Public Document Pack

Cambridge City Council

Notice of Council



Date: Thursday, 24 July 2025

Time: 6.00 pm

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

3QJ [access the building via Peashill entrance]

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 [access the building via Peashill entrance] on Thursday, 24 July 2025 at 6.00 pm and I hereby summon you to attend.

Dated 16 July 2025

Yours faithfully

Robert Pollock

Chief Executive

Agenda

1	Apologies for Absence				
2	Declarations of Interest				
3	Mayor's announcements				
4	4 Day Week - Shared Services South Cambridgeshire District Council (Page 1)	ages 9 - 14)			
5	Update on Local Government Reorganisation (Page 1997)	ges 15 - 34)			
6	Public questions time				
7	To deal with oral questions				
8	To consider the recommendations of Cabinet/Executive for adoption				
8a	Outturn Report 2024/25 (Page 1997)	ges 35 - 84)			
9	To consider the recommendations of Committees for adoption				
9a	Civic Affairs & Audit Committee - Proposed Amendments to Member Allowances (Page 1997)	ges 85 - 94)			
10	To consider the following notices of motion, notice of which has been given by:				
10a	Councillor Holloway: Local Government Reorganisation				
	Seconded by Councillor Bick				

This Council notes:

Cambridge is served by two tiers of local government – Cambridge City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council. Each provides different services over different geographies, with some overlapping responsibilities. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority also serves this area, as does the Greater Cambridge Partnership.

Unitary authorities combine the functions currently carried out by county councils and district-level councils.

On 19 October 2023, Cambridge City Council passed a motion on 'A Unitary Council'1, asking the Leader and Chief Executive of the Council to:

"... initiate discussions... to identify options for a less fragmented and more cohesive model of Government for Cambridge, that best serves the needs of its residents. These discussions should involve and engage with the people of the city in a meaningful way, thereby recognising the need for our governance structures to reflect the wishes of the people we serve."

In summer 2024, Cambridge City Council carried out an initial engagement exercise on the 'Future of Local Government for Cambridge'¹. Around 60 people attended in-person workshops and over 500 people responded to the online survey. Nearly 83% of respondents thought that a unitary authority for the Cambridge area should be explored.

A report on this engagement exercise was considered at Full Council on 28 November 2024². Councillors agreed that the Leader should report back about next steps in summer 2025, following discussions with other local leaders and ministers.

In December 2024, the Government announced that local government in England would be reorganised, inviting proposals for new unitary councils from all two-tier areas³. On the current timetable, new unitary councils for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough would come into being in 2028.

Since the Government's announcement, all seven existing councils in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough have engaged in a collaborative process to explore options for local government reorganisation.

Leaders have set out three geographical options for proposals to be worked up.

A public survey on issues relating to local government reorganisation, agreed by all councils in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, is running for just over one month, closing on 20 July⁴.

The Local Government Reorganisation item in these meeting papers sets out the current situation, including relevant data and context for

²https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/s67343/241119%20Council%20report%20on%20Future% 20of%20Local%20Government.pdf

¹ https://engage.cambridge.gov.uk/en-GB/projects/cambridge-local-government

³ https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/english-devolution-white-paper-power-and-partnership-foundations-for-growth/english-devolution-white-paper

⁴ https://can-campaigns.co.uk/local-councils-in-cambridgeshire-and-peterborough-are-changing/

deciding which geographical configuration of unitary councils might be most appropriate for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

This Council believes:

 That a unitary authority based on the current boundaries of Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, alongside viable arrangements for the rest of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, is likely to be the best option for the residents of Cambridge.

This Council resolves:

- To work with other local authorities in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough on a proposal for the whole area that can be submitted to the Government by 28 November 2025.
- To continue to collaborate with all councils across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, including providing information to support proposals that are not its preferred option.
- To launch a further engagement exercise to better understand Cambridge residents' views on their preferred geography for local government reorganisation.

10b Councillor Dalzell: Securing Arbury Court's Future as a Thriving Community Hub

This Council notes:

- The vital role Arbury Court plays as a community hub serving North Cambridge residents;
- 2. The ongoing 'Shaping North Cambridge' consultation and the positive engagement between officers, local businesses, and the community regarding future redevelopment plans;
- The constructive approach taken by officers in engaging with local businesses and residents during the consultation process;
- 4. Current uncertainty facing existing businesses due to lease arrangements ending in 2030;
- 5. The strong preference expressed by local businesses for replacement retail facilities to be built before existing premises are redeveloped, avoiding the need for temporary

accommodation;

6. That detailed consultation findings and proposals will not be presented to Cabinet until October 2025.

This Council believes:

- Local businesses and residents deserve certainty about Arbury Court's future and their role in it now, rather than waiting for final proposals;
- 2. The positive collaborative approach between officers and the community should be formally endorsed and protected;
- 3. Any redevelopment must enhance rather than diminish Arbury Court's function as a community retail hub.

This Council resolves:

- 1. That any development proposal for Arbury Court will prioritise the construction of replacement retail facilities before existing businesses are displaced;
- To ensure that existing businesses will receive appropriate lease extensions or firm relocation commitments extending well beyond 2030;
- 3. To ensure the redevelopment enhances retail provision and community facilities rather than diminishing them;
- 4. To establish these principles as non-negotiable parameters for any development brief or partner selection process.
- 10c Councillor Tong: The Failure of Jesus Lock Island and Baits Bite Lock Island

The River Cam faces an existential threat.

The islands of the two locks that maintain a steady water level, Jesus Lock and Baits Bite Lock, are both at risk of failing due to the disrepair. Meanwhile, in their June update, titled An Organisation in Crisis ⁵, the Conservators of the River Cam announced that they were in dire financial straits.

While the urgent work needed to Baits Bite Lock Island has been approved, the Conservators of the River Cam have said that a much-needed rebuild of both lock islands would be impossible given the

¹ https://www.camconservancy.org/_files/ugd/79067b_d61c6956e9bf47a3a48ba6a30f54696a.pdf

cost, even without factoring in the fact that Jesus Lock island also requires stabilisation in the short term.

While the damage caused to both the local environment and tourism would be a problem in itself, the harm that this would cause to the local community would be most devastating. A representative of Cam Valley Forum has acknowledged² that if the water level of the river lowered, local residents could be exposed to centuries of waste that has laid buried, posing a significant health risk.

Urgent action must be taken, yet the Conservators of the River Cam do not have the funds to do so, stating that they believe 'unless specifically instructed by state or court, the necessary funding required by the Conservancy to ensure long-term survival will not be made available.'

The council resolves to:

- Write to Steve Reed, Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, explaining the need for the Conservators of the River Cam to receive funding for these essential repairs.
- To also request that responsibility for overseeing the River Cam is transferred to any future unitary authority comprising Cambridge.
- 11 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.

- 12 To consider any other business
- 12a Notification of Cabinet Portfolios (Pages 95 98)

Emergency Evacuation Procedure

In the event of the fire alarm sounding all persons should vacate the building by way of the nearest escape route and proceed directly to the assembly point in front St Mary's Church. The duty Officer will assume overall control during any evacuation, however in the unlikely event the duty Officer is unavailable, this responsibility will be assumed by the Committee Chair.

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

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 <u>democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk</u> by 12 noon two working days before the meeting.

The full text of any public question must be submitted in writing by noon two working days before the date of the meeting or it will not be accepted. All questions submitted by the deadline will be published on the meeting webpage before the meeting is held.

Further information on public speaking will be supplied once registration and the written question / statement has been received.



Agenda Item 4



REPORT TITLE: South Cambridgeshire District Council Four Day Week

To:

Council, 24 July 2025

Report by:

Jane Wilson, Chief Operating Officer

Tel: 01223 457860 Email: jane.wilson@cambridge.gov.uk

Wards affected:

ΑII

Director Approval: Director Jane Wilson confirms that the report author has sought the advice of all appropriate colleagues and given due regard to that advice; that the equalities impacts and other implications of the recommended decisions have been assessed and accurately presented in the report; and that they are content for the report to be put to the Executive Councillor for decision.

1.	Recommendations					
1.1	It is recommended that Council:					
	Approve the inclusion of services hosted by South Cambridgeshire District Council and shared with Cambridge City Council specifically Greater.					
	Council and shared with Cambridge City Council, specifically Greater Cambridge Shared Planning and Shared Waste Services, within South					
	Cambridge Shared Planning and Shared Waste Services, within South Cambridgeshire District Council's plan and process to become a permanent					
	32-hour per week, four-day week employer.					
2.	Purpose and reason for the report					
2.1	South Cambridgeshire District Council is considering the recommendation to					
	become a permanent 32-hour per week, four-day week employer at their full					
	Council on 17 July 2025. That decision is subject to the approval of Cambridge					
	City Council, on the basis that it will impact the services hosted by South					
	Cambridgeshire DC and shared with this Council.					
3.	Alternative options considered					
3.1	The options before the Council are either to agree with the recommendation or					

refuse the recommendation.

4. Background and key issues

- Full information on the trial, the trial findings, and the outcomes of resident engagement can be read at the link provided under the appendices section of this report.
- 2. In summary, the trial findings demonstrated the following:
 - Increased employee well-being, intention to stay at the Council, and employee commitment
 - Financial savings (c£399k across both Councils, of which £109k attributed to Cambridge City Council)
- 3. In terms of performance measures, there were statistically significant improvements performance measures for:
 - Major planning applications (% completed in time)
 - Non-major planning applications (% completed in time)
 - Average number of weeks for householder planning application determination
- 4. There were no statistically significant decreases in performance measures for either shared service.
- 5. There were statistically significant decreases in resident and business satisfaction in a number of areas including the shared services. However, it should be noted that this is not reflected in the performance data and should be viewed in light of a general trend across the country of declining public satisfaction with local government.
- 6. SCDC carried out a formal consultation in relation to its best value duties which showed that the approach does meet best value standards.
- 7. Locally recognised Trade Unions have been engaged throughout this process

	and have given their support to the initiative.
5.	Corporate plan
5.1	Corporate plan 2022-27: our priorities for Cambridge - Cambridge City Council
	This links to Corporate Priority 4, Modernising the Council to lead a greener city
	that is fair for all.
6.	Consultation, engagement and communication
6.1	As part of this process there have been multiple routes for consultation,
	engagement, and communication, including affected staff, members of the public,
	businesses, and previous opportunities for Councillors to hear about and discuss
	this initiative. Details on the public and business consultations are set out in the
	appendices to the report to South Cambridgeshire District Council, available on
	that authority's website (item 11, p.179 in the main pack). Choose agenda
	document pack - Council 17 July 2025 - South Cambridgeshire District Council
7.	Anticipated outcomes, benefits or impact
7.1	The outcome of this decision is that it will enable SCDC to continue with its planned
	process to become a 32-hour, 4-day week employer. As the services shared with
	Cambridge City Council are currently functioning on this basis since there are no
	expected changes to delivery.
8.	Implications
8.1	The South Cambridgeshire District Council report highlights the risk around local
	government reorganisation, and the controls put in place through their proposed
	process.
8.2	Financial Implications
	As the outcome of this decision would be no change in our current arrangements,
	there are no financial implications associated with the decision.
8.3	Legal Implications

	As SCDC is the employing authority for these two services there are no legal
	implications for Cambridge City Council in agreeing this recommendation.
0.4	
8.4	Equalities and socio-economic Implications
	As approval of the recommendation will mean the continuation of the existing
	activity, there are no equalities and socio-economic implications.
8.5	Net Zero Carbon, Climate Change and Environmental implications
	As approval of the recommendation will mean the continuation of the existing
	activity, there are no equalities and socio-economic implications.
8.6	Procurement Implications
	There are no procurement implications associated with this decision
8.7	Community Safety Implications
	There are no Community Safety implications associated with this decision
9.	Background documents
	Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to
	Information) Act 1985.
9.1	None
10.	Appendices
10.1	The papers to South Cambridgeshire District Council's Full Council meeting on
	17 July 2025 referenced in this report are available on that authority's website
	(item 11, p.179 in the main pack):
	Choose agenda document pack - Council 17 July 2025 - South Cambridgeshire
	District Council
	To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please
	contact Jane Wilson, Chief Operating Officer, jane.wilson@cambridge.gov.uk,

01223 457860	



Agenda Item 5



Report to	Council, 24 July 2025
Lead Cabinet Member	Councillor Cameron Holloway, Leader of the Council
Lead Officer	David Kidston, Strategy and Partnerships Manager
Key Decision	No

Director Approval: The Chief Executive confirms the report author has sought the advice of all appropriate colleagues and given due regard to that advice; that the equalities impacts and other implications of the recommended decisions have been accurately presented in the report; and that they are content for the report to be put to Council for decision.

