased net capital spending, as detailed in Appendix D.

### **23/40/CNL To consider the recommendations of Committees for adoption**

**a) Civic Affairs Committee - Review of Budget Process Timetable for 2023/24 and Constitutional Updates**

#### **Resolved (by 33 votes to 0) to:**

- i. Approve the changes to Council Procedure Rules and Budget Framework Rules as set out in the Appendix A of the officer's report.

### **23/41/CNL To deal with oral questions**

1. Councillor Young to the Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services.

Could the Executive Councillor for Open Spaces please update council on the herbicide free trials going on across the city?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. Most recently the Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee considered an Officer report in March 2023. The report updated on the

work completed on the Herbicide Reduction Plan<sup>1</sup> which include an evaluation of the two herbicide free trial wards in Arbury and Newnham, an appraisal of the herbicide free street scheme. The report made recommendations on the further reduction and stop in the use of herbicides in the City with the scheme being expanded into West Chesterton and Trumpington. This would allow further assessment of the scheme.

- ii. Alternative methods of managing weeds had also been considered such as mechanical brushes, hoeing and pressure washing.
- iii. An evaluation of the Trial had identified that the Plan had created opportunities for contributions, collaborative working and involvement and feedback and learning from a wide range of stakeholders, including Councillors, Pesticide Free Cambridge, On the Verge, residents, volunteers, and community groups and we continue to work on these aspects of the Herbicide Reduction Plan.
- iv. About to conduct 'ward walkabouts' in the Trial areas in August to which Ward Councillors would be invited. The Herbicide Working Group would also meet again, now that there were new items to discuss.
- v. Since the report in March 2023, we have worked on a Communication Plan and undertaken more outreach work, such as, a letter to Schools on becoming pesticide free, contributed to research by University College London<sup>2</sup> and there has been no applications of herbicides on the County Council's highways land in the city.
- vi. The Happy Bee scheme has proved popular with residents and would look at how this could be maintained.
- vii. The Trial responses remained positive.
- viii. Officers continue to monitor the Trial and the impact on local streets before giving further consideration on whether to become herbicide free and from a position of understanding the implications following an appraisal of the impact of that change.

## 2. Councillor Wade to the Executive Councillor for Communities

What support will we be providing residents with this winter for those still struggling with the cost-of-living crisis?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. During 2022/23 the Council provided a range of support for residents struggling with the rising cost of living, including:

---

<sup>1</sup> following the Exec Councillor decision on the 27th January 2022 to Trail a Herbicide Reduction Plan

<sup>2</sup> The research presents as a questionnaire that feeds into a larger project on general attitudes to the environment and the impact of community behaviours, social norms, and policies on broader changes in human-environmental relationships and outcomes.

- A series of 11 [Cost of Living Support Pop-Ups](#) at community venues across the city from October 2022-February 2023.
  - Provided regular [Warm and Welcoming Spaces](#) at the Council's 5 community centres, which offered community events, quiet spaces and meals to local people.
  - Supported partners to provide warm spaces and community meals by awarding £1,000 [winter support grants](#) to 43 voluntary and community organisations.
  - Distributed 500 hot water bottles, 130 blankets and 89 air-fryers to people in need.
  - A total of £20,000 to the Cambridgeshire Local Assistance Scheme (CLAS) to ensure that they could meet increased demand for [energy vouchers](#) from Cambridge residents in urgent financial need.
  - Offered £10,000 match funding to Cambridge Sustainable Food and Cambridge Food Poverty Alliance's "[Cost of Food and Living Crisis Campaign](#)". which aimed to raise funds for frontline support to communities.
- ii. Much of this activity was funded through £179,000 funding from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care System (ICS) for work to address heating and health issues during 2022/23.
- iii. Further funding had been secured from the ICS for 2023/24, but rather than cost of living issues, this is focussed on three themes of family, children and young people's mental health, and high impact service users.
- iv. Officers in the cross-council Cost of Living Working group met recently to review the lessons learnt from support provided over the winter of 2022/23 and explore what support could be provided by the Council and partners over the coming autumn and winter.
- v. Feedback received from residents attending the Warm and Welcoming Spaces was that most people valued the support and sense of community connection that they got from coming to community centres, rather than needing somewhere warm to be in the cold weather. With this feedback in mind, rather than running dedicated sessions, the Council would be keeping its community centres open all year round and promoting them to residents as warm and welcoming spaces that they can access when needed.

- vi. Officers are also considering how we work with partner organisations to respond to ongoing needs. We are exploring opportunities for further pop-up events, but initial feedback suggests that there is more limited capacity amongst voluntary and community partners to engage in these events over the coming winter.
  - vii. Data from the Low-Income Family Tracker (LIFT) system was being used to develop targeted communication campaigns for low-income residents who may benefit from income maximisation support, housing advice, energy efficiency measures and free sports and cultural activities provided by the Council and other local partner organisations.
  - viii. All of this had been made possible as a result of the local community and volunteering sector which the Council would like to pay tribute to.
3. Councillor Holloway to the Executive Councillor for Housing and Homelessness

Could the Executive Councillor give an update on Homelessness and how we are preparing for the winter?

