

Cambridge City Council Notice of Council

Date: Monday, 17 March 2025

Time: 6.30 pm (or at the conclusion of the Extraordinary Council meeting which begins at 6pm).

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

Contact: 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 Monday, 17 March 2025 at 6.30 pm and I hereby summon you to attend.

Dated 7 March 2025

Yours faithfully

Robert Pollock

Chief Executive

Agenda

This meeting is a continuation of the meeting held on Monday 24 February 2025 and will consider agenda items 8, 9a, 9b, 9c, 9d, 11b, 11c and 11d (which have been renumbered 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d and 3a, 3b and 3c below)

- 1 To deal with oral questions (Pages 13 - 18)
- 2 To consider the following notices of motion, notice of which has been given by:
 - 2a Councillor Porrer - Improving the Delivery of High Quality Local Development
Council **BELIEVES** its Planning Committees beneficially shape and add value to development within our area; and that, contrary to the

government's characterisation, they do not simply 'say no', but create leverage which helps makes local development as good and as sustainable as it can be - and that their track record demonstrates this.

It also **BELIEVES** that, whatever the situation in other parts of the country, the main constraints on policy-compliant development in our area are: failure to implement permissions already given, speed of implementation enabling infrastructure by third party organisations, the capacity of the construction industry and the availability of so-called 'viability' to claim exemption from affordable housing policy.

Noting its initiatives to streamline the planning process as a means of encouraging construction activity, council **URGES** the government not to eliminate the processes which in our area add value to development, in terms of both an enabling policy framework and approval for individual projects – democratically based and equipped with local knowledge to judge context.

Instead of impairing good practice where it exists, council **URGES** the government to target those parts of the country where there is a failure to adopt local plans to meet societal needs and/or mis-use of development control to frustrate compliant development; and to assist us in this area by focusing on more significant impediments to needed development such as:

- Implementing: a 'use it or lose it' approach to planning permission;
- Bringing forward a supported skills plan for the construction industry;
- Acceleration of supportive infrastructure such as water, energy and transport;
- More prompt delivery of national planning decisions like the sewage works relocation (on which we depend for other local decisions);
- Making requirements for affordable housing and community facilities more 'escape-proof' and enforceable.

Accordingly council **REQUESTS** that the Chief Executive writes to both to the Deputy Prime Minister and to the local MPs who represent different parts of the city of Cambridge, Daniel Zeichner and Pippa Heylings, to encourage them to ensure that upcoming legislation and other government policy reflects these views.

2b Councillor Tong - Barriers to Cambridge Growth
2025

The purpose of this motion is to draw attention to the very real barriers to the Labour government's ambitious growth plans for Cambridge and the concerns raised for quality of life and the natural environment.

Active Motion:

Background:

This council notes the announcement by the Chancellor, Rachel Reeves on 29 January 2025 that she intends to go "further and faster" to deliver an Oxford- Cambridge Growth Corridor.

This Council notes that Chancellor Reeves places particular attention on life sciences, artificial intelligence and advanced manufacturing.

This Council notes the stated aim of Chancellor Reeves to overcome constraints on economic growth in the region and her statement that to grow we need to attract world class companies and world class talent.

This motion is intended to form an open letter to the Chancellor and her team.

Water Supply Concerns:

This Council notes with concern that the Chancellor wishes to pursue further investment in life sciences and AI. Both of these are particularly demanding in terms of water use as well as demands made on the national grid.

Cambridge is in a water stressed region and the national grid is also overstretched locally. The proposed new reservoir will be ten years too late to provide the water needed for the council's original growth plans let alone the increases demanded by first Michael Gove and then Angela Rayner and Rachel Reeves.

The council notes that just one small data centre uses 26 million litres of drinking quality water per year -enough water for 648 adults using 110L per day.

The council further notes that the new Fenland reservoir is in an area prone to flooding raising concerns over water security.

The council further notes that the “investment” required to build the new reservoirs will be provided by allowing water companies to raise their charges in excess of inflation while continuing to pay excessive amounts to management and investors.

The council asks in which sense is the Chancellor providing this investment and calls upon her to renationalise our failing water companies.

Transport concerns:

This council notes Chancellor Reeves’ desire to improve commuter routes across the region.

The council wishes to draw her attention to EW Rail’s own passenger transport figures which show a very limited demand for the proposed new services. EW rail will do nothing to help workers travelling to Cambridge from Haverhill and the east of the city.

Quality of life

This council notes the Chancellor’s emphasis on attracting world class talent to Cambridge. These are people who might choose to work anywhere and will expect a high quality of life not just a job. Our excessively high housing costs mean that many workers don’t have enough disposable income to enjoy what Cambridge has to offer. Moreover, young GPs and other key workers can’t afford to live here so our health services suffer.