UPDATE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION

1.	Recommendations					
1.1	It is recommended that Council:					
	Notes the progress to date on Local Government Reorganisation.					
	Notes that of the proposed geographies, 'Option B' best meets key MHCLG					
	criteria for Local Government Reorganisation, as outlined at paragraph 4.6.					
	Agrees to hold an Extraordinary Council meeting to discuss the final proposal(s).					
2.	Purpose and reason for the report					
2.1	To provide Council with an update on Local Government Reorganisation (LGR), and the					
	preferred options for new unitary councils recently proposed by Council Leaders from					
	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.					
2.2	Previous papers and background					
	<u>'A Unitary Council'</u> , Council motion, 19 October 2023					

- <u>'The Future of Local Government for Cambridge'</u>, Council meeting, 28 November 2024
- English Devolution White Paper, HM Government, 16 December 2024
- Letter to Minister of State, Jim McMahon MP from Leaders of Cambridge, Exeter,
 Ipswich, Oxford and Norwich, 21 January 2025 [see separate attachment]
- Letter to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Council leaders from Minister of State,
 Jim McMahon MP, 5 February 2025
- <u>'Update on Local Government Reorganisation'</u>, Extraordinary Council meeting, 17
 March 2025
- Letter to Minister of State, Jim McMahon MP from leaders of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough councils, 21 March 2025
- A news statement announcing the three preferred unitary council options,
 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Council Leaders, 11 June 2025.
- <u>Devolution and Local Government Reorganisation Cambridge City Council,</u> information and frequently asked question, council website.

3. Context

- 3.1 On 16 December 2024, The White Paper on English Devolution was published. It proposes extensive reforms to the framework of local government across England and its relationship to central government, described as a 'rewiring of the state'. This includes devolution to strategic mayoral authorities and local government reorganisation in two-tier areas. Adjoining unitary councils have been included where there is evidence of failure or their size hinders their ability to deliver sustainable and high-quality services.
- 3.2 Cambridgeshire & Peterborough already has devolved powers via the 'deal' that established the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority in 2017. Under the Government's proposals all Mayoral Combined Authorities will become Mayoral Strategic Authorities with additional responsibilities and powers, including for aspects of

	transport and infrastructure, skills and employment, strategic planning, economic
	regeneration, public safety, and public service reform.
3.3	On 5 February 2025, Jim McMahon, Minister of State for Local Government and English
	Devolution, invited proposals to establish unitary authorities across Cambridgeshire and
	Peterborough (see link above). Proposals are required to be submitted to government by
	28 November 2025.
3.4	Six of the seven Council Leaders submitted a joint interim response to Government on
	21 March 2025 (see link above). The Leader of Fenland District Council also submitted
	a letter. These responses did not commit the Councils to a particular course of action and
	do not fetter future decisions.
3.5	The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) issued guidance on 5 February 2025. This sets out detailed criteria for the creation of new unitary authorities, which the government will use to assess proposals it receives. The key criteria include:
	Financial resilience: "the right size to achieve efficiencies, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks".
	Economy and housing: "sensible economic areas" and helping "to increase housing supply and meet local needs".
	Sustainable public services: "prioritising the delivery of high-quality and
	sustainable public services to citizens" with "consideration given to the impacts for
	crucial services such as social care, children's services, SEND and homelessness,
	and for wider public services including for public safety".
	Democratic representation and community engagement: "enabling stronger
	community engagement and neighbourhood empowerment".
	Devolution: "new unitary structures must support devolution arrangements".
3.6	The guidance currently states that proposals should ideally use existing district areas as
	the building blocks for new councils. Although government has not ruled out boundary
	changes it has indicated there would need to be a strong justification, and the
	reorganisation process could take longer. In addition, the Local Government and Public

3.7 The government initially placed significant emphasis on new unitary authorities aiming to have a population of 500,000 or more. This expectation has diminished over time. Proposals of less than this population figure have not been discouraged as the government recognises it may not make sense for some areas. Informally, there has been an indication that the minimum population the government would consider to be financially sustainable is around 300,000. This is consistent with previous government criteria from 2019, which 'expected' proposals to have a population 'in excess of 300,000'. 3.8 There are approximately 920,000 residents (ONS mid-year estimates; 2023) in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough: around 150,000 in Cambridge; 91,000 in East Cambridgeshire; 104,000 in Fenland; 186,000 in Huntingdonshire; and 169,000 in South Cambridgeshire – making a total of 700,000 in the County area; plus 220,000 people in Peterborough, which is already a unitary authority. 3.9 Based on conservative assumptions the population of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is expected to grow to over 1,060,000 over the next 15 years. That forecast does not include, for example, the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan for around 50,000 homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. 3.11 Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough		Involvement in Health Act 2007, requires that Local Authority boundaries do not cross
have a population of 500,000 or more. This expectation has diminished over time. Proposals of less than this population figure have not been discouraged as the government recognises it may not make sense for some areas. Informally, there has been an indication that the minimum population the government would consider to be financially sustainable is around 300,000. This is consistent with previous government criteria from 2019, which 'expected' proposals to have a population 'in excess of 300,000'. 3.8 There are approximately 920,000 residents (ONS mid-year estimates; 2023) in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough: around 150,000 in Cambridge; 91,000 in East Cambridgeshire; 104,000 in Fenland; 186,000 in Huntingdonshire; and 169,000 in South Cambridgeshire — making a total of 700,000 in the County area; plus 220,000 people in Peterborough, which is already a unitary authority. 3.9 Based on conservative assumptions the population of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is expected to grow to over 1,060,000 over the next 15 years. That forecast does not include, for example, the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan for around 50,000 homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough		police force boundaries but can otherwise be whatever best meets government guidance.
Proposals of less than this population figure have not been discouraged as the government recognises it may not make sense for some areas. Informally, there has been an indication that the minimum population the government would consider to be financially sustainable is around 300,000. This is consistent with previous government criteria from 2019, which 'expected' proposals to have a population 'in excess of 300,000'. 3.8 There are approximately 920,000 residents (ONS mid-year estimates; 2023) in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough: around 150,000 in Cambridge; 91,000 in East Cambridgeshire; 104,000 in Fenland; 186,000 in Huntingdonshire; and 169,000 in South Cambridgeshire – making a total of 700,000 in the County area; plus 220,000 people in Peterborough, which is already a unitary authority. 3.9 Based on conservative assumptions the population of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is expected to grow to over 1,060,000 over the next 15 years. That forecast does not include, for example, the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan for around 50,000 homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough	3.7	The government initially placed significant emphasis on new unitary authorities aiming to
government recognises it may not make sense for some areas. Informally, there has been an indication that the minimum population the government would consider to be financially sustainable is around 300,000. This is consistent with previous government criteria from 2019, which 'expected' proposals to have a population 'in excess of 300,000'. 3.8 There are approximately 920,000 residents (ONS mid-year estimates; 2023) in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough: around 150,000 in Cambridge; 91,000 in East Cambridgeshire; 104,000 in Fenland; 186,000 in Huntingdonshire; and 169,000 in South Cambridgeshire – making a total of 700,000 in the County area; plus 220,000 people in Peterborough, which is already a unitary authority. 3.9 Based on conservative assumptions the population of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is expected to grow to over 1,060,000 over the next 15 years. That forecast does not include, for example, the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan for around 50,000 homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough		have a population of 500,000 or more. This expectation has diminished over time.
been an indication that the minimum population the government would consider to be financially sustainable is around 300,000. This is consistent with previous government criteria from 2019, which 'expected' proposals to have a population 'in excess of 300,000'. 3.8 There are approximately 920,000 residents (ONS mid-year estimates; 2023) in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough: around 150,000 in Cambridge; 91,000 in East Cambridgeshire; 104,000 in Fenland; 186,000 in Huntingdonshire; and 169,000 in South Cambridgeshire – making a total of 700,000 in the County area; plus 220,000 people in Peterborough, which is already a unitary authority. 3.9 Based on conservative assumptions the population of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is expected to grow to over 1,060,000 over the next 15 years. That forecast does not include, for example, the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan for around 50,000 homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. 3.11 Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough		Proposals of less than this population figure have not been discouraged as the
financially sustainable is around 300,000. This is consistent with previous government criteria from 2019, which 'expected' proposals to have a population 'in excess of 300,000'. 3.8 There are approximately 920,000 residents (ONS mid-year estimates; 2023) in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough: around 150,000 in Cambridge; 91,000 in East Cambridgeshire; 104,000 in Fenland; 186,000 in Huntingdonshire; and 169,000 in South Cambridgeshire — making a total of 700,000 in the County area; plus 220,000 people in Peterborough, which is already a unitary authority. 3.9 Based on conservative assumptions the population of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is expected to grow to over 1,060,000 over the next 15 years. That forecast does not include, for example, the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan for around 50,000 homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. 3.11 Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough		government recognises it may not make sense for some areas. Informally, there has
criteria from 2019, which 'expected' proposals to have a population 'in excess of 300,000'. There are approximately 920,000 residents (ONS mid-year estimates; 2023) in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough: around 150,000 in Cambridge; 91,000 in East Cambridgeshire; 104,000 in Fenland; 186,000 in Huntingdonshire; and 169,000 in South Cambridgeshire – making a total of 700,000 in the County area; plus 220,000 people in Peterborough, which is already a unitary authority. Based on conservative assumptions the population of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is expected to grow to over 1,060,000 over the next 15 years. That forecast does not include, for example, the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan for around 50,000 homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough		been an indication that the minimum population the government would consider to be
 There are approximately 920,000 residents (ONS mid-year estimates; 2023) in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough: around 150,000 in Cambridge; 91,000 in East Cambridgeshire; 104,000 in Fenland; 186,000 in Huntingdonshire; and 169,000 in South Cambridgeshire – making a total of 700,000 in the County area; plus 220,000 people in Peterborough, which is already a unitary authority. Based on conservative assumptions the population of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is expected to grow to over 1,060,000 over the next 15 years. That forecast does not include, for example, the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan for around 50,000 homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough 		financially sustainable is around 300,000. This is consistent with previous government
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough: around 150,000 in Cambridge; 91,000 in East Cambridgeshire; 104,000 in Fenland; 186,000 in Huntingdonshire; and 169,000 in South Cambridgeshire – making a total of 700,000 in the County area; plus 220,000 people in Peterborough, which is already a unitary authority. 3.9 Based on conservative assumptions the population of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is expected to grow to over 1,060,000 over the next 15 years. That forecast does not include, for example, the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan for around 50,000 homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough		criteria from 2019, which 'expected' proposals to have a population 'in excess of 300,000'.
Cambridgeshire; 104,000 in Fenland; 186,000 in Huntingdonshire; and 169,000 in South Cambridgeshire – making a total of 700,000 in the County area; plus 220,000 people in Peterborough, which is already a unitary authority. 3.9 Based on conservative assumptions the population of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is expected to grow to over 1,060,000 over the next 15 years. That forecast does not include, for example, the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan for around 50,000 homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough	3.8	There are approximately 920,000 residents (ONS mid-year estimates; 2023) in
Cambridgeshire – making a total of 700,000 in the County area; plus 220,000 people in Peterborough, which is already a unitary authority. 3.9 Based on conservative assumptions the population of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is expected to grow to over 1,060,000 over the next 15 years. That forecast does not include, for example, the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan for around 50,000 homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough		Cambridgeshire and Peterborough: around 150,000 in Cambridge; 91,000 in East
Based on conservative assumptions the population of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is expected to grow to over 1,060,000 over the next 15 years. That forecast does not include, for example, the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan for around 50,000 homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough		Cambridgeshire; 104,000 in Fenland; 186,000 in Huntingdonshire; and 169,000 in South
 3.9 Based on conservative assumptions the population of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is expected to grow to over 1,060,000 over the next 15 years. That forecast does not include, for example, the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan for around 50,000 homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. 3.11 Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough 		Cambridgeshire – making a total of 700,000 in the County area; plus 220,000 people in
is expected to grow to over 1,060,000 over the next 15 years. That forecast does not include, for example, the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan for around 50,000 homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough		Peterborough, which is already a unitary authority.
include, for example, the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan for around 50,000 homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough	3.9	Based on conservative assumptions the population of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough
homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough		is expected to grow to over 1,060,000 over the next 15 years. That forecast does not
by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company. History and local identity 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough		include, for example, the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan for around 50,000
History and local identity 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. 3.11 Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough		homes or 120,000 people, or any population increases arising from plans to be developed
 3.10 Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity. 3.11 Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough 		by the Government owned Cambridge Growth Company.
3.11 Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough		History and local identity
significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough	3.10	Ministers have also encouraged proposals to consider local history and identity.
period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough	3.11	Cambridge has a longstanding civic history and identity. The town was a strategically
		significant centre for trade, civil, legal, and military administration from the Anglo-Saxon
with 10 wards. Residents have had local arrangements for governing themselves with a		period. In 1086, the Domesday Book described Cambridge as a principal English borough
man to mander reconstruction have the desired and reconstruction and r		with 10 wards. Residents have had local arrangements for governing themselves with a
degree of independence from the Crown since the 12th century.		degree of independence from the Crown since the 12th century.
3.12 Townspeople lobbied for Royal Charters in the early 13th century which established their	3.12	Townspeople lobbied for Royal Charters in the early 13th century which established their
right to appoint a Mayor, levy taxes, regulate trade and administer local justice. Last year		right to appoint a Mayor, levy taxes, regulate trade and administer local justice. Last year
was the 800-year anniversary that local government has operated from the site of the		was the 800-year anniversary that local government has operated from the site of the
Guildhall. In recognition of its history, administrative importance, and economic success		Cuildball In recognition of its history administrative importance, and economic success