- i. The Council continues to see very high levels of homelessness in Cambridge, and we provide a wide range of services to people experiencing homelessness to help them into settled accommodation as quickly as possible.
- ii. Street homelessness is only part of the picture of homelessness in Cambridge.
- iii. Many people will experience the devastating impact of homelessness without sleeping on the streets. However, those on the streets are those most at risk from the impact of adverse weather. The Council has a programme in place, as in previous years that provides additional options during the worst of the winter.
- iv. This winter, provision would repeat what was provided last year with nightly provision from November until March (inclusive), regardless of the weather for people who were rough sleepers locally connected to the city.
- v. When the weather was particularly bad the Council also provide further bedspaces under the Severe Weather Emergency Provision (SWEP), within hostels in the city or, if these spaces aren't available, in hotel accommodation. This is provided on a short-term basis when the Met Office forecasts a temperature of zero or under for three successive days or during periods of prolonged heavy rain or high winds or long periods of generally cold and damp weather.



4. Councillor Flaubert to the Executive Councillor for Community Wealth Building and Community Safety

Could the Executive Councillor for Community Wealth Building and Community Safety please explain what support is available from the City Council for victims of Hate Crimes?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. There was no place for hate in Cambridge.
- ii. To combat hate crime in the City, the Council were undertaking the following as well as supporting victims of hate crime:
  - In November 2022, the Council supported the launch of Stop Hate UK Cambridgeshire 24 hour hate crime reporting service. This service helped tackle all forms of hate crime and discrimination.
  - The Council delivers a confidential racial harassment service which offered advice and helped anyone living or visiting Cambridge suffering racial harassment. The service identified the support required, assessed the risk of further incidents, and took action to increase home security, legal action, and injunctions as example.
  - Officers actively engaged with local communities to foster dialogue, promote inclusivity, and addressed hate crime issues.
  - Had met with the Police and Crime Commissioner to discuss these issues as tackling hate crime was a Community First Priority.

5. Councillor Hossain to the Leader

Cambridge does not want this Congestion Charge. It will crush businesses and hit the least well off and most vulnerable the hardest. We need to listen. Listen to residents, to businesses, to charities, to community and to all faith groups. No one should be taxed to go to their prayers. During covid, residents of our city saw planters pop up in their roads almost overnight. Now those planters have become metal barriers. This council claims to be so concerned about congestion and pollution in our city. Yet our politicians are creating the very congestion & pollution they claim to want to solve! It's time this council said enough! Enough to the madness of closing Mill Road bridge, to the threatened closure of Arbury Road! We must stop the push to carve up the city that we love. Taxpayers cannot use their roads, someone using as their private roads as for example Nightingale Avenue, Bateman street, Luard Road, Panton Street, Story's way, Carlyle Road, Vinery Road. We are here for all not for few. What is Cambridge Council's view on roads closures & congestion charge plan?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. Recommended reading the published State of the City 2023 report. The report highlighted that only three other cities in the UK recorded more days of poor air quality than Cambridge.
- ii. The two wards exposed to the highest air pollution were Petersfield and Kings Hedges; something needed to be done to tackle climate change and congestion in the city.
- iii. There were no plans to close Arbury Road, the closure of Mill Road had been taken in March following an extensive consultation, 72% of respondents supported the restriction of vehicles crossing the bridge and welcomed the closure.
- iv. Could not comment on road closures referenced in the question and would have to investigate these in more detail.
- v. From the extensive GCP consultation on the Sustainable Travel Zone (STZ), there were concerns around the design of the STZ which is why the GCP Board had asked officers to look again at the scheme and recommend alternative ways forward which might include things like reduced hours, reduced charges, or free days.
- vi. Work was being undertaken to find a suitable way to find a proposal that would be acceptable to residents. Until that proposal was available and the Council had a chance to analyse the proposal it was wrong to comment if the Council supported the congestion charge or not.
- vii. It was important to stress that no decision had been taken and all options remained for consideration, including the option not to proceed with STZ.

6. Cllr Pounds to the Executive Councillor for Communities.

Could the Executive Councillor for communities give us more information about the recently announced Street Arts Festival?

The Executive Councillor responded with the following:

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The Streets Arts Festival named Out of the Ordinary was a brand-new event developed by the Cultural Services Team.
- ii. The aim was to provide a free cultural event for residents and visitors to the city, co funded in partnership with Cambridge Business Improvement District (BID).
- iii. The event would include small street shows, walkabout acts across the city centre during the August bank holiday weekend. Further information would be released next week.

- iv. It was hoped that this would become an annual event in the cultural calendar; an arts calendar bid was being prepared so that additional events and workshops could be offered next year outside of the city centre.
7. Councillor McPherson to the Executive Councillor for Community Wealth Building and Community Safety

Following recent tragic events, what is the council doing to ensure residents are made fully aware of the dangers of lithium battery charging?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. Would like to convey our thoughts and sympathies to those affected by the tragic event at Sackville Close.
  - ii. Would like to thank the emergency services for their rapid response and to council officers for their continued work to support those impacted by this sad event.
  - iii. Needed to work with multiple agencies (and particularly with the fire service) to ensure that this did not happen again.
  - iv. It was important to promote the fire service's safety message while assisting members of the community to implement the advice.
  - v. An information event had been planned to take place in Kings Hedges with external agencies.
  - vi. The Council's Cambridge Matters and Open Door Magazine was also being used to promote these safety messages.
  - vii. Would be working with residents to look at how the Council could increase access to safe storage and charging points for e-bikes and mobility scooters.
  - viii. For the wider community, it was recognised that information was recognised in different ways and all services and councillors must promote fire safety messages where possible.
  - ix. Had highlighted the importance of fire safety advise to Police and Crime Commissioner to raise the issues with the Vison Zero Partnership.
  - x. Would be writing to the relevant Secretary of State to emphasise the need to regulate charging batteries for e- cars, bikes, scooters etc.
8. Councillor Baigent to the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure

What are the important quick wins that could improve rail transportation for the Cambridge area?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The Council supported further rail investment and it was vital to get further improvements right.
  - ii. A modern transport system needed to work for people in their daily lives; people shaped their routines around transport systems asking if there was a bus stop or railway near home or work etc,
  - iii. In 2014, 9.8million passengers used Cambridge station. The rail transport strategy 2014 resulted in a 660% increase in the Cambridge station usage to 74.6million in 2019 which dropped to 14.9million due to the pandemic in 2021. Rising again to 45.6 million in March 2022.
  - iv. The rail figures across the country showed usage for work was 80% pre-pandemic use while leisure had increased to 120%.
  - v. Any improvements were quick wins and supported more quick wins. The Council would work with the Combined Authority on these improvements.
  - vi. Wanted to ensure that every train would stop at the new Cambridge Station, would like the Cambridge to Kings Lynn service to increase to two trains a hour, Cambridge to Cambridge North should be six a hour and every train should stop at the new Waterbeach station.
9. Councillor Naomi Bennett to the Executive Councillor for Housing and Homelessness

The Green and Independent Group welcomes the 25 June 2023 by Homes England that they will now fund replacement “Affordable” homes as well as new ones. However, the new scheme comes with conditions that existing projects may not be able to satisfy. What plans does the Executive councillor have to take advantage of the additional funding and will she bring a report to Housing Scrutiny in September 2023 to identify which pipeline projects are expected to qualify and which are not?

The Executive Councillor said the following:

- i. The Development Team were aware of the changes to Homes England grant funding and staff were reviewing schemes that may benefit from this change in funding, to evaluate which schemes may be eligible. Not all schemes would be suitable, and the Council would need to balance resources in terms of delivery, placemaking and benefits for the Housing Revenue Account.
- ii. The team were in regular engagement with Homes England to ensure that the Council would be well placed to capitalise on this change in funding.

- iii. There would be an update on the delivery programme at the Housing Scrutiny Committee in September, where they would be updated on the Homes England grant programme, and it was hoped to update on which pipeline projects would be submitted for grant applications.

A full list of oral questions including those not asked during the meeting can be found in the Information Pack, which is published on the meeting webpage [Agenda for Council on Thursday, 20th July, 2023, 6.00 pm - Cambridge Council](#).

**23/42/CNL To consider the following notices of motion, notice of which has been given by:**

**a) Councillor Flaubert - Removal of Restrictive Covenants on Childminders**  
Councillor Flaubert proposed and Councillor Payne seconded the following motion:

Council **notes** that some housebuilders impose restrictive covenants prohibiting residents from running businesses from homes and that such a prohibition can prevent the operation of domestic childcare provision within the community and shares the concern about the implications of this with Cambridgeshire County Council, which debated the matter earlier this year.

Council **considers** that the availability of childcare is an important component of a sustainable community - in terms of service, social integration, employment and parental participation in the workforce: its absence encourages unnecessary travel and presents a barrier to securing family livelihoods and the pursuit of chosen lifestyles – and that this is particularly true of wholly new neighbourhoods.

Council **calls on:**

- a) the Planning Committee and members on the Joint Development Control Committee to explore the use of planning conditions to avoid restrictive covenants on business use which preclude domestically based childcare provision, where this can be supported by evidence of need
- b) the Greater Cambridge Planning Service to engage with housebuilders active in Greater Cambridge to address the childcare deficit for new communities being delivered as part of the current adopted Local Plan 2018; and in view of predicted growth, seek their support for approaches that will meet the needs of childcare providers and families in the emerging joint local plan

- c) the Executive Councillor for Planning and Infrastructure to develop a planning policy regarding childminders that will include feedback from the engagement with housebuilders and stakeholders across Greater Cambridge, including organisations like PACEY, to ensure that needs are balanced across all the interests in the community so that childminders are exempt from blanket covenants to restrict businesses being run from homes.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed and Councillor Moore seconded the following amendment to the Removal of Restrictive Covenants on Childminders and Other Small Enterprises motion. (Deleted text ~~struckthrough~~, additional text underlined.)

Council notes that some housebuilders impose restrictive covenants prohibiting residents from running businesses from homes and that such a prohibition can prevent the operation of ~~domestic childcare provision with the community and shares the concern about the implications of this with Cambridgeshire County Council, which debated the matter earlier this year~~ small enterprises, including domestic childcare provision within the community.

Council notes that at its annual meeting on May 16 2023 Cambridgeshire County Council resolved to 'make a recommendation to the District Councils that on strategic new developments, a condition of planning is that such restrictive covenants which are to be put in place state explicitly that childcare on domestic premises will be exempt, where there is an identified need which can be demonstrated'.

Council agrees that the availability of childcare is an important component of a sustainable community in terms of service, social integration, employment and parental participation in the workforce, its absence encourages unnecessary travel and presents a barrier to securing family livelihoods and the pursuit of chosen lifestyles – and that this is particularly true of wholly new neighbourhoods.