In conclusion

This council asks the Chancellor to reconsider her plans for Cambridge. We ask her to be open and transparent in acknowledging the extent of our water and other environmental problems as well as the fears of local communities who already perceive increasing inequity in our already rapidly expanding city.

We firmly believe that the measures she proposes are insufficient to secure the future and safety of our residents, our economy and of our natural environment.

Councillor Davey proposes and Councillor Thornburrow seconds the following amendment to motion 2b, additional text underlined and deleted text ~~struck through~~.

~~The purpose of this motion is to draw attention to the very real barriers to the Labour government’s ambitious growth plans for Cambridge~~

~~and the concerns raised for quality of life and the natural environment.~~

~~Active Motion:~~

~~Background:~~

~~This council notes the announcement by the Chancellor, Rachel Reeves on 29 January 2025 that she intends to go “further and faster” to deliver an Oxford- Cambridge Growth Corridor.~~

~~This Council notes that Chancellor Reeves places particular attention on life sciences, artificial intelligence and advanced manufacturing.~~

~~This Council notes the stated aim of Chancellor Reeves to overcome constraints on economic growth in the region and her statement that to grow we need to attract world class companies and world class talent.~~

~~This Council notes the open letter co-written by Cambridge leaders to the UK government in January 2025 which welcomes the government’s recognition of the importance of the region for the government’s ambitious growth plan.~~

~~In addition, it highlights the major issues facing the region stating ‘If we are to maximise the potential benefits of those future Cambridge innovations – the ‘software’ breakthroughs – it will mean investing in the ‘hardware’ of the city. Lack of investment in housing, water and transport needs has meant we have not been able to maximise growth for Cambridge, the region and Britain.’~~

~~This Council looks forward to working with central Government and the Cambridge Growth Company to tackle these challenges and continue delivering the best for our residents and businesses.~~

~~This motion is intended to form an open letter to the Chancellor and her team.~~

~~Water Supply Concerns:~~

~~This Council notes with concern that the Chancellor wishes to pursue further investment in life sciences and AI. Both of these are particularly demanding in terms of water use as well as demands made on the national grid.~~

~~Cambridge is in a water stressed region and the national grid is also overstretched locally. The proposed new reservoir will be ten years~~

~~too late to provide the water needed for the council's original growth plans let alone the increases demanded by first Michael Gove and then Angela Rayner and Rachel Reeves.~~

~~The council notes that just one small data centre uses 26 million litres of drinking quality water per year – enough water for 648 adults using 110L per day.~~

~~The council further notes that the new Fenland reservoir is in an area prone to flooding raising concerns over water security.~~

~~The council further notes that the “investment” required to build the new reservoirs will be provided by allowing water companies to raise their charges in excess of inflation while continuing to pay excessive amounts to management and investors.~~

~~The council asks in which sense is the Chancellor providing this investment and calls upon her to renationalise our failing water companies.~~

Transport concerns:

~~This council notes Chancellor Reeves' desire to improve commuter routes across the region.~~

~~The council wishes to draw her attention to EW Rail's own passenger transport figures which show a very limited demand for the proposed new services. EW rail will do nothing to help workers travelling to Cambridge from Haverhill and the east of the city.~~

Quality of life

~~This council notes the Chancellor's emphasis on attracting world class talent to Cambridge. These are people who might choose to work anywhere and will expect a high quality of life not just a job. Our excessively high housing costs mean that many workers don't have enough disposable income to enjoy what Cambridge has to offer. Moreover, young GPs and other key workers can't afford to live here so our health services suffer.~~

In conclusion

~~This council asks the Chancellor to reconsider her plans for Cambridge. We ask her to be open and transparent in acknowledging the extent of our water and other environmental problems as well as the fears of local communities who already perceive increasing inequity in our already rapidly expanding city.~~

~~We firmly believe that the measures she proposes are insufficient to secure the future and safety of our residents, our economy and of our natural environment.~~

2c Councillor Hossain - Opposition to a Blanket 20mph Speed Limit Zone in Cambridge

Council notes that:

1. Cambridgeshire County Council has proposed introducing 20 mile per hour speed restrictions on 38 new roads in Cambridge City.
2. When combined with existing roads with 20 mile per hour speed restrictions, this would have the effect of making all major routes within the city 20mph, equivalent to an effective 20mph city-wide limit.