	Cambridge was granted City status by King George VI in 1951. The University of
	Cambridge had opposed the previous proposal for city status in 1616.
3.13	Prior to the last significant local government reorganisation in 1974, which created the
	current 'two tier' arrangements, Cambridge City Council enjoyed wide ranging delegated
	powers. These included for example, responsibility for education, health and welfare,
	wastewater treatment, libraries, highways, planning, and weights and measures.
3.14	On the last occasion that local government reorganisation was seriously considered, in
	1994, six out of seven councils supported reorganisation. Five out of the seven councils
	supported the creation of four new unitary authorities: City of Cambridge Council based
	on expanding the boundary fixed in 1935; Huntingdonshire County Council; Greater
	Peterborough Council (including Fenland), and Cambridgeshire County Council (South
	Cambridgeshire and East Cambridgeshire).
3.15	The proposals for four unitary authorities estimated transition costs of around £26m and
	ongoing savings from reorganisation of £5.1m (2024 prices), which would take around 5
	years to 'payback'.
2.40	The national annual stands then four a Complaining suritant national stands the site is a supervisor surban
3.16	The rationale presented then for a Cambridge unitary reflected the city's growing urban
	geography and identity, long tradition of self-government as well as its importance as a
	centre of excellence for science and technology.
4.	Progress to date: local government reorganisation
4.1	All councils in an area are expected to work together in the best interests of the whole
	area to develop and submit proposals by 28 November 2025. However, Government
	recognises that there will be some cases where agreement on a single proposal will not
	be possible despite best efforts. A Leaders and a Chief Executives LGR group has met
	regularly since the invitation from Government to develop proposals collaboratively.
4.2	Cambridge City Council has also been working with other historic fast-growing cities,
	including Oxford, Exeter, Ipswich and Norwich. Leaders from these Councils wrote to
	Minster of State Jim McMahon in January 2025, to make the case for the economic,
	historic and civic importance of smaller cities, and the contribution they make to new
	housing. The letter provided evidence that unitary authorities between 200,000 and

	400,000 can strike the right balance between efficiency, effectiveness and community engagement.				
4.3	Chief Executives commissioned chief finance officers and data analysts from each authority to develop a financial model to evaluate different unitary options. This is being supplemented by analysis from Pixel, a leading local government financial advisor. The modelling to date is based on the existing approach to local government funding. The government is currently consulting on changes to it and as a result the draft model will need to be updated.				
4.4	Leaders have considered the implications of several options for the geography of new unitary councils based on available evidence. Some of these options were excluded as they did not meet criteria set by the Government or because the financial analysis showed that they were less financially viable. Leaders also felt that three unitary authorities for the area would be less likely to meet the Government's financial resilience criteria.				
4.5	On 11 June 2025, council Leaders announced that they had identified three preferred options to establish new unitary councils across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Each of these options would lead to the creation of two unitary councils. In future, these councils would be responsible for providing all local government services across the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area and replace all seven existing local authorities.				
4.6	The three options set out below are all based on existing authority boundaries. Peterborough Fedand District Peterborough Fedand District Peterborough Fedand District South Cambridgeshire District Cambridgeshire District Proposal A Proposal B Proposal C				

	Proposal	Unitary 1		Unitary	2	
	Proposal A: North-west / South-east	Peterborough City Fenland District Huntingdonshire District and County Council fund	East South	bridge City Cambridgeshire h Cambridgeshir County Council fo	e District	
	Proposal B: North / South	Peterborough City East Cambridgeshire Di Fenland District Huntingdonshire District and County Council fund	strict South and 0	bridge City h Cambridgeshir County Council fi		
	Proposal C: North-east / South-west	Peterborough City East Cambridgeshire Fenland District and County Council fund	Hunti Soutl	bridge City ingdonshire Disti h Cambridgeshir nty Council functi	e District and	
4.7	Members are requested to review the three proposals and consider their suitability for the Cambridge City area, and for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough as a whole. The government requires proposals to provide a viable solution for the whole geography not just the area that includes our own authority.				he	
5	High-level appraisal of options					
5.1	A high-level appraisal against the government's key reorganisation criteria is set out below. The appraisal is provisional, as the proposals are yet to be worked up in detail, though some shared data is already available from which emerging conclusions can be drawn. Appendix 1 contains commentary on the appraisal below.					ail,
5.2			Option A	Option B	Option C	
	-	nce: ve efficiencies, improve tand financial shocks	3 (amber)	4 (green)	3 (amber)	
	Economy and housing: Sensible economic areas; helping to increase housing supply and meet local needs.		3	4	3	
			(amber)	(green)	(amber)	
	Sustainable Pub	olic Services	3	3	2	
		ality and sustainable particular adult social	(amber)	(amber)	(amber/ red)	

	homelessness.				
	Total scores	9/12	11/12	8/12	
	Scoring / RAG rating: 1 - does not meet criteria (red) 2 - unlikely to meet criteria (amber/red) 3 - likely to meet criteria (amber) 4 - meets criteria (green)				
	 Appraisal against the government's crit community engagement' was not under details. At this stage differentiation between 	rtaken as this v	vill largely depe	end on propos	sal
	Other criteria such as the implicat Cambridgeshire & Peterborough alread nearly all other 'two-tier' areas.		•		
6.	Next Steps				
6.1	The three options are being further developed and may all be submitted as proposals to Government by 28 November 2025. Each option has different strengths and different implications for services, local communities, and businesses. A motion invites Council to consider a preferred option for reorganisation it is inclined to support.		ent		
6.2	Officers will continue to share data and information to prepare the proposals. At the direction of the Leader, City Council officers have been engaged in developing Option B with other supportive authorities. The County Council is developing option A, and Huntingdonshire is developing option C.		n B		
6.3	By submitting a final proposal or proposals and Public Involvement in Health Act 2 Secretary of State (MHCLG) the final dec does not require the affected councils to g preferred approach.	007 would be ision on any p	triggered. Th	at will give t y structures a	the and
6.4	At this stage, it seems likely that multiple pro- will be submitted to Government. Ministe subject to a statutory consultation in ear	rs will then de	cide which pro	pposal(s) will	be

	determination on the proposal they intend to implement. There is no guarantee that any
	proposal which the City Council endorses will be chosen by Ministers.
6.5	The decision regarding which proposal to support is a matter for the Leader and/or
	Cabinet to determine. However, a final proposal for reorganisation may be brought to
	Council for discussion at an appropriate point to inform that decision. This may entail an
	Extraordinary Council meeting, potentially in November.
6.6	Based on current Government timelines from April 2028 Cambridge City Council and all
	other existing Councils in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough would likely be abolished
	and replaced with new unitary authorities. The new unitary authorities would take on all
	the powers, responsibilities, assets and liabilities, and civic functions of the existing
	authorities within their new boundaries.
6.7	The new unitary authorities are expected to operate in a shadow form from May 2027 so
	that they can plan for and manage a smooth transition. Shadow authorities have power
	to recruit staff and plan for implementation, but they do not have statutory local
	government powers until they 'go live'. The City Council would continue to provide
	services to residents and retain its full powers and responsibilities up to and until those
	become vested in a new unitary authority.
7.	Consultation, engagement and communication
7.1	The Government expects councils to decide how best to engage locally in a meaningful
	and constructive way and to evidence that in their proposals.
7.2	The City Council previously engaged residents about the 'Future of Local Government
	for Cambridge' in summer 2024. Almost half of over 500 respondents indicated they
	'don't know or don't think it is easy' to find out how to access the services they want
	under the current 'two tier' arrangements. Nearly 71% 'agreed or strongly agreed' that a
	unitary authority would serve their and the city's interests more effectively; and nearly
	83% 'agreed' that options for a unitary council for the Cambridge area should be
	explored. The council unanimously endorsed recommendations arising from that
	exercise at a council meeting on 28 November 2024.
7.3	Views on a preferred geography for a new unitary authority for the Cambridge area were
	not sought as part of that engagement, however, many respondents offered suggestions.