Council further notes that restrictions on other small enterprises can have equally negative effects on the communities where they apply, and that

exemptions for childcare on domestic premises should also apply to other small enterprises.

Council therefore calls on:

- (a) the Planning Committee and members on the Joint Development Control Committee to explore the use of planning conditions to avoid restrictive covenants on business use which preclude small enterprises such as domestically based childcare provision, where this can be supported by evidence of need
- (b) the Greater Cambridge Planning Service to engage with housebuilders active in Greater Cambridge to address the childcare deficit for new communities being delivered as part of the current adopted Local Plan 2018; and in view of predicted growth, seek their support for approaches that will meet the needs of childcare providers and families in the emerging joint local plan
- (c) the Executive Councillor for Planning and Infrastructure to develop a planning policy regarding childminders that will include feedback from the engagement with housebuilders and stakeholders across Greater Cambridge, including organisations like The Professional Association for Childcare and Early Years (PACEY), to ensure that needs are balanced across all the interests in the community so that childminders are exempt from blanket covenants to restrict businesses being run from homes.

On a show of hands the amendment was carried by 27 votes to 0.

**Resolved (unanimously) that:**

Council notes that some housebuilders impose restrictive covenants prohibiting residents from running businesses from homes and that such a prohibition can prevent the operation of small enterprises, including domestic childcare provision within the community.

Council notes that at its annual meeting on May 16 2023 Cambridgeshire County Council resolved to 'make a recommendation to the District Councils that on strategic new developments, a condition of planning is that such restrictive covenants which are to be put in place state explicitly that childcare on domestic premises will be exempt, where there is an identified need which can be demonstrated'.

Council agrees that the availability of childcare is an important component of a sustainable community in terms of service, social integration, employment and parental participation in the workforce, its absence encourages unnecessary travel and presents a barrier to securing family livelihoods and the pursuit of chosen lifestyles – and that this is particularly true of wholly new neighbourhoods.

Council further notes that restrictions on other small enterprises can have equally negative effects on the communities where they apply, and that exemptions for childcare on domestic premises should also apply to other small enterprises.

Council therefore calls on:

- a) the Planning Committee and members on the Joint Development Control Committee to explore the use of planning conditions to avoid restrictive covenants on business use which preclude small enterprises such as domestically based childcare provision, where this can be supported by evidence of need
- b) the Greater Cambridge Planning Service to engage with housebuilders active in Greater Cambridge to address the childcare deficit for new communities being delivered as part of the current adopted Local Plan 2018; and in view of predicted growth, seek their support for approaches that will meet the needs of childcare providers and families in the emerging joint local plan
- c) the Executive Councillor for Planning and Infrastructure to develop a planning policy regarding childminders that will include feedback from the engagement with housebuilders and stakeholders across Greater Cambridge, including organisations like The Professional Association for Childcare and Early Years (PACEY), to ensure that needs are balanced across all the interests in the community so that childminders are exempt from blanket covenants to restrict businesses being run from homes.

**23/43/CNL Councillor Bennett - Community Wealth Building and Procurement**



Councillor Bennett will withdraw the Motion under Council Procedure Rule 13.3.

**8c Councillor Tong - Open Doors at the Guild Hall**

Councillor Tong proposed and Councillor Howard seconded the following motion:

1. This council resolves to promote a closer relationship between the council and residents by opening the Guildhall to the public.
2. It is envisaged that initially this would be on a trial basis and hours would be limited, or by appointment only.
3. It is envisaged that priority would be given to school groups and other educational visits.
4. This council resolves to consider ways of opening up its collection of antique ceremonial objects to public view, perhaps by partnering with a suitable local Museum.

Background Notes (not part of active motion):

1. We understand that before lock down, school visits were made to the Guild Hall on occasion.
2. The Guild Hall still contains a courthouse and functioning cells which were used up until the 1920s.
3. The Guild Hall is also home to the Council's collection of ceremonial objects, such as maces and trowels.

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor Porrer seconded the following amendment to the composite motion (deleted text ~~struckthrough~~ and additional text underlined)

1. This council resolves to promote a closer relationship between the council and residents by opening the Guildhall to the public.
- ~~2. It is envisaged that initially this would be on a trial basis and hours would be limited, or by appointment only.~~
- ~~3. It is envisaged that priority would be given to school groups and other educational visits.~~
- ~~4. This council resolves to consider ways of opening up its collection of antique ceremonial objects to public view, perhaps by partnering with a suitable local Museum.~~

~~Background Notes (not part of active motion):~~

- ~~1. We understand that before lock down, school visits were made to the Guild Hall on occasion.~~
- ~~2. The Guild Hall still contains a court house and functioning cells which were used up until the 1920s.~~
- ~~3. The Guild Hall is also home to the Council's collection of ceremonial objects, such as maces and trowels.~~

Council notes that:

1. With the Guildhall currently occupied by a tenant and Mandela House still operating as if locked down, that the council is not projecting an open and accessible physical presence to the public;
2. The council has made the welcome decision to retain the Guildhall as a civic building at the heart of the city and to operate from it in future;
3. That even with the recent shift to digital transactions with the council, there is an unrealised potential for a physical shop window for its work offering some personal contact.