Council believes that:

1. Speed restrictions should always only be implemented with the specific consent and evidenced support of the local community on a street-by-street basis to reflect the impacts this may have on individual neighbourhoods.
2. Lower speed limits can lead to inefficient traffic flow, causing vehicles to operate at lower gears for longer durations. This results in increased fuel consumption and higher emissions, exacerbating air pollution at a time when we should be working to improve air quality.
3. Many residents and workers in Cambridge rely on their vehicles for essential travel. A reduction in speed limits without clear justification risks increasing fuel consumption, placing an additional financial burden on motorists at a time of rising living costs.
4. Decisions of this scale should be subject to a Comprehensive Economic Impact Assessment to evaluate the potential consequences of this policy. Major decisions affecting local businesses, workers, and residents should be backed by proper research and consultation.

Council resolves:

1. To write to Cambridgeshire County Council in objection to the existing proposals on the basis that individual neighbourhoods have not been properly consulted, nor city residents made properly aware of the overall transport implications of a city-wide 20mph speed restriction.
2. To include in our submission to Cambridgeshire County Council a request for a full economic and environmental impact assessment to be conducted before any future proposals of this kind are made.
3. To engage in meaningful consultation with local businesses, residents, and transport professionals to ensure any changes to speed limits are evidence-based and proportionate.
4. To prioritise alternative measures to improve road safety, such as better road maintenance, improved traffic light sequencing, and targeted enforcement in high-risk areas rather than blanket speed restrictions.

2d Councillor Sheil - A National Care Service for England - national UNISON campaign

This council believes adult social care should enable people to live the life they want to live.

But despite the previous government's commitment to 'fix social care', deferrals by and excuses from that same government have left this vital public service in a desperate condition.

The problems in social care are particularly evident in the workforce. Many care staff are paid minimum wage or less for a difficult and skilled job. Some domiciliary care employees do not get paid for their travel time between care visits, while care workers are paid significantly less than the minimum wage for overnight sleep-in shifts. Most care workers do not even have access to an adequate occupational sick pay scheme, which means they lose significant sums in wages when they are unwell or need to self-isolate. Meanwhile, this country has been shamed by the exploitation of many migrant care staff, who are forced to work excessive hours or pay huge amounts for their training or equipment.

Figures from Skills for Care show there are 131,000 vacancies in the care sector, one of the highest rates in the entire economy. Workforce

shortages; poor pay and conditions; and a lack of national direction on social care mean too many people cannot access the care they need.

The Labour Government is proposing local government reorganisation which will reconfigure the structure and responsibilities of local government. This will mean that the responsibilities of any future unitary authority in Cambridge will include social care. The Cambridgeshire County Council has noted that between 2020 and 2024 the cost of providing services for older people and people with physical disabilities increased by 64%. Rising demand for these services will inevitably impact any future Cambridge council's budget.

But there is hope. This council notes the campaign by UNISON, the lead trade union in social care, for a National Care (NCS) in England, for a service which will:

- improve the quality of care for everyone who needs it.
- support independent living and take a 'home first' approach which enables people to recover outside hospital and care homes with the right help.
- promote public sector and non-profit delivery of care services.
- have national partnership working, bringing together employers, unions, and government in a national partnership.
- Implement a Fair Pay Agreement in adult social care.

This council also welcomes the commitment made in the Labour Party's 2024 general election manifesto to 'undertake a programme of reform to create a National Care Service, underpinned by national standards, delivering consistency of care across the country'.

This council further notes that the Fabian Society has published a comprehensive plan for building a NCS in England, with empowered local authorities at its core, called *Support Guaranteed: The Roadmap to a National Care Service*. The report states: 'Councils should remain in charge [of social care]. But our firm view is that more nationwide rights, standards and functions are needed for local government to fulfil its adult social care mission.'

This council believes that building a NCS can also help drive wider economic growth. The 2023 Future Social Care Coalition report *Carenomics* demonstrates the contribution that social care makes to

the UK economy, with the sector generating in England alone £51.5 billion in gross value added (GVA) to the economy.

This council pledges its support for a NCS and encourages the new government to carry out this reform.

3 Officer Decisions

- 3a To note - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority- Appointment of the Council's Audit and Governance Committee reserve (substitute) member (Pages 19 - 20)
- 3b To note - Appointment of Cambridge City Council Representatives to the Conservators of the River Cam (Pages 21 - 22)
- 3c To note - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority- Appointment of 1 x member to the CPCA's Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Pages 23 - 24)

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
- Phone: 01223 457000

Cambridge City Council is committed to being transparent and open when the Council and its members are involved in taking decisions. The Council will endeavour to live stream/record the Full Council meeting. The livestream can be watched online as the meeting happens or the recording can be watched after the meeting via the Council's YouTube page [<https://www.youtube.com/@camcitco/streams>]. On some occasions this may not be possible, due to a technical fault with the equipment. Whilst this is frustrating it is important to note that there is no legal requirement to record or livestream meetings. The meeting may proceed in person only should there be an ICT failure on the day.