

COUNCIL

17 March 2025
7.45 - 10.15 pm

Present: Councillors Ashton, Baigent, Bennett, Bick, Bird, Blackburn-Horgan, Carling, Clough, Davey, Divkovic, Dryden, Flaubert, Gardiner-Smith, Gilderdale, Glasberg, Hauk, Holloway, Hossain, Lee, Lokhmotova, Martinelli, McPherson, Moore, Nestor, Payne, Porrer, Pounds, Robertson, Sheil, Smart, S. Smith, Swift, Thittala, Thornburrow, Todd-Jones, Tong, Wade and Young

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

25/26/CNL Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillors Baigent, Blackburn-Horgan, Glasberg, Tong	All	Personal - Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Bennett	25/31/CNL	Personal – Member of a party that is affiliated with national “20 is plenty” campaign.
Councillor Hossain	25/31/CNL	Personal – Taxi driver.
Councillor Bennett	25/32/CNL	Personal – Disabled woman. A Local Government Association Disabilities Champion. Member of the Low-Income Tax Reform Group, which had a large involvement in career issues. A family carer, a recipient of care and an employer of carers.
Councillor Sheil	25/32/CNL	Personal - Member of Unison and a care worker.
Councillor Bird,	25/32/CNL	Personal - Member of Unison.

Blackburn-Horgan, Porrer, Todd-Jones, Thornburrow		
---	--	--

25/27/CNL To deal with oral questions

Question 1:

Councillor Hauk to the Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services.

What does the Council do to promote herbicide-free methods for weed control on roads and open spaces to private bodies such as developers, colleges, schools, and other councils?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. To promote herbicide free methods the most important and critical thing the Council could do was to continue to be a herbicide free authority.
- ii. Using weed killer allowed dangerous poisons to flow into waterways and this should be avoided.
- iii. Some other UK authorities changed plans to be herbicide free and then re-introduced the use of weed killers, but the Executive Councillor was determined to deliver a better and more sustainable methodology for weed removal. The Council took a multipronged approach to encourage herbicide free weed management.
- iv. The Council had published and made available detailed reports online about alternative weed control technologies such as mechanical removal cultural practices and biological controls. So others such as developers, colleges, schools and other councils had practical help and examples to help them to manage weeds without resorting to chemicals.
- v. The Council actively worked with external stakeholders such as Pesticide Free Cambridge and On The Verge to foster partnerships and share case studies by collaborating. The Council created a network of informed ambassadors who exchanged knowledge and supported with each other in adopting non-chemical strategies to further motivate the uptake of herbicide free practices.
- vi. The Council offered technical advice and support to reduce the initial challenges and costs that could arise from transitioning to alternative methods.

- vii. Officers were attending a meeting with Central Government in March 2025 to share best practice and challenges around integrated pest management uptake in urban environments. The meeting would also be attended by representatives from Pesticide Action Network and potentially the Local Government Association along with a couple of other councils.
- viii. Through our website, City Matters and other meetings; the Council kept stakeholders informed about the benefits of herbicide free weed management highlighting environmental health and biodiversity gains. This communication ensured that all parties were aware of both the rationale and practical steps to take.

Question 2:

Councillor A Smith to the Executive Councillor for Community Safety and Homelessness

The Labour government announced the largest ever cash boost to turn the tide on homelessness in December 2024. What will this mean for the city council and our work to end homelessness?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. Was delighted the Labour Government had given a much needed boost to homelessness services through funding for next year. This was just the start of a huge amount of work that's required.
- ii. For the City Council there were three main elements to homelessness funding that the Council received from the government.
- iii. The Council had a significant uplift of £250,000 homelessness prevention grant for the next year, which took our total funding across all three elements to about £2.2 million for the next year. This uplift had already allowed the Council to give out significantly more money in Grants to local organizations for next year about £83,000 more than the Council did for the current year.
 - a. A range of projects finance and debt advice specific support for women who were sleeping rough or vulnerably housed.
 - b. Specialist help for young people facing homelessness, also for older people facing homelessness, victims of domestic abuse support for those living in our modular homes and much more so

was really glad that the Council were able to continue and significantly increase grant funding this year.

- iv. The Council intended to spend money on some of its own projects so some of that extra money would go towards a new supported lettings officer and there would also be some spent on a homelessness review as the Council developed a strategy for the next year.

Question 3:

Councillor Swift to the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Environment.