Council calls for:

1. A timetable for the council's re-occupation of the Guildhall to be agreed and published as soon as is practicable;
2. An interim re-instatement of a daily open door, a reception to the public staffed by the council, a small exhibition space for topical matters related to the city council and other public services, and computer terminals enabling digital access for the public to the wider services of the council;
3. Access to be enabled to schools and other visitors to the council chamber and civic regalia.

On a show of hands, the amendment was lost by 10 votes to 23.

Councillor Pounds proposed, and Councillor Dryden seconded the following amendment to the Open Doors at the Guildhall motion. (Deleted text ~~struck through~~, additional text underlined.)

- ~~1. This council resolves to promote a closer relationship between the council and residents by opening the Guild Hall to the public.~~

- ~~2. It is envisaged that initially this would be on a trial basis and hours would be limited, or by appointment only.~~
- ~~3. It is envisaged that priority would be given to school groups and other educational visits.~~
- ~~4. This council resolves to consider ways of opening up its collection of antique ceremonial objects to public view, perhaps by partnering with a suitable local Museum.~~

**Background Notes (not part of active motion):**

- ~~4. We understand that before lock down, school visits were made to the Guild Hall on occasion.~~
- ~~5. The Guild Hall still contains a court house and functioning cells which were used up until the 1920s.~~
- ~~6. The Guild Hall is also home to the Council's collection of ceremonial objects, such as maces and trowels.~~

**Council notes that:**

- Public access to the Guildhall and its predecessor buildings have played a vital role in the civic and community life of Cambridge for centuries.
- There is an open invitation to the Guildhall for members of the public to observe and contribute to the work of the Council, which is fundamental to the transparency and accountability of the democratic process.
- The presence of the ceremonial artifacts in the Guildhall is symbolic of the Council's institutional authority as a democratically elected decision-making body, and these are available to view.
- The Guildhall's facilities are open to the public for a diverse range of community and commercial activities, facilitated in part by the Allia-operated Future Business Centre which was pioneered by the Labour Group.
- Hosting tours of the Guildhall for the Cambridge community, including youth organisations, is already a core part of the Mayor's role, and work is underway to establish the demand for – and resource implications of – tours for school children.

**Council believes that:**

- Maintaining and expanding public access to the Guildhall is an important part of showing openness to residents, and preserving the civic history of Cambridge.
- This must be part of a wider culture around opening our spaces across the city, improving resident access to other spaces such as community

centres, so that delivery of services and contact with the Council is not limited to a central location.

Council resolves to:

- Reiterate its commitment to maintaining the Guildhall as the City's seat of local government, and its commitment to refurbishing the Guildhall into a community-oriented civic space in line with the pledge made in Cambridge Labour's manifesto.
- Continue to invite a diverse range of community and educational organisations into the Guildhall and encourage any such organisations which are interested to reach out to the Mayor.

On a show of hands, the amendment was carried by 23 votes to 4.

**Resolved (by 33 votes to 4) that:**

Council notes that:

- Public access to the Guildhall and its predecessor buildings have played a vital role in the civic and community life of Cambridge for centuries.
- There is an open invitation to the Guildhall for members of the public to observe and contribute to the work of the Council, which is fundamental to the transparency and accountability of the democratic process.
- The presence of the ceremonial artifacts in the Guildhall is symbolic of the Council's institutional authority as a democratically elected decision-making body, and these are available to view.
- The Guildhall's facilities are open to the public for a diverse range of community and commercial activities, facilitated in part by the Allia-operated Future Business Centre which was pioneered by the Labour Group.
- Hosting tours of the Guildhall for the Cambridge community, including youth organisations, is already a core part of the Mayor's role, and work is underway to establish the demand for – and resource implications of – tours for school children.

Council believes that:

- Maintaining and expanding public access to the Guildhall is an important part of showing openness to residents and preserving the civic history of Cambridge.
- This must be part of a wider culture around opening our spaces across the city, improving resident access to other spaces such as community centres, so that delivery of services and contact with the Council is not limited to a central location.

Council resolves to:

- Reiterate its commitment to maintaining the Guildhall as the City's seat of local government, and its commitment to refurbishing the Guildhall into a community-oriented civic space in line with the pledge made in Cambridge Labour's manifesto.
- Continue to invite a diverse range of community and educational organisations into the Guildhall and encourage any such organisations which are interested to reach out to the Mayor.

### **23/44/CNL Councillor Moore - Waste Strategy**

Councillor Moore proposed and Councillor Nestor seconded the following motion:

This council notes:

- Cambridge City Council is the waste and recycling collection authority for Cambridge City.
- Cambridgeshire County Council is the waste disposal authority for Cambridgeshire including the city of Cambridge
- The County Council has a PFI contract with Thalia (previously Amey Cespa) for the disposal of residual (black bin) waste, which is treated in the Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) facility before it is sent to landfill in Waterbeach.
- The Waterbeach landfill is predicted to be full in the next 8-10 years (2031-2033).
- Food waste represents the largest material category in England's waste stream, and is generally sent for disposal, also forming the largest component of England's residual waste. Detailed waste analysis from 2019 shows that one third of residual waste in Cambridgeshire is food waste, although residents are asked to dispose of their food waste in the green bin.
- Estimates suggest that 8-10% of global greenhouse gas emissions are from with food waste.
- In 2020 10% of greenhouse gas emissions in Cambridge were caused by waste management, which equates to 49.6 ktCO<sub>2</sub>e.
- The government's 2018 Waste & Resources Strategy has a target of achieving the UN's Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 12.3 which aims at halving per-capita global food waste by 2030 and standardising waste collection across the UK in order to increase recycling rates.