The most popular were a unitary for Cambridge and the immediate surrounding area and a unitary council based on the administrative geography of Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. 7.4 A joint survey by all Cambridgeshire and Peterborough was carried out from 19 June to 20 July 2025. It asked residents and businesses for views on the future of local government for the whole area. The engagement focused on the connections people have to different areas, including where they work, socialise or receive healthcare, and their priorities for the new unitary Councils. Feedback from the survey will be analysed and supplemented by focus groups in each local authority area to inform proposals. 9. **Implications** 9.1 There are a range of potential **benefits** of creating new unitary councils, including: Reducing complexity and increasing democratic accountability by giving Councillors responsibility for all local government services in their area. Public service reform and more joined up provision of services delivering better outcomes and better value for money for residents. Ensuring that local government is more **financially sustainable**. **Clarity for residents** about who is responsible for services they receive. A stronger and more cohesive voice for an area in discussions with central government and key partners to amplify the issues of most concern to residents. Boundaries that better reflect the **economic geography and housing** markets so that new councils can support sustainable and inclusive economic growth.

9.2 Local government reorganisation also presents **risks**. It is important that members understand the potential risks and that proposals include the appropriate mitigation. Key risks include:

 Establishing new unitary councils will incur one-off implementation costs, which will need to be met from existing budgets. Government has provided a grant of £318,000 to councils across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to develop proposals and supports the use of capital receipts to fund transition costs and service transformation.

- Reorganisation may have a negative impact on staff capacity during the transition period, and in the short-term uncertainty could affect retention and recruitment.
- The new unitary council would have responsibility for adult social care, children's services, Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND), and homelessness where increasing demand could create financial pressures. Proposals will need to ensure any new unitary councils are able to meet current and future demand for services in their area through available resources, such as Council Tax, Business Rates, Government grants, fees and charges, and income generation.
- The new authorities will be required to harmonise Council tax rates so that all
 residents are treated fairly. This can be phased to mitigate increases in bills should
 the new authorities decide to harmonise upwards.
- Unitary authorities will be larger, have fewer Councillors, and could feel more 'remote' from residents. Proposals will need to ensure the number of Councillors balances efficient and effective decision-making with local representation and manageable workloads.

10 Financial Implications

10.2

- At this stage, direct financial implications are minimal. Once Ministers decide which proposal to proceed with, detailed plans will need to be developed which will provide a more accurate picture of disaggregation and integration costs, efficiency savings as well as the benefits of unitary local government.
 - It is expected that there will be significant financial implications associated with the implementation of local government reorganisation, both during the transition phase and once new unitary councils are established. Some of the key financial benefits include opportunities to ensure long-term financial sustainability through the integration of service provision, streamlining of back-office costs and assets, and economies of scale. Key risks include one-off transition costs, council-tax harmonisation, financial pressures from rising social care demand and any debt inherited from dissolved authorities.

	Legal Implications
10.3	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 provides the key statutory framework for local government reorganisation. The Secretary of State can at any time invite proposals for reorganisation. The criteria against which proposals are to be judged are set out in the invitation letter from Minister of State, Jim McMahon MP – see link above.
10.4	Shadow authorities would be governed by councillors elected in 2027. These 'shadow members' would likely become councillors in the new unitary authorities at the 'go live' date. Property and assets belonging to the existing councils would be split between the new councils by agreement or determined by the Secretary of State if agreement cannot be reached.
	Staffing
10.5	Beyond reducing duplication, local government reorganisation does not necessarily imply or require large scale redundancies. The overwhelming majority of employees will transfer automatically to one of the new authorities. Senior officers are more likely to be at risk as separate services from different authorities are integrated. Reorganisation will also create new opportunities and career development for many staff.
10.6	It is not possible to give more details in relation to the workforce implications at this stage. However, Councillors should be mindful of the importance of maintaining high quality service delivery in the meantime and ensure that council staff continue to feel valued and are engaged in the reorganisation process.
	Equalities and socio-economic Implications
10.7	There are no significant equalities or socio-economic implications arising from the submission of an interim response to Government on local government reorganisation.
	Net Zero Carbon, Climate Change and Environmental implications
10.8	There are no significant Net Zero Carbon, Climate Change and Environmental implications arising from the submission of an interim response to Government on local government reorganisation.
1	12

	Procurement Implications
10.9	The Council procured some initial financial advice on LGR options and procured another consultant to provide advice on how LGR proposals can address the Government's criteria on public services, financial sustainability, democratic accountability and community engagement.
	Community Safety Implications
10.10	There are no community safety implications arising from the submission of an interim response to Government on local government reorganisation.
11	Background documents
11.1	English Devolution White Paper
12	Appendices
	Appendix 1 – Narrative summary against key appraisal criteria
	To inspect papers or if you have a query on the report please contact david.kidston@cambridge.gov.uk

Appendix 1: summary of proposals against key appraisal criteria

Context

The narrative summary in this appendix reflects the appraisal set out in paragraph 5.2. It provides commentary against key government criteria for each preferred option, including an overall assessment of how likely each option is to meet the government's criteria.

The appraisal is provisional. The full proposals for the different options are yet to be worked up. However, some shared data and evidence is already available, including from public sources, from which emerging conclusions can be drawn.

The financial information provided below for each unitary authority is also provisional and should be treated with caution. It is based on forecast resources that each new unitary might expect to receive under the existing local government finance system. The current approach uses population and needs data that in some cases is more than 10 years out of date but is still used in the government's modelling, so is the most accurate data available currently.

The expected financial position of new unitary authorities will be updated in the proposals to government. The proposals should be able to give a more accurate picture and should reflect the likely implications of the current consultation on the Fair Funding Review, which sets out the Government proposals to reform the local government finance system. The consultation is open until 15 August.

The Fair Funding Review proposals are complex. At a strategic level they would place greater weight on a fairer redistribution of local government funding to reflect current population needs and deprivation; population growth, and different cost pressures associated with urban, rural and coastal authorities. This impact of the proposals on the reorganisation options for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is currently being assessed.

The options below are ranked in order of scoring. Highest first.

Option B: 11/12 - 'most likely to meet government criteria.'



Peterborough, Huntingdonshire, East Cambridgeshire, Fenland 601,000 population; approx. resources per head £1,092

Cambridge, South Cambridgeshire 319,000 population; approx. resources per head £1,021

Financial resilience: of the three options, option B is best able to mitigate financial risks, withstand financial shocks and achieve efficiencies over the long term. Each unitary would have different comparative strengths: one a large population, below average needs, diverse economic base and higher resources per head; the other a smaller, lower need but fast-growing population and economy, with lower resources per head. These comparative strengths complement each other to maximise financial resilience for the whole area and help alleviate the inherent financial challenges which all reorganisation options will have to address to meet government criteria.

- North unitary: incidence of weaker tax base, higher needs and greater dependency on government grants in Peterborough and Fenland, mitigated as far as possible by being part of a unitary with a large population that would have the scale to have greater resilience and manage financial shocks more effectively.
- South unitary: lower level of government grants due to lower per capita population needs; funding risks offset by resilient and fast-growing tax base better able to support anticipated population increase to over 400,000 in 10-15 years.

Economy and Housing: three distinct economies¹ and four travel to work areas² form two complementary economic geographies. At least three quarters of all working residents would live and work in the council area where they reside. Each unitary authority would have greater scope to develop ambitious Local Plans to reflect the distinct housing and economic needs in their areas.

 North unitary: has a diverse and resilient rural-urban economy with advanced manufacturing, logistics, and agritech and a growing number of business parks. It also benefits from the direct economic spillover effects from the southern innovation cluster including by creating demand for non-knowledge intensive businesses, jobs and

² Productivity in towns and travel to work areas, UK - Office for National Statistics

¹ Fens; Huntingdonshire/Peterborough; Greater Cambridge (CPIER 2018)

services. The unitary has the potential for spatial plans to identify strategic housing and growth sites unconstrained by former administrative boundaries between existing authorities; £40bn annual business turnover with 250,300 employees³, and the majority of the sub-region's smaller businesses.

South unitary: fast-growing city region with globally significant innovation economy. The new unitary would be in the top 15 largest UK employment clusters and have one of the highest densities of knowledge intensive businesses in the UK. The economy would have £80bn annual business turnover with 226,000 employees (Beauhurst 2024). 80% of working residents would live and work in the unitary area. There is scope to enhance long-term investor and business confidence by integrating the Greater Cambridge Local Plan and Greater Cambridge Partnership. This is also the economic geography that is the focus of the government owned Cambridge Growth Company. Cambridge and South Cambs both have existing investment partnerships to build new affordable and social housing.

Sustainable public services: resources would be divided most effectively of all options to enable sustainable public services, based on more equal distribution of existing needs, future demand pressures and financial resources across the sub-region. Both councils would have below England average social care needs. Both unitary authorities would have strong in-built incentives to implement public service reform to improve outcomes, achieve service improvements and efficiencies to address social care performance and financial constraints.

- North Unitary: would have economies of scale and buying power to reshape existing inefficient care markets. There would be significant scope to integrate 'lower tier' preventative services with social care and work jointly with NHS community teams to improve resident outcomes. Peterborough already has experience of shared social services and successful disaggregation from Cambridgeshire County Council. All former council housing would continue to be managed by registered providers, reducing integration challenges for all housing related services.
- South Unitary: would have a low level of care needs and opportunity to collaborate with the local innovation economy on care-tech and workforce development. There would be significant opportunities to integrate social care with housing and health services to improve resident outcomes. Existing Greater Cambridge shared services for planning, bin collection, transport, housing strategy and others make integration more straightforward. The new unitary inherits council housing from both former stock owning

_

³ 50+ employees and/or £5.1m balance sheet or £10.2m turnover ('Local Growth Index', Beauhurst, 2024).

authorities making service integration more straightforward.

Option A: 9/12 - 'likely to meet government criteria.'



Peterborough, Huntingdonshire, Fenland 510,000 population; approx. resources per head £1,100 Cambridge, South Cambridgeshire, East Cambridgeshire 410,000 population.; approx. resources per head £1,023

Financial resilience: good scope for resilience, though not as effective mitigation of financial risks and potential for greater exposure to financial shocks compared to option B. One authority would inherit a higher concentration of former councils with lower tax bases, higher needs and greater dependency on government grants than option B.

- North-west unitary: weaker overall tax base, higher population needs, and reduced economies of scale than option B to enable efficiencies. While it would have equivalent resources per head as option B the unitary inherits proportionally higher unit costs for social services, lower overall performance, and less capacity to grow its tax base reducing long term financial resilience. The authority would have greater reliance on social care grants to fund services compared to B, which would put greater pressure on budgets for universal services.
- South-west unitary: maintains relatively low social care profile and low level of government grants though has proportionally larger aging population and equivalent resources per head as option B. There would be an increased risk of care costs increasing faster than tax-base growth as the population ages. This could crowd out discretionary spending on universal services, such as community grants, and maintenance of public spaces.

Economy and Housing: this option creates greater imbalance in total economic output, jobs and planned housing development between each new unitary due to the more economically dominant southern unitary.

North-west unitary: would retain only 28% of business turnover and 44% of jobs (Beauhurst 2024), in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area. It would lose economic diversity (East Cambs has 5.4% of total UK exporting businesses - 5th highest) and some of the economic spillover benefits from the Cambridge economy that Option B 'north unitary' would enjoy.