There's currently a live consultation on the Council's smoke control areas. Can the Executive for Climate Change and Environment explain what this means and how residents can respond?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The Council were asking residents and businesses for their views on proposals to amend the boundary of the existing smoke control areas with the option to include permanent residential vessels.
- ii. A smoke controlled area was a space designated by the Council to reduce pollution from burning wood and coal.
- iii. The Council were considering these changes to improve the health of residents and visitors.
- iv. Smoke from chimneys contained tiny particulate matter known as PM2.5 which could travel deep into peoples' lungs and cause/worsen numerous health conditions.
- v. In Cambridge solid fuel and wood burning was the largest single source of PM2.5 emissions.
- vi. The Council currently had three smoke control areas established in the 1960s that covered the west and centre of the city.
- vii. Smoke control areas rules did not apply to the permanent residential vessels ie house boats.
- viii. Cambridge had expanded since the 1960s and so smoke control areas now only covered a small proportion of residential dwellings. The use of wood burning stoves had also recently increased significantly.
- ix. The proposal was to revoke the existing smoke control areas and replace with one that covered the entire city and boats.

Question 4:

Councillor Gardiner-Smith to the Executive Councillor for Communities

How does the City Council's grants team provide support to Cambridge residents though funding voluntary groups/ organisations in the city of Cambridge?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. Round one of the £5,000 and under Community Grant scheme for this year has been delivered. There were a huge number of applications and some £84,000 has been awarded to the voluntary organizations in our city. Demand on the budget was very high and groups who were not successful would receive guidance and advice from the grants team going forward.
- ii. Round two of the grant scheme would launch on the 23rd of April. Ward Councillors would be encouraged to promote the scheme in their ward.
- iii. The Council would also award 92 community grants and discretionary rate relief awards with a value of over £1 million in 2025. The Council had provided homelessness prevention grants to 11 organizations in the city and sustainable city grants to 4 organizations, the Council also funded Cambridge CAB so they could help city residents with general advice and support.

Question 5:

Councillor Glasberg to the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Environment

RVMs were automated machines which offer an efficient, convenient and cost-effective way to recycle plastic bottles and aluminium cans. What steps has the council taken to investigate a trial of Reverse Vending Machines (RVM's)?

The Executive Councillor did not respond as the question was withdrawn.

Question 6:

Councillor Ashton to the Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services

Can the Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services give an update on the ongoing programme of refurbishment works to public toilets in Cambridge?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The recent refurbishment of public toilets program was successfully completed in late 2024 involving a mix of full and partial refurbishments at key locations. Drummer Streets and Cherry Hinton Hall now featured changing places facilities which were funded externally.
- ii. Nightingale Recreation Ground had a new facility that was operational.
- iii. The Silver Street facility was currently being constructed and funded by the capital program.
- iv. Public toilet improvements ensured public amenities met modern standards of safety, accessibility and hygiene.

Question 7:

Councillor Robertson to the Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure

Can the Executive for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure update the council on the latest news about our 5-year land supply and what this means for Cambridge City specifically?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. Changes to the way council housing needs were calculated were introduced in December last year alongside publication of the revised National Planning Policy Forum.
- ii. Overnight the combined housing need for greater Cambridge went from 1,726 homes a year to 2,309 per year - an additional 583 per year. This inevitably impacted upon the calculation of the supply of new homes to meet city future needs over the next 5 years. This calculation was important because planning policy was tilted towards approving development if a local area supply fell short of the 5-year supply.
- iii. Based on information collected this time last year the Greater Cambridge 5-year housing supply calculation overnight fell from a comfortable 5 years to 4.6 years.
- iv. The shared planning services therefore focussed on exploring what could be done to ensure more homes could come forward within the next 5 years.
- v. The Council already had planning permission for 36,000 homes across Greater Cambridge. These mainly concentrated on larger strategic scale

sites. The current focus was therefore on tackling the barriers preventing these and other new homes permitted from being built. This included ensuring that City Council processes supported construction starting on site promptly, once the permission has been given, through to trying to understand why permissions had been granted and were not being implemented by the landowner.

- vi. The Council would also liaise with government and key partners operating in the area to see if they could help accelerate delivery.
- vii. The Council also expected to publish an updated assessment of supply in April 2025.

Question 8:

Councillor Lokhmotova to the Executive Councillor for Housing.

Can the executive councillor for housing explain what the council is doing to ensure the housing associations operating in our city provide high quality, safe and secure housing for our residents?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The Council's Environmental Health Team ensured all private sector housing including Housing Association properties were safe and secure by investigating any complaints the Council may receive from tenants regarding the condition of their property.
- ii. The investigations were conducted under the Housing Act 2004 which gave the Council the duty and power to investigate and take the most appropriate actions. This could be from informal contact with the Housing Association through to enforcement action such as a service of notice requiring works to be completed.
- iii. The Council also conducted proactive work to identify properties that may not reach an appropriate standard by using government data sources and contacting landlords to request inspections. This could be private landlords or housing associations. All registered providers (housing associations, local authorities etc) were regulated by the regulator of the social housing. Their 4 consumer standards were there to ensure properties in the social housing sector were safe and well maintained. They ensure this both by annual data return, inspection regime and working collaboratively with the housing ombudsman.

Question 9:

Councillor Flaubert to the Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services.