- The Greater Cambridge Shared Waste Service recently carried out a successful separate food waste collection trial.
- The City Council's climate strategy has an ambition of Cambridge being a net zero carbon city by 2030.
- Upgrade works at the treatment facility provide an opportunity to ensure the future needs of the city and county and our carbon reduction targets.
- The government is offering collection authorities (including all of the districts in Cambridgeshire) funding, through the waste and resources strategy, to introduce separate weekly food waste collections.

This council will:

- Ask the leader of the City Council to write to the Leader of Cambridgeshire County Council requesting that they create a waste disposal strategy to ensure both the best service and continuity for residents alongside improving opportunities for food waste treatment and increased recycling rates.
- Ask the leader of the City Council to write to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to support both waste collection and waste disposal authorities to establish separate weekly food waste collections as set out in the Waste and Resources Strategy, in order to achieve our waste reduction and net zero targets.

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

### **23/45/CNL Councillor Thornburrow - Stop Dumping Sewage in our River and Chalk Streams**

Councillor Thornburrow proposed, and Councillor Holloway seconded the following motion:

This Council notes that:

On 21st July 2022, a motion was passed by the Council regarding Rivers, Safe Swimming and Sewage, which recognised the cumulative impact of sewage discharge events.

The responsible bodies are the Environment Agency for general oversight, Cambridge Water for water supply, and Anglian Water for sewage. Despite members highlighting the issues in this Council, and engaging with the Environment Agency and Anglian Water, recent evidence shows that pollution levels in our rivers and chalk streams remain unacceptable.

Many residents and local organisations have rightly raised concerns about the health implications of the poor water quality in our rivers and chalk streams, especially during summer months when local children and families would expect to be able to bathe and enjoy nature-rich river banks. Cam Valley Forum have undertaken water quality tests for the year 2021 to 2022, and Anglian Water continue to take weekly tests. All show poor water quality.

On 22nd September 2022, South Cambridgeshire District Council agreed a motion calling for measures to stop water companies dumping raw sewage in our chalk streams, and has begun working towards a formal application to Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs for an inland bathing water stretch within their district under the Bathing Water Directive (2006/7/EC).

A designation as a bathing water site from the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs imposes a legal obligation on Anglian Water to reduce sewage pollution in the area concerned until the level 'good' or 'excellent' is reached; requires the Environment Agency to test the water regularly during the bathing season in order to produce an annual classification as "excellent", "good", "sufficient" or "poor"; requires the local council and agencies to publish the annual water quality classification; and can help residents enjoy the benefits of wild swimming, reducing stress, and improving wellbeing, fitness and contact with nature.

Therefore, this Council calls on everyone to engage with the River Cam and its associated chalk streams and tributaries with respect, accepting our stewardship of this vital natural resource, and asks all residents and organisations of Cambridge to act as guardians of the river and be mindful of the impact of our own actions and those of others that threaten its health and survival.

Furthermore, in order to reduce threats to the River Cam and its tributaries caused by pollution and over-abstraction, this Council:

- will support a formal application to Defra for an inland water stretch along the River Cam within Cambridge City Council boundaries to be designated as a bathing water site, working with Anglian Water and local partners such as Cam Valley Forum, recognising that designation would bring tangible benefits to the health of the river and city residents, subject to approval from the Executive Councillor following consideration by the Environment & Community Scrutiny Committee;
- asks the Chief Executive to send a formal letter to the Environment Agency, Cambridge Water, and Anglian Water expressing its concerns

over the state of the River Cam and associated chalk streams and other tributaries, and calling for their assistance in improving water quality and reducing pollution;

- will continue to consider the impact of the emerging Local Plan on the water environment through the cross-party, cross-boundary Shared Planning Local Plan Advisory Group, and the cross-party Cambridge City Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee;
- affirms the goal, agreed by the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service, of having the water management plan for our chalk streams based on being an 'environmental destination' with subsequent protection as sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), rather than 'business as usual plus';
- will provide public access to the full response of Greater Cambridge Shared Planning to the Cambridge Water, Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) consultation.

### References

Information provided by the Government on Bathing Water Quality <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/bathing-waters>

Information from Cam Valley Forum <https://camvalleyforum.uk/water-quality/>  
South Cambridgeshire District Council motion, agreed on 22 September 2022 <https://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=93434>

Councillor Glasberg proposed and Councillor Bennett seconded the following amendment to the composite motion (deleted text ~~struck through~~ and additional text underlined)

This Council notes that:

On 21st July 2022, a motion was passed by the Council regarding Rivers, Safe Swimming and Sewage, which recognised the cumulative impact of sewage discharge events.

The responsible bodies are the Environment Agency for general oversight, Cambridge Water for water supply, and Anglian Water for sewage. Despite members highlighting the issues in this Council, and engaging with the Environment Agency and Anglian Water, recent evidence shows that pollution levels in our rivers and chalk streams remain unacceptable.

Many residents and local organisations have rightly raised concerns about the health implications of the poor water quality in our rivers and chalk streams,



especially during summer months when local children and families would expect to be able to bathe and enjoy nature-rich river banks. Cam Valley Forum have undertaken water quality tests for the year 2021 to 2022, and Anglian Water continue to take weekly tests. All show poor water quality.