South-weast unitary: this council's greater economic strength could lead to sub-regional imbalance over time. The unitary would also have significant economic difference by combining an area with one of the greatest concentrations of high-growth enterprises in the UK with a district (East Cambs) with the least high growth enterprises in the sub-region. It may be challenging to integrate the ambitious growth strategy in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan with the paused planning framework in East Cambridgeshire.

Sustainable public services: similar geographic size and population masks greater difference in needs within and between each new authority.

- North-western Unitary: has the second highest per-capita social care burden of any of the six unitary options under consideration. The unitary would have reduced economies of scale and buying power compared to the option B 'north unitary' to address those challenges. This would be compounded by inherent financial pressures described above, which could put a strain on non-care budgets. All former council housing would continue to be managed by existing registered providers.
- South-western Unitary: would have below England average care needs, but the inherent financial pressures described above (similar resources per head to option B combined with a larger aging population) could put a strain on non-care budgets. It would be more challenging to integrate existing shared services, and transport and planning strategies than the option B 'south unitary' option. That could impact growth prospects and reduce tax base growth affecting budgets to deliver public services. The area includes existing authorities which own and do not own council housing, increasing the complexity of service integration.

Option C: 8/12 - 'less likely to meet government criteria.'



Peterborough, Fenland, East Cambridgeshire 415,000 population; approx. resources £1,121 per head.

Cambridge, South Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire 505,000 population; approx. resources £1,023 per head.

Financial resilience: this option has less scope for long-term resilience for the whole area as financial risks are concentrated in one unitary. Overall, it has greater exposure to financial shocks than other options and compounds the financial challenges described in option A.

- North-east unitary: greatest concentration of financial risk of all unitary options due to having the weakest tax bases and highest population needs.
- <u>South-west unitary</u>: this option has a similarly low social care spend profile compared to the Southern unitary in option B, though it would have greater social care pressures arising from a larger aging population than the southern councils in both options B and A.

Economy and Housing: this option has greatest imbalance in total economic output, jobs and planned housing development between each unitary. It has lowest proportion of residents living and working in the same council area of all options.

- North-east unitary: the council would have only 17% of business turnover and 35% of jobs in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (Beauhurst, 2024) and the lowest level of planned housing development of all the unitary council options
- South-west unitary: would have the greatest proportion of total economic activity of all options posing greater risk to sub-regional economic imbalance over time. Distinct Local Plans progressing to similar timetables for Greater Cambridge and Huntingdonshire would need to bridge two distinct functional economic areas, as well as address the economic needs of the growing Peterborough city region which may present operational and political challenges.

Sustainable public services: This option would have the greatest difference in needs between each new unitary council of all the options, which could overall make it more difficult to deliver sustainable public services across the sub-region.

 North-east Unitary: would have the highest per-capita social care needs of any of the six unitary options. All former council housing would be managed by existing registered providers. • <u>South-west Unitary:</u> the council would have below England average care needs, though it would have a greater pressure on social care services than the south unitary in option B due to a larger older population. The council would combine existing authorities which own and do not own council housing, making integration of housing services with health and social care more complex.

Agenda Item 8a



REPORT TITLE: 2024/25 OUTTURN REPORT

To:

Council

24 July 2025

Report by:

Jody Etherington, Chief Finance Officer

Tel: 01223 458130 Email: jody.etherington@cambridge.gov.uk

Wards affected:

ΑII

Director Approval: Chief Finance Officer Jody Etherington confirms that the report author has sought the advice of all appropriate colleagues and given due regard to that advice; that the equalities impacts and other implications of the recommended decisions have been assessed and accurately presented in the report; and that they are content for the report to be put to the council for decision.

1.	Recommendations				
1.1	It is recommended that council:				
	1. Note this 2024/25 outturn report, including the final net underspend on the				
General Fund of £3.762 million which will be transferred to the Civic Quarter re					
	agreed by council in February 2025.				
	2. Approve, as recommended by Cabinet at their meeting on 15 July 2025:-				
	a. the carry forward of General Fund capital budgets totalling £55.172 million as				
	set out in detail at Appendix A(iv), together with the carry forward of £2.145				
	million of associated General Fund revenue funding.				
	b. the carry forward of £280,000 of Housing Revenue Account revenue budget				
	allocated for transformation purposes (see paragraph 5.8).				
	c. the carry forward of Housing Revenue Account capital budgets totalling				
	£50.941 million as set out in detail at Appendix B(iv).				

Purpose and reason for the report
This report explains the final outturn position for the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) for the 2024/25 financial year. It was considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 15 July 2025. It is now presented to council in support of its statutory and constitutional responsibilities in respect of financial sustainability and monitoring compliance with the budgetary framework.
Under the council's financial regulations, budget carry forwards in excess of £50,000 require approval by council.
Alternative options considered
A decision not to approve the carry forward of transformation funding in the HRA would increase the risk that the service is unable to respond to the ever-changing statutory landscape in respect of social housing, and/or any recommendations made by the Regulator of Social Housing following their forthcoming inspection. This could have a detrimental impact upon council tenants.
A decision not to approve capital carry forwards (and associated revenue resources to finance lead) would lead to the relevant capital projects needed to be halted or curtailed. The impact of this on council services would vary project by project. The list of projects affected is set out in full at Appendix D.
General Fund
General Fund Revenue Outturn
The net outturn position on the General Fund, after proposed carry forwards, is an underspend of £3.762 million, as follows:-

	General Fund Revenue Outturn	2024/25
		£m
	General Fund services – original budget	27.558
	Prior year carry forwards approved	0.440
	Other approved in-year budget adjustments	(0.654)
	General Fund services – final budget	27.344
	General Fund services – final outturn	24.847
	Carry forward requests	0.077
	Net underspend on General Fund services	(2.420)
	Net overspend on non-service expenditure and funding	0.053
	Funding from Transformation & Reinvestment Fund for one-off restructuring costs	(1.395)
	Total net underspend against General Fund reserve	(3.762)
4.2	General Fund Services The net underspend on services of £2.420 million can be further broken down	as follows:-
	General Fund Services Underspend	2024/25 £m
	Exceptional item – overachievement of investment income	(2.901)
	Exceptional item – one-off transformation costs to be funded from Transformation & Reinvestment Fund	1.395
	Net underspend on other General Fund services	(0.914)
	Total net underspend on General Fund services	(2.420)
4.3	Investment income was £2.901 million higher than budget due to persistent l rates, and higher than anticipated cash balances available to invest duri following capital slippage.	_
4.4	One-off transformation costs of £1.395 million associated with the cour Redesign Programme, and subsequent restructuring, will be funded Transformation & Reinvestment Fund as provided for in the 2025/26 Bud Report. Further details are set out at paragraph 4.12 below.	d from the

4.5 Excluding these one-off amounts, the total net underspend on day-to-day General Fund services is therefore £914k. This includes the following significant variances on individual services:-

Net overspends

- Streets and open spaces (£419k across all portfolios, excluding the impact
 of one-off restructuring costs) made up of a number of smaller factors,
 including loss of income from the distribution service (where bookings are currently
 not being accepted), an overspend on vehicle repairs and maintenance, an
 overspend on the cleaning contract following recontracting, and a reclassification
 of grant income from revenue to capital.
- Waste and recycling (£396k) as a result of the new Materials Recovery Facilities contract.
- Garage services (£358k) due to underachievement of income from external customers and an overspend on parts, agency costs and other running costs.
- Insurance (£351k) due to the excess payable in respect of two large fires and five liability claims in the year, the procurement of events insurance, and increased premiums following a review of property coverage.
- Bereavement services (£262k before transfers from earmarked reserves) –
 due mainly to a fall in cremation income following the opening of other crematoria
 locally.

Net underspends

- Parking services (£876k) as a result mainly of increased usage and revenue,
 with some savings in utility and salary costs.
- IT (£685k) due to new cost-sharing arrangements, effective procurement, discontinued projects, retired systems, and some budgetary slack (which has been addressed in setting the budget for 2025/26).
- Shared planning service (£609k) due to additional fee income from major site applications, more streamlined workflows following transformation, and government grant received.
- Administrative buildings (£358k) due in large part to lower than anticipated utility costs – budgets have been adjusted for 2025/26 where necessary.

4.6	A more detailed breakdown of outturn by service grouping is provided at Appendix A,
	whilst Appendix B contains commentary on all individual cost centre variances greater
	than £50.000.

4.7 Given the council's current financial position and continuing need to deliver savings over the medium-term, carry forward of service revenue budgets has not generally been permitted this year. Exceptions have been made in two cases where there is a specific budget allocation to a revenue project and it has not been possible to spend the allocated amounts in 2024/25 due to project slippage. The total amount to be carried forward is £77k. Since each carry forward is individually below £50k, these have been approved by the Chief Finance Officer in line with his delegated authority. They are summarised at Appendix C for information only.

4.8 Non-service Expenditure and Funding

Non-service expenditure and funding is summarised in the table below:-

	Final	Final	Carry	Net
	Budget	Outturn	Forward	(Under)/
			Requests	overspend
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Capital accounting adjustments	(5.737)	(6.380)	-	(0.643)
Capital expenditure financed from revenue	2.803	0.416	2.145	(0.242)
Collection fund deficits	1.114	1.114	-	-
Business rates and core government grants	(15.574)	(14.528)	-	1.046
Council tax	(10.253)	(10.253)	-	-
Net transfers to earmarked reserves	23.112	23.004	-	(0.108)
Total non-service expenditure and funding	(4.535)	(6.627)	2.145	0.053

4.9 Capital accounting adjustments include £448k of additional interest income from internal lending to the HRA, in support of the housing capital programme.

4.10 There is an in-year underspend of £2.387 million in relation to capital expenditure

financed by revenue. This is primarily caused by capital slippage (including £1.482 million in relation to the WREN solar project at Waterbeach), and it is proposed to carry forward £2.145 million to allow completion of the relevant approved capital projects in future years. 4.11 The net underachievement of business rates and core government grants income of £1.046 million has arisen largely as a result of a significant number of business rate appeals being settled in year, following the deadline for submitting appeals in respect of the 2017 rating list. Some of these appeals resulted in backdated refunds having to be made going back a number of years. The current business rate retention and levy system means that the council effectively bears 20% of the cost of such refunds. 4.12 **Restructuring Costs** The 2025/26 Budget Setting Report approved by council in February 2025 contained provision for the creation of a £3.149 million Transformation & Reinvestment Fund (TRF) during 2025/26, to be used first and foremost to fund any one-off restructuring costs incurred during and following the recent group redesign programme. It was anticipated at the time that the majority of such costs would arise in 2025/26. 4.13 Accounting standards require that restructuring costs are recognised when the council has a legal or constructive obligation to proceed, rather than when amounts are paid. As the implementation paper for the group redesign programme was published in February 2025, it has therefore been necessary to include costs of £1.395 million in the General Fund in 2024/25, even though most of this will not actually be paid out until the following year. 4.14 Since the TRF has only been set up in 2025/26, it is necessary to 'bring forward' funding from 2025/26 to fund the 2024/25 costs. This will be achieved by funding the 2024/25 costs from the General Fund in the first instance, but then reducing the planned contribution from the General Fund to the TRF in 2025/26 by an equivalent amount (from £3.149 million to £1.754 million).