Could the Exec Councillor for Open Spaces please update the council on inclusive play areas across the city?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. Provided an update on City Council actions and progress made since the publication of the outdoor play spaces and Investments drastically in March 2024, as well as insights from the follow-up s106 funding allocation report presented on the 16th of January 2025 to Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee.
- ii. The investment strategy report laid out a comprehensive approach for improving city council outdoor play bases with a strong focus on inclusivity.
- iii. The Council was actively implementing recommendations to upgrade existing play areas with modern accessible equipment and improved surface treatments where funding became available to ensure that new design standards across the city reflected the needs of all children including those with disabilities.
- iv. Using City Council data to provide prioritize investment in neighbourhoods where current facilities did not adequately serve diverse community needs, this was evidenced in the most recent s106 funding allocation report in January 2025, the s106 report confirmed that the Council had successfully mobilised section 106 contributions to enhance and create inclusive play areas. This had enabled the Council to invest in new projects and refurbishments that meet modern accessibility and safety standards.
- v. Both reports highlighted the importance of engaging with the community so the Council had conducted consultations with local residents, schools and user groups to gather feedback on existing facilities and future improvements and establish monitoring mechanisms to ensure that the investment translated into tangible benefits with regular reviews and adjustments based on community feedback.
- vi. City Council focus remained on ensuring that every play area not only met current accessibility standards, but also served as a vibrant inclusive space that fostered community interaction and active play.

- vii. Where funding permitted, the Council continued to work closely with all partners to refine City Council approach and accelerate delivery in areas where needs were greatest.

A full list of oral questions including those not asked during the meeting can be found in the Agenda, which is published on the meeting webpage [Agenda for Council on Monday, 17th March, 2025, 6.30 pm - Cambridge Council](#).

25/28/CNL To consider the following notices of motion, notice of which has been given by:

25/29/CNL Councillor Porrer - Improving the Delivery of High Quality Local Development

Councillor Porrer proposed and Councillor Payne seconded the following motion:

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.

During discussion of the motion, Councillor Thornburrow proposed and Councillor Baigent seconded stopping the debate and moving straight to the vote to accept the motion or not, after Councillor Porrer had the right to reply as proposer of the original motion.

This proposal to move to the vote was accepted by 19 votes to 14 with 1 abstention.

The motion was lost by 14 votes to 21 with 1 abstention.

25/30/CNL Councillor Tong - Barriers to Cambridge Growth 2025

Councillor Tong proposed and Councillor Clough seconded the following motion:

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 proposed and Councillor Thornburrow seconded the following amendment to the motion, additional text underlined and deleted text struckthrough.

~~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.~~

The amendment was carried by 32 votes to 4.

Resolved (by 34 votes to 4) that:

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.

25/31/CNL Councillor Hossain - Opposition to a Blanket 20mph Speed Limit Zone in Cambridge

Councillor Hossain proposed the following motion:

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.

The motion was lost as there was no seconder to support it.

25/32/CNL Councillor Sheil - A National Care Service for England - national UNISON campaign

Councillor Flaubert left at the start of this item and did not return.

Councillor Sheil proposed and Councillor Davey seconded the following motion:

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.

Resolved (by 34 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions) to support the motion.

25/33/CNL Vote of Confidence in the Mayor

Liberal Democrat Councillors proposed a vote of no confidence in the Mayor and would contact the Head of Legal Practice outside the meeting on how to proceed.

The meeting adjourned 21:45-22:06.

The Mayor announced there was no procedure to cover a proposed vote of no confidence in the Mayor ie proposed motions without notice. He exercised discretion to suspend Council procedure rule section 14 of Part 4A of the constitutions to allow this motion without notice to be considered and handed over to the Deputy Mayor to Chair proceedings.

Councillor Martinelli proposed and Councillor Tong seconded a motion of no confidence in the Mayor.

The motion was lost by 13 votes to 21 with 0 abstentions.

Councillor Ashton proposed and Councillor Moore seconded a motion of no confidence in the Mayor.

Resolved (by 22 votes to 12 with 0 abstentions) to support the motion.

The Mayor resumed Chair of the meeting.

The Leader thanked outgoing Councillors Carling and Gilderdale who were standing down.

25/34/CNL Officer Decisions

25/35/CNL To note - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority- Appointment of the Council's Audit and Governance Committee reserve (substitute) member

The appointment of Councillor Martin Smart as the City Council's reserve (substitute) member on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Audit and Governance Committee was noted.

25/36/CNL To note - Appointment of Cambridge City Council Representatives to the Conservators of the River Cam

The appointment of David Levien, Councillor Neil Gough, Alistair Wilson and Sarah Tovell to the Conservators of the River Cam from 1 January 2025 for a maximum three-year term was noted.

25/37/CNL To note - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority- Appointment of 1 x member to the CPCA's Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The appointment of Councillor Thornburrow as one of the Council's representatives on the CPCA Overview & Scrutiny Committee was noted.

The meeting ended at 10.15 pm

CHAIR