On 22nd September 2022, South Cambridgeshire District Council agreed a motion calling for measures to stop water companies dumping raw sewage in our chalk streams, and has begun working towards a formal application to Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs for an inland bathing water stretch within their district under the Bathing Water Directive (2006/7/EC).

A designation as a bathing water site from the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs imposes a legal obligation on Anglian Water to reduce sewage pollution in the area concerned until the level 'good' or 'excellent' is reached; requires the Environment Agency to test the water regularly during the bathing season in order to produce an annual classification as "excellent", "good", "sufficient" or "poor"; requires the local council and agencies to publish the annual water quality classification; and can help residents enjoy the benefits of wild swimming, reducing stress, and improving wellbeing, fitness and contact with nature.

Therefore, this Council calls on everyone to engage with the River Cam and its associated chalk streams and tributaries with respect, accepting our stewardship of this vital natural resource, and asks all residents and organisations of Cambridge to act as guardians of the river and be mindful of the impact of our own actions and those of others that threaten its health and survival.

Furthermore, in order to reduce threats to the River Cam and its tributaries caused by pollution and over-abstraction, this Council:

- will support a formal application to Defra for an inland water stretch along the River Cam within Cambridge City Council boundaries to be designated as a bathing water site, working with Anglian Water and local partners such as Cam Valley Forum, recognising that designation would bring tangible benefits to the health of the river and city residents, subject to approval from the Executive Councillor following consideration by the Environment & Community Scrutiny Committee;
- The Council will carefully consider the implications of the 3 July 2023 guidance Bathing waters: apply to designate or de-designate - GOV.UK ([www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk))

- In particular, the council will take advice as to the legal and public health implications of encouraging a minimum of 100 people to spend an aggregate of 800 hours immersed in an unsafe and polluted area. This is a requirement of any new application for designated status.
- The Council will also take advice as to the legal and public health implications of encouraging an unknown number of people to expose themselves to polluted water. It should be borne in mind that only testing for e coli would be required if designated status is granted and not for the other chemicals and contaminants known to be present in the Cam.
- The Council will carefully consider and take independent biodiversity advice on the impact on the river, the river banks, protected species and particularly on the three local nature reserves adjacent to the site.
- The Council will consult the Conservators of the River Cam who are the statutory navigation authority for the river.
- The Council will consider the impact on existing other users of the area including but not limited to the existing 600 member canoe club, the iconic punt route through this narrow site to Grantchester Meadows and the impact on the key tourism asset of the Scudamores punt station and existing visitors to and residents of this popular and heavily used area..
- The Council shall review the accident and safety records of the site and consider the costs and biodiversity implications of making the site physically safe for swimmers.
- The council shall consider the considerable capital and recurring costs and feasibility of providing and maintaining appropriate bankside facilities to comply with the 3 July 2023 requirements and its own safety standards.
- The Council shall consider the likelihood of any designated bathing water application resulting in cleaner water given that water status remains poor at the only current inland bathing site at Ilkley.
- The Council shall consider carefully the outcome of this preliminary review before making any decision to permit a public consultation to take place or any application for designated bathing area status to proceed.
- asks the Chief Executive to send a formal letter to the Environment Agency, Cambridge Water, and Anglian Water expressing its concerns over the state of the River Cam and associated chalk streams and other tributaries, and calling for their assistance in improving water quality and reducing pollution;
- will continue to consider the impact of the emerging Local Plan on the water environment through the cross-party, cross-boundary Shared Planning Local Plan Advisory Group, and the cross-party Cambridge City Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee;

- affirms the goal, agreed by the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service, of having the water management plan for our chalk streams based on being an 'environmental destination' with subsequent protection as sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), rather than 'business as usual plus';
- will provide public access to the full response of Greater Cambridge Shared Planning to the Cambridge Water, Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) consultation.

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 5 votes to 32 votes.

Councillor Porrer proposed and Councillor Nethsingha seconded the following amendment to the composite motion (deleted text ~~struckthrough~~ and additional text underlined)

This Council notes that:

On 21st July 2022, a motion was passed by the Council regarding Rivers, Safe Swimming and Sewage, which recognised the cumulative impact of sewage discharge events.

The responsible bodies are the Environment Agency for general oversight, Cambridge Water for water supply, and Anglian Water for sewage. Despite members highlighting the issues in this Council, and engaging with the Environment Agency and Anglian Water, recent evidence shows that pollution levels in our rivers and chalk streams remain unacceptable.

Many residents and local organisations have rightly raised concerns about the health implications of the poor water quality in our rivers and chalk streams, especially during summer months when local children and families would expect to be able to bathe and enjoy nature-rich river banks. Cam Valley Forum have undertaken water quality tests for the year 2021 to 2022, and Anglian Water continue to take weekly tests. All show poor water quality.

On 22nd September 2022, South Cambridgeshire District Council agreed a motion calling for measures to stop water companies dumping raw sewage in our chalk streams, and has begun working towards a formal application to Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs for an inland bathing water stretch within their district under the Bathing Water Directive (2006/7/EC).

A designation as a bathing water site from the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs imposes a legal obligation on Anglian Water to reduce

sewage pollution in the area concerned until the level 'good' or 'excellent' is reached; requires the Environment Agency to test the water regularly during the bathing season in order to produce an annual classification as "excellent", "good", "sufficient" or "poor"; requires the local council and agencies to publish the annual water quality classification; and can help residents enjoy the benefits of wild swimming, reducing stress, and improving wellbeing, fitness and contact with nature.