4.15 General Fund Reserves

The 2025/26 Budget Setting Report, approved by council in February 2025, included a proposal to transfer any net General Fund underspend this year to the Civic Quarter reserve. As set out at paragraph 4.1, the total amount to be transferred is now confirmed at £3.762 million. As such, the in-year underspend will not impact upon the unallocated General Fund reserves.

4.16 The table below sets out the General Fund reserve balance as at 31 March 2025, and the updated forecast for the next year:-

General Fund Reserve	2024/25	2025/26
	Actual	Forecast
	£m	£m
Brought forward balance at 1 April	40.844	18.863
Planned use of reserves:-		
- Transfer to Civic Quarter Development Reserve	(20.000)	-
- Transfer to Our Cambridge Fund (approved MTFS November 2023)	(0.974)	-
- Transfer to Climate Change Fund	(0.750)	-
- Transfer to Governance Review Reserve	(0.150)	-
- Transfer to Greater Cambridge Impact Fund Reserve	-	(0.800)
- Transfer to Transformation & Reinvestment Fund	-	(3.149)
- Planned use of reserve to fund one-off Folk Festival proposal	-	(0.075)
- Planned use of reserve to balance budget in-year	(4.747)	(1.567)
Business rates growth – indicative growth element (at risk)	3.813	9.515
Impact of revenue budgets carried forward to 2025/26	2.222	(2.222)
Temporary use of General Fund to cover 2024/25 restructuring costs (to be	(1.395)	1.395
repaid from Transformation & Reinvestment Fund in 2025/26)		
Carried forward balance at 31 March	18.863	21.960

4.17 The prudent minimum balance for the General Fund is set at £6.541 million, with a target level of £7.849 million. The above table demonstrates that, even were no business rates growth to be achieved in 2025/26, reserve balances would remain comfortably above the target level.

4.18	General Fund Capital Outturn						
	The final outturn on Coneral Fund conital projects is as follows:						
	The final outturn on General Fund capital projects is as follows:- General Fund Capital Outturn						
	Canada Fund agrital averagitives agricinal hydrat	£m					
	General Fund capital expenditure – original budget	86.355 19.855					
	Prior year carry forwards approved Other approved in-year budget adjustments	6.234					
	General Fund capital expenditure – final budget	112.444					
	General Fund capital expenditure – final outturn	57.931					
	Carry forward requests	55.172					
	Net overspend on General Fund capital expenditure	0.659					
	Net overspend on General i und capital expenditure	<u> </u>					
4.19	The net overspend of £659k includes equity loans of £463k to the Cambridge	Investment					
4.10							
	Partnership for preliminary works at Fanshawe Road and ATS/Murketts, for	· ·					
	approval of both schemes. This loan will be repaid from profits of the complete	ed schemes.					
4.20	A detailed breakdown of significant variances and carry forward reque	ests against					
	individual capital projects is provided at Appendix D. General Fund capital c	_					
	requests of £55.172 million have been brought forward for approval.	arry rormana					
	requests of £35.172 million have been brought forward for approval.						
5.	Housing Revenue Account (HRA)						
5.1	HRA Revenue Outturn						
	The revenue outturn on the HRA is summarised as follows:-						

	HRA Revenue Outturn							
					£m			
	Net operating surplus – original budget				(20.343)			
	Prior year carry forwards approved				0.563			
	Other approved in-year budget adjustments				(0.649)			
	Net operating surplus – final budget				(20.429)			
	Net operating surplus – final outturn				(18.363)			
	Carry forward requests				0.280			
	Net overspend on HRA operating activities							
	Underspend on interest payable				(1.345)			
	Additional transfer to earmarked reserves (tenant sat	isfaction grar	nt)		0.036			
	Net HRA overspend before capital financing				1.037			
	Reduction in revenue financing of capital expenditure	e to accommo	odate oversp	pend	(0.924)			
	Net overspend on HRA reserve				0.114			
5.2	The HRA is a ringfenced fund and must be s	elf-financin	g by statu	ite. The HF	RA Business			
	Plan relies upon generating an operating su							
	then used to cover the borrowing costs asso	•	•	•				
	· ·							
	to contribute towards future capital expenditu	re, eitner o	n existing	Stock or th	e delivery of			
	new homes.							
5.3	In 2024/25, the operating surplus achieved was £18.363 million against a budget of							
	£20.429 million, i.e. a net overspend of £2.34	6 million. ┐	Γhis is bro	ken down f	urther in the			
	following table:							
'	ionowing table.							
		Final	Final	Carry	Net			
		Budget	Outturn	Forward	(Under)/			
		Buuget	Outturn	Requests	overspend			
		£m	£m	£m	£m			
	Operating income	~	~	~	2			
	- Rents	(51.982)	(52.013)	_	(0.031)			
	- Service charges	(3.390)	(4.018)	_	(0.628)			
	- Other	(0.913)	(0.841)	_	0.072			
	Operating expenditure	36.918	39.467	0.280	2.829			
	Interest receivable	(1.062)	(0.958)	-	0.104			
1			` ,	0.000	2.346			
	Net operating surplus (20.429) (18.363) 0.280							

- 5.4 The overachievement of service charge income of £628k includes £518k charged to leaseholders in respect of 2023/24. The council is required to set service charges to leaseholders in advance based upon its best estimate of costs, but after year-end must then compare the amounts charged to the actual costs incurred and either collect any underpayment or refund any overpayment. For 2023/24, actual costs incurred were significantly higher than initially estimated, resulting in extra income being invoiced in 2024/25. 5.5 The overspend of £2.829 million on operating expenditure includes the following significant items:-Net overspends • Day to day repairs (£1.566 million) – due to an increase in legal disrepair claims received, remedial work required in respect of DCM (Damp, Condensation and Mould) in preparation for legislative changes in October 2025, and increases in labour and materials costs. • Asset management (£771k) - includes £582k unbudgeted spend on the use of waking watch at multiple sites this year where fire risks have been identified.
 - Voids (£465k) due to an unexpected influx of void properties and an increase in labour and materials costs.
 - Client and third party repairs (£426k) includes costs relating to the Kingsway and Sackville fires.
 - Citywide schemes (£252k) due largely to additional electrical repairs arising from the electrical testing programme.

Net underspend

- Corporate recharges (£585k) representing the HRA share of underspends on council corporate services.
- 5.6 The overspend on HRA operating expenditure has been counteracted to some extent by

an underspend of £1.345 million on interest payable by the HRA. This is due to significant capital slippage which has reduced the extent to which the HRA has had to internally borrow (from the General Fund) during the year to fund capital expenditure. The 2024/25 Budget Setting Report assumed £62.1 million of borrowing to finance capital expenditure during the year, but the final actual figure required was only £15.3 million. Nevertheless, it is still anticipated that this borrowing will be required in the future, therefore interest costs will continue to rise.

- 5.7 Taking all of the above into account, there is a net overspend on the HRA before capital financing of £1.037 million. There is insufficient headroom within the HRA reserve to absorb such an overspend and remain above the target balance set out in the 2025/26 Budget Setting Report. As such, it has been necessary to reduce the level of revenue resources applied to finance capital expenditure in year by £923k. Since the capital expenditure still needs to be financed, this has the effect of increasing the level of borrowing required this amount is included in the total new borrowing of £15.3 million referenced above. Ultimately, this means higher interest costs for the HRA in the future.
- There is one carry forward proposed within HRA revenue budgets, which is an underspend of £280k on transformation activity. Some of the HRA-specific activity has been delayed due to a corporate focus on the group redesign programme but now this has been implemented there is significant work to be done, including a review of how the council uses its main HRA IT system, and a review of the approach to asset compliance and strategic asset management which will cover both General Fund and HRA assets.

5.9 **HRA Reserve**

The table below sets out the HRA reserve balance as at 31 March 2025, and the updated forecast for the next year:-

	Housing Revenue Account Reserve	2024/25	2025/26			
		Actual	Forecast			
		£m	£m			
	Brought forward balance at 1 April	7.566	7.559			
	Planned use of reserves	(0.172)	1.012			
	Net overspend against HRA reserve after carry forwards	(0.114)	-			
	Temporary impact on reserves of carry forwards (delayed spend)	0.280	(0.280)			
	Carried forward balance at 31 March	7.560	8.291			
5.10	The 2005/20 Dudget Cetting Depart set a prodest minimum below	oo for LIDA				
5.10	The 2025/26 Budget Setting Report set a prudent minimum balan					
	£6.161 million, with a target level of £7.393 million. The above to					
	we are forecasting to remain above the target level of reserves,	albeit we ha	ave had to			
	achieve this in 2024/25 by increasing the level of borrowing to fu	nd capital ex	kpenditure,			
	as set out at paragraph 5.7 above.					
5.11	A more detailed review of the long-term financial sustainability	of the HRA	, including			
	consideration of the capacity to undertake further borrowing to fund capital expenditure					
	in the future, will be carried out over the summer.		У.р. Оттонтон О			
	in the rature, will be carried out over the summer.					
5.12	HRA Capital Outturn					
	The final outturn on HRA capital projects is as follows:-					
	Housing Revenue Account Capital Outturn		2024/25			
			£m			
	Housing Revenue Account capital expenditure – original budget		96.339			
	Prior year carry forwards approved		11.481			
	Other approved in-year budget adjustments		(0.072)			
	Housing Revenue Account capital expenditure – final budget		107.748			
	Housing Revenue Account capital expenditure – final outturn		57.178			
	Carry forward requests		50.941			
	Net overspend on Housing Revenue Account capital expenditure	_	0.371			
5.13	The net overspend of £371k includes the following significant vari	ances:-				

 An overspend of £694k on fire prevention and fire safety works due to essential work arising from fire risk assessments. An overspend of £551k on urgent communal ceiling replacements required for health and safety reasons. An underspend of £571k against the HHSRS (Housing Health and Safety Rating) System) budget, as a result of a decision to apply this budget to the urgent communal ceiling replacements above. An underspend of £314k on communal doors and glazing as a result of a decision to apply this budget towards the urgent fire safety works above. 5.14 A detailed breakdown of significant variances and carry forwards against individual capital projects is provided at Appendix D. HRA capital carry forward requests of £50.941 million have been brought forward for approval. 6. Corporate plan 6.1 The council's budget framework supports all aspects of the Corporate Plan. Budgets requested for carry forward have already been approved by council in 2024/25 or an earlier year, and approval of carry forwards will allow for delivery of the priorities these budgets were assigned to support. Corporate plan 2022-27: our priorities for Cambridge - Cambridge City Council 7. Consultation, engagement and communication 7.1 The 2024/25 budget-setting process was subject to full public consultation in line with the council's Code of Best Practice on Consultation and Community Engagement. 8. Anticipated outcomes, benefits or impact 8.1 Approval of budget carry forwards will allow delivery of the associated corporate carry forwards.

9.	Implications
9.1	Relevant risks
	Where capital budgets are carried forward due to project slippage, this increases the risk
	of overall overspend due to extended project timelines and the impact of inflation where procurement is delayed. This risk will need to be managed by the relevant project
	manager in line with the council's usual Financial Regulations.
9.2	Financial Implications
	The financial implications of the requested carry forwards have already been taken into account within future reserve projections, for example those used to inform the proposed savings targets for budget setting in 2026/27 and beyond. Since budget has already been assigned, there is no further implication from approving carry forwards (apart from the increased risk of overspend identified above).
9.3	Legal Implications
	None identified.
9.4	Equalities and socio-economic Implications
	The equalities and socio-economic implications of individual budget proposals will have been considered at the time of budget setting in line with the relevant council policy and statutory requirements. This includes the preparation of an Equalities Impact Assessment for each year's budget as a whole, and further assessments for individual proposals where the impact is likely to be significant.
9.5	Net Zero Carbon, Climate Change and Environmental implications
	The net zero, climate change and environmental implications of individual budget proposals will have been considered at the time of budget setting in line with the relevant

	council policy and statutory requirements. This includes the assignment of a climate
	change rating to each individual proposal.
9.6	Procurement Implications
	None identified.
9.7	Community Safety Implications
	None identified.
10.	Background documents
	Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to
	Information) Act 1985
10.1	Budget Setting Report (General Fund) 2024/25 to 2028/29
	HRA Budget Setting Report (BSR) 2024/25
11.	Appendices
11.1	Appendix A(i) – General Fund Revenue Outturn 2024/25
	Appendix A(ii) – General Fund Major Service Variances 2024/25
	Appendix A(iii) – General Fund Revenue Carry Forwards
	Appendix A(iv) – General Fund Capital Outturn 2024/25
	Appendix B(i) – Housing Revenue Account Outturn 2024/25
	Appendix B(ii) – Housing Revenue Account Major Operating Variances 2024/25
	Appendix B(iii) – Housing Revenue Account Carry Forwards
	Appendix B(iv) – Housing Revenue Account Capital Outturn 2024/25
	To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact
	Jody Etherington, Chief Finance Officer, tel: 01223 458130, email:
	jody.etherington@cambridge.gov.uk.

General Fund Revenue Outturn 2024/25

Portfolio / Service Grouping	Final Budget Fi	inal Outturn	Variance	Carry	Adjusted
, and a second property of the second propert	2024/25	2024/25	2024/25	Forward	Variance
					2024/25
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Climate Action and Environment					
Environmental Health	1,636	1,595	(41)	0	(41)
Garage Services	(7)	351	358	0	358
Markets & Street Trading	(518)	(473)	45	0	45
Streets and Open Spaces	3,493	3,803	310	0	310
Waste & Recycling	3,079	3,475	396	0	396
Total Climate Action and Environment	7,683	8,751	1,068	0	1,068
Communities					
Management Costs	485	512	27	0	27
Community Centres	1,201	1,094	(107)	30	(77)
Community Development	898	985	87	0	87
Community Safety	(1)	(1)	0	0	0
Culture & Community	1,259	1,064	(195)	0	(195)
Sport & Recreation	2,845	2,937	92	0	92
Total Communities	6,687	6,591	(96)	30	(66)
	3,00.	3,332	(55)		(00)
Community Wealth Building and Community Safety	1.013	012	(101)	0	(101)
Community Safety	1,013	912	(101)	0	(101)
Voluntary Sector	152	170	18	0	18
Central Services	16	9	(7)	0	(7)
Total Community Wealth Building and Community Safety	1,181	1,091	(90)	0	(90)
Finance, Resources and Transformation					
Admin Buildings	2,529	2,171	(358)	0	(358)
Central Services	5,734	5,346	(388)	0	(388)
Management Costs	320	327	7	0	7
Finance General	(2,495)	(5,572)	(3,077)	0	(3,077)
Human Resources	0	11	11	0	11
Legal Services	778	796	18	0	18
Property Services	(7,619)	(7,711)	(92)	0	(92)
Audit	264	203	(61)	0	(61)
Payroll	148	212	64	0	64
Revenues and Benefits	1,348	1,560	212	0	212
Total Finance, Resources and Transformation	1,007	(2,657)	(3,664)	0	(3,664)
Housing and Homelessness					
General Fund Housing	2,045	2,038	(7)	0	(7)
Environmental Health	473	455	(18)	0	(18)
Housing Strategy	227	225	(2)	0	(2)
Homelessness	623	699	76	0	76
Total Housing and Homelessness	3,368	3,417	49	0	49
The Leader					
Central Services	2,815	2,774	(41)	0	(41)
Corporate Strategy	215	140	(75)	0	(75)
Democratic Services	1,457	1,590	133	0	133
Development	274	67	(207)	47	(160)
Management Costs	530	719	189	0	189
Voluntary Sector	1,510	1,483	(27)	0	(27)
Total The Leader	6,801	6,773	(28)	47	19

Portfolio / Service Grouping	Final Budget 2024/25	Final Outturn 2024/25	Variance 2024/25	Carry Forward	Adjusted Variance 2024/25
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Open Spaces and City Services					
Bereavement Services	(576)	(314)	262	0	262
Bereavement - Transfer to earmarked reserves	0	(184)	(184)	0	(184)
Management Costs	380	416	36	0	36
Parking Services	(3,623)	(4,499)	(876)	0	(876)
Streets and Open Spaces	2,430	2,796	366	0	366
Total Open Spaces and City Services	(1,389)	(1,785)	(396)	0	(396)
Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure					
Central Services	66	37	(29)	0	(29)
Building Control	260	141	(119)	0	(119)
Development	81	240	159	0	159
Planning	1,482	873	(609)	0	(609)
Streets and Open Spaces	117	558	441	0	441
Total Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure	2,006	1,849	(157)	0	(157)
Share of net service underspend attributable to:					
- Housing Revenue Account	0	585	585	0	585
- Ringfenced services	0	232	232	0	232
Total for all Portfolios	27,344	24,847	(2,497)	77	(2,420)
Non-service expenditure					
Capital accounting adjustments	(5,737)	(6,380)	(643)	0	(643)
Capital expenditure financed from revenue	2,803	416	(2,387)	2,145	(242)
Cost of revised capital financing strategy	0	0	0	0	0
Collection fund deficit	1,114	1,114	0	0	0
Contributions to earmarked funds	22,500	26,154	3,654	0	3,654
Total non-service expenditure	20,680	21,304	624	2,145	2,769
Net spending requirement	48,024	46,151	(1,873)	2,222	349
Funded by:					
Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA)	(4,853)	(4,853)	0	0	0
Locally Retained Business Rates – Growth Element/additiona		(4,215)	1,098	0	1,098
Core funding grants	(3,675)	(3,727)	(52)	0	(52)
New Homes Bonus (NHB)	(1,733)	(1,733)	0	0	0
Appropriations from earmarked funds	612	612	0	0	0
Council Tax	(10,253)	(10,253)	0	0	0
Contributions to/(from) reserves	(22,809)	(21,982)	827	(2,222)	(1,395)
Total funding	(48,024)	(46,151)	1,873	(2,222)	(349)
Net Total	0	0	0	0	0

Portfolio	Service Grouping	Cost Centre	Reason for Variance	Over/ (under)spend £'000
Climate Action and Environment	Garage Services	Fleet Management - Operational	£60k overspend in salaries costs due to the need to use agency staff when there was a freeze on recruitment for the restructure. General costs of running the service have increased such as waste, ICT, uniform, cleaning and rent. Internal income net £36k overachieved due to ageing council fleet.	93
		Garage- External Work	Underachievement in income due to private external customer purchasing a new fleet with service contracts resulting in loss of £90k income. East Cambs have also replaced a lot of their fleet and therefore we have lost £160k income. Parts overspend of £95k, mitigated by South Cambs income which was £100k overachieved.	265
Page 52	Streets and Open Spaces	Grounds Maintenance & Street Cleaning	There is an overspend of £107k in the vehicle repairs and maintenance budget. This variance is primarily attributable to the age and deteriorating condition of our operational fleet, which has resulted in an increased frequency and cost of essential repair and maintenance activities. The ageing profile of the fleet has significantly impacted the level of maintenance required to ensure that vehicles remain roadworthy and compliant with health and safety standards, whilst continuing to support operational service delivery. Please note that the overspend on fleet vehicles is mitigated through an overachievement of £101k in income generated by our commercial activities. This additional income has offset the majority of the overspend, thereby reducing the net budgetary impact on the overall service. Also a restructuring provision adjustment of £276k.	310
2	Waste & Recycling	Greater Cambridge Shared Waste	Overspend due to contract and supplier changes for Materials Recovery Facilities (MRF). The contract had to be retendered with effect from August 2024. New contract price is now more reflective of national prices.	396
Communities	Community Centres	Clay Farm Community Centre	£25k one-off recharge to the medical centre for electricity after a metering issue was resolved. Replacement chiller project delay £30k (to be carried forward). Utility costs £31k less than budget.	(63)
		The Meadows Community Centre	Utility costs £70k less than budget due to a metering issue which is now resolved.	(58)
	Community Development	Neighbourhood Community Development	The overspend is due to the restructuring provision adjustment.	88
	Culture & Community	Corn Exchange and Guildhalls Cultural Services and Events	This year's surplus is primarily the result of a fuller programme of events, which drove improved food & beverages spend, event recharges and ticket profit. In addition, budgeted staffing costs remained unused as certain roles were not rehired. These savings were redirected to support the Transformation Project.	(614)

Portfolio	Service Grouping	Cost Centre	Reason for Variance	Over/ (under)spend £'000
Communities (contd)	Culture & Community (contd)	Folk Festival Cultural Services and Events	Full report on the challenges of the Folk Festival financial performance went to Exec Cllr and Scrutiny. Headlines relate to inflationary increases on equipment and infrastructure, and challenges to types of ticket sales (reductions in all weekend tickets).	393
	Sport & Recreation	Leisure Contract Client Costs	Planned underspends in a range of maintenance & budget lines to offset / balance overspend in Sport & Recreation Administration.	(81)
		Sport & Recreation Administration	Additional costs incurred in Cleaning, TSG cyclical works and reactive maintenance repairs along with increased utility costs.	153
Community Wealth Building and Community Safety	Community Safety	сстv	Underspend due to overachieved fees income by delivering CCTV projects and SLA.	(98)
And Transformation	Admin Buildings	Guildhall	£104k underspend in utilities - budgets have been adjusted for next year.	(62)
ලිnd Transformation (D		Mandela House	£140k underspend in utilities - budgets adjusted for next year. £34k underspend in maintenance. Underspends in refuse, cleaning & tools & equipment.	(184)
	Audit	Shared Audit Service	Salary underspend due to vacant posts which were reviewed as part of transformation programme. Agency Worker expenditure minimised, resulting in overall saving.	(61)
	Central Services	GMB	The overspend is due to the restructuring provision adjustment.	61
		Human Resources Operations (Staff- General)	The underspend is due to the restructuring provision adjustment.	(62)
		Insurance Fund	Overspend due to additional premium charges for missing properties from the insured portfolio, events insurance (£75k). Motor claims insurance was slightly more than the historical trend (£12k). Five liability claims were £20k each (£100k). Overspend on fire claims due to Kingsway and Sackville fires (£165k).	351

Portfolio	Service Grouping	Cost Centre	Reason for Variance	Over/ (under)spend £'000
Finance, Resources and Transformation (contd)	Central Services (contd)	IT Contract Costs	Underspend due to new cost-sharing agreement, effective procurement of supplies and services, discontinued revenue projects, retired systems, and budgetary slack. The savings proposal on 25/26 FY BSR addressed the budgetary slack. The budget for the future year has also been adjusted to ensure budgetary efficiency.	(685)
		Pensions Costs Recharged	Unfunded pension contributions came in under budget - budget has been reduced for 2025/26.	(99)
		Quality/Health & Safety Management - Indirect	The underspend is due to a vacant post.	(52)
ס	Finance General	Finance General	Includes £2.901m overachievement of interest income due to higher than anticipated interest rates, and higher cash balances to invest following capital slippage. Also includes £111k release of central bad debt provision following annual review.	(3,078)
Page 5	Management Costs	Assets & Property Assistant Director	The overspend is related to the Interim Strategic Property Lead's salary costs, which is budgeted in the Director of Economy & Place cost centre.	51
4		Shared Payroll Service	The overspend is due to the restructuring provision adjustment.	64
	Property Services	Director of Economy & Place	The net underspend between this cost centre and Assets & Property Assistant Director is £15k, due to a transfer of the Interim Strategic Property Lead's salary costs between cost centres.	(66)
		GF Asset Management	Underspend in salaries.	(134)
		Lion Yard - South End	Overachievement in income due to recontracting at higher letting rates than budgeted.	(55)
		Other Commercial Properties	Higher than expected voids (£58k in business rates) and £55k costs associated with the Colville Road temporary costs/provision. £25k overspend in legal fees due to an ongoing legal case.	123
		Other Industrial Properties	Overachievement in income due to recontracting at higher letting rates than budgeted.	(58)
		Property Services	Underspend in salaries due to freeze in recruitment whilst the restructure was taking place.	(119)

Portfolio	Service Grouping	Cost Centre	Reason for Variance	Over/ (under)spend £'000
Finance, Resources and Transformation (contd)	Property Services (contd)	The Lion Yard	Underachieved income due to on-account rent adjustments. This means more ground rent was charged to the tenant in the previous years. After multiple years of adjustments, the tenant is now on credit, and forecast income for 2025/26 is less than budgeted.	394
	Revenues and Benefits	Housing Benefit Subsidy & Expenditure	The variance is primarily due to net subsidy differences of £272k following submission of the final subsidy claim to the DWP. Overall gross expenditure is £28.105 million. The variance is partly offset by a positive variance of £50k with respect to the recovery of benefit overpayment from claimants who are no longer claiming benefit.	222
		Housing Benefits	Underspend is due to benefits administration subsidy received from DWP more than budgeted.	(69)
		Local Taxation	Overspend on agency staff to provide maternity cover and underachievement of fees and charges income from court costs. Income from court fees is variable and outside of the control of the service.	60
Housing and Momelessness	General Fund Housing	Housing Strategy	The overspend is due to the restructuring provision adjustment.	77
ge 55	Homelessness	Homelessness Costs	Overspend on legal costs due to challenges of homelessness decisions.	71
Open Spaces and City Services	Bereavement Services	Bereavement	Transfer to/from earmarked reserve for balances on the bereavement cost centres.	(184)
,		Bereavement Services Central Costs	£81k overspend on legal costs relating to A14 claim, £26k overspend on vehicle repairs due to ageing vehicle plus the use of agency staff/Streets and Open Spaces staff to cover vacancies.	115
		Cambridge Crematorium	Cremation income has reduced due to other local crematoriums opening.	275
		City Cambridge Cemeteries	£138k overachievement on pre-purchase plots. General underspends in the cost centre.	(166)
	Parking Services	Castle Hill Car Park	Return to increased office working has increased usage and income.	(57)

Portfolio	Service Grouping	Cost Centre	Reason for Variance	Over/ (under)spend £'000
Open Spaces and City Services (contd)	Parking Services (contd)	Grafton Centre East Car Park	Reduction in car park usage and revenue (£317k). Similar reductions in footfall figures in shopping centre due to shop closures in advance of most of centre closing. This underachievement is masked by the fact we have £440k business rates credits dating back to 2017 as the rateable value was reduced by £125k per annum and the credits have only just been applied.	(172)
		Grand Arcade Car Park	Increase in usage and revenue due to delay in reopening of Park Street car park and relocation of shoppers from Grafton Centre following its closure of shops. Large underspend on electricity under query with landlord.	(481)
		Park Street Car Park	New car park site - handover was delayed resulting in underachievement against income budget.	54
		Parking Administration	Underspend in salaries due to vacancies and a freeze on recruitment due to the restructure. £37k underspend in bank charges. £37k refund in VAT for repairs.	(102)
Page 56		Queen Anne Terrace Car Park	Increase in usage and income due to relocation of shoppers from Grafton Centre following its closure of shops. Also, large underspend on electricity.	(170)
56	Streets and Open Spaces	Arboriculture	The overspend is primarily the result of increased demand for reactive and essential tree safety work across the city. The past 12 months have seen a higher frequency of severe weather events. These have resulted in an increased number of emergency callouts to deal with dangerous or fallen trees, which carry higher costs due to the urgent nature of the work. Cambridge has an ageing and increasingly vulnerable tree stock. As part of our duty of care, the Council has had to act on an increasing number of high-risk trees identified through inspection cycles. Many of these works, including removals and large-scale pruning, are high-cost activities. We have also seen cost increases from contractors due to inflation, fuel costs, and higher demand across the sector. While this year's spend is lower than last year's £254k, which included a significant backlog of essential works and storm recovery operations, we are still operating above our base budget due to the ongoing volume and urgency of work required. We are reviewing how we prioritise work and exploring whether additional investment in planned maintenance and inspection capacity could help reduce reactive costs in future years.	55
		Chalk Stream Project	Budgeted a salary for a grant funded post - budget was therefore not required as grant covered the costs.	(57)
		Distribution Service	Distribution Officer has been on long term sick leave resulting in no full time cover for the service. We had already seen declining income in the charitable sector income. We are no longer taking bookings as the service is in review.	121

Portfolio	Service Grouping	Cost Centre	Reason for Variance	Over/ (under)spend £'000
Open Spaces and City Services (contd)	Streets and Open Spaces (contd)	Public Realm Enforcement	Salaries underspend due to vacant posts not filled and frozen because of restructure.	(130)
		Public Toilets	Grant received in previous years for Changing Places has been transferred to Capital causing £100k variance, and £100k cleaning contract overspend due to recontracting costing more than the budget allocation.	208
Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure	Building Control	3C Building Control	The service achieved £123k underspend per partner council. Key reasons for the underspend are good management of finances, including resources. The service is also going through a transformation, and the efficiency will be reflected in the future year's budgeted contributions from the partner councils. The funding formula has changed from a budgeted 75:25 ratio to 80:20 ratio of fee earning to non-fee earning work moving forward. Additionally, service overachieved external income targets and underspent on business as usual service expenditure.	(119)
О	Development	Urban Growth Project Management	The overspend is due to the restructuring provision adjustment.	159
Page 57	Planning	Greater Cambridge Shared Planning	£609k underspend due to additional fee income from major site applications and transformation of the planning performance agreements/pre-apps. This has resulted in a more streamlined workflow, which has increased income. In addition, government grant also contributed to the underspend. The service operates on a continuous improvement model, which has resulted in better recruitment and retention and has translated into financial efficiencies.	(609)
	Streets and Open Spaces	Project Delivery	£180k underachievement in the recovery of officer costs for capital and S106 schemes. £52k savings proposal from 2023/24 budget for Public Art not yet realised. Also includes cost of restructuring provision.	441
The Leader	Corporate Strategy	Corporate Policy	The underspend is due to the restructuring provision adjustment.	(75)
	Democratic Services	Electoral Registration	The overspend is due to the increased activity around electoral registration and absent voting as a result of the general election in July 2024. This, and the annual audit of the register that followed, required a higher number of (legally required) letters to be sent, which subsequently increased costs on printing and postage.	79
		Members Support	Overspend as member allowances are above the budget allocated; this includes additional responsibilities that are paid for Deputy Mayor of the Combined Authority. Also includes cost for national insurance contributions that are not allocated budget for member allowances along with stationery allowance.	82

Portfolio	Service Grouping	Cost Centre	Reason for Variance	
				£'000
The Leader (contd)	Development	Cambridge Northern Fringe East (CNFE)	Predominantly delays in DCO decision etc and therefore in legal/other support needs which will come in 2025/26 etc. £47k will be carried forward.	(140)
		North East Cambridge (NEC) Hartree	Same project as Cambridge Northern Fringe East (CNFE) above under new code. Vacant possession costs due to be finally covered by loan from Homes England but decision deferred.	(66)
	Management	Assistant Chief Executive	The overspend is due to the restructuring provision adjustment.	178

General Fund Revenue Carry Forwards Appendix A(iii)

Approved by Chief Finance Officer under delegated authority

Portfolio	Service Grouping	Cost Centre	Variance	Carry Forward	Adjusted	Commentary
			2024/25		Variance	
					2024/25	
			£	£	£	
Communities	Community Centres	Clay Farm Community	(62,742)	30,000	(32,742)	Budget was set aside to purchase replacement chillers, the purchase of which was
		Centre				delayed and will now take place in 2025/26.
The Leader	Development	Cambridge Northern	(140,375)	46,870	(93,505)	The funding carried over is for project management, legal costs and community
		Fringe East (CNFE)				engagement which has been delayed and needs to be available in 2025/26.

Subject to approval by full council

Portfolio	Service Grouping	Cost Centre	Variance	Carry Forward	Adjusted	Commentary
			2024/25		Variance	
П					2024/25	
o			£	£	£	
apital expenditure	financed from revenue	9	(2,386,721)	2,145,000	(241,721)	Revenue contributions to capital associated with capital projects where carry forward
ſΩ	Φ					has been requested.
ل اً						
9						

Appendix A(iv)

Project	Final Budget 2024/25 £'000	£'000	Variance 2024/25 £'000	Carry Forward £'000	Variance 2024/25 £'000	
Waste & Recycling Bins - New Developments (S106)	173	48	(125)	125	0	S106 contribution budget towards waste and recycling bin costs for new developments. It was underspent because of lower than planned drawdown and bin distribution. Rephase budget to 2025/26.
Waste vehicle replacement programme	1,580	1,576	(4)	4	0	The purchases relate to the Shared Waste service only. Vehicles have been purchased by SCDC under delegated authority.
Commercial property repair and maintenance	304	77	(227)	227	0	Some projects planned for 2024-25 will not start until 2025-26. Funds required for commercial repairs at the crematorium to be carried forward.
Administrative buildings maintenance	187	0	(187)	187	0	Some maintenance on hold due to Civic Quarter project.
epot Relocation programme to create perational Hub	8,884	5,389	(3,495)	3,495	0	Contract awarded, contract in progress & practical completion July 2025.
Environmental Improvements Programme	73	0	(73)	73	0	Delivery of programme of previously committed improvements progressing well. Remaining budget to carry forward to 2025/26, in order to continue delivery as reaffirmed by Exec Cllr following Environment & Community Scrutiny on 20 March 2025.
Environmental Improvements Programme - South Area	33	8	(25)	25	0	Delivery of programme of previously committed improvements progressing well. Remaining budget to carry forward to 2025/26, in order to continue delivery as reaffirmed by Exec Cllr following Environment & Community Scrutiny on 20 March 2025.
Environmental Improvements Programme - West/Central Area	49	0	(49)	49	0	Delivery of programme of previously committed improvements progressing well. Remaining budget to carry forward to 2025/ 26, in order to continue delivery as reaffirmed by Exec Cllr following Environment & Community Scrutiny on 20 March 2025.

Project	Final Budget 2024/25 £'000	£'000	-	Carry Forward £'000	Adjusted Variance 2024/25 £'000	
Environmental Improvements Programme - East Area	20			7	0	Delivery of programme of previously committed improvements progressing well. Remaining budget to carry forward to 2025/26, in order to continue delivery as reaffirmed by Exec CIIr following Environment & Community Scrutiny on