Therefore, this Council calls on everyone to engage with the River Cam and its associated chalk streams and tributaries with respect, accepting our stewardship of this vital natural resource, and asks all residents and organisations of Cambridge to act as guardians of the river and be mindful of the impact of our own actions and those of others that threaten its health and survival.

Furthermore, in order to reduce threats to the River Cam and its tributaries caused by pollution and over-abstraction, this Council:

- ~~• will support a formal application to Defra for an inland water stretch along the River Cam within Cambridge City Council boundaries to be designated as a bathing water site, working with Anglian Water and local partners such as Cam Valley Forum, recognising that designation would bring tangible benefits to the health of the river and city residents, subject to approval from the Executive Councillor following consideration by the Environment & Community Scrutiny Committee;~~
- Agrees to evaluate the potential of a formal application to Defra for an inland water stretch along the River Cam within Cambridge City Council boundaries to be designated as a bathing site, working with Anglian Water and local partners such as Cam Valley Forum, in order to secure an improvement in water quality while also taking into account the impact of any increased usage and avoidance of significant additional cost; and requests a report on this to the Environment & Community Scrutiny Committee to inform a balanced decision by the Executive Councillor.
- asks the Chief Executive to send a formal letter to the Environment Agency, Cambridge Water, and Anglian Water expressing its concerns over the state of the River Cam and associated chalk streams and other tributaries, and calling for their assistance in improving water quality and reducing pollution;
- will continue to consider the impact of the emerging Local Plan on the water environment through the cross-party, cross-boundary Shared Planning Local Plan Advisory Group, and the cross-party Cambridge City Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee;

- affirms the goal, agreed by the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service, of having the water management plan for our chalk streams based on being an 'environmental destination' with subsequent protection as sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), rather than 'business as usual plus';
- will provide public access to the full response of Greater Cambridge Shared Planning to the Cambridge Water, Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) consultation.

On a show of hands, the amendment was carried by 33 votes to 1.

**Resolved (by 33 votes to 1 vote) that:**

This Council notes that:

On 21st July 2022, a motion was passed by the Council regarding Rivers, Safe Swimming and Sewage, which recognised the cumulative impact of sewage discharge events.

The responsible bodies are the Environment Agency for general oversight, Cambridge Water for water supply, and Anglian Water for sewage. Despite members highlighting the issues in this Council, and engaging with the Environment Agency and Anglian Water, recent evidence shows that pollution levels in our rivers and chalk streams remain unacceptable.

Many residents and local organisations have rightly raised concerns about the health implications of the poor water quality in our rivers and chalk streams, especially during summer months when local children and families would expect to be able to bathe and enjoy nature-rich riverbanks. Cam Valley Forum have undertaken water quality tests for the year 2021 to 2022, and Anglian Water continue to take weekly tests. All show poor water quality.

On 22nd September 2022, South Cambridgeshire District Council agreed a motion calling for measures to stop water companies dumping raw sewage in our chalk streams and had begun working towards a formal application to Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs for an inland bathing water stretch within their district under the Bathing Water Directive (2006/7/EC).

A designation as a bathing water site from the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs imposes a legal obligation on Anglian Water to reduce sewage pollution in the area concerned until the level 'good' or 'excellent' is reached; requires the Environment Agency to test the water regularly during

the bathing season in order to produce an annual classification as “excellent”, “good”, “sufficient” or “poor”; requires the local council and agencies to publish the annual water quality classification; and can help residents enjoy the benefits of wild swimming, reducing stress, and improving wellbeing, fitness and contact with nature.

Therefore, this Council calls on everyone to engage with the River Cam and its associated chalk streams and tributaries with respect, accepting our stewardship of this vital natural resource, and asks all residents and organisations of Cambridge to act as guardians of the river and be mindful of the impact of our own actions and those of others that threaten its health and survival.

Furthermore, in order to reduce threats to the River Cam and its tributaries caused by pollution and over-abstraction, this Council:

- Agrees to evaluate the potential of a formal application to Defra for an inland water stretch along the River Cam within Cambridge City Council boundaries to be designated as a bathing site, working with Anglian Water and local partners such as Cam Valley Forum, in order to secure an improvement in water quality while also taking into account the impact of any increased usage and avoidance of significant additional cost; and requests a report on this to the Environment & Community Scrutiny Committee to inform a balanced decision by the Executive Councillor.
- asks the Chief Executive to send a formal letter to the Environment Agency, Cambridge Water, and Anglian Water expressing its concerns over the state of the River Cam and associated chalk streams and other tributaries, and calling for their assistance in improving water quality and reducing pollution;
- will continue to consider the impact of the emerging Local Plan on the water environment through the cross-party, cross-boundary Shared Planning Local Plan Advisory Group, and the cross-party Cambridge City Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee;
- affirms the goal, agreed by the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service, of having the water management plan for our chalk streams based on being an ‘environmental destination’ with subsequent protection as sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), rather than ‘business as usual plus’;
- will provide public access to the full response of Greater Cambridge Shared Planning to the Cambridge Water, Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) consultation.

## **23/46/CNL Written questions**

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

The meeting ended at 11.21 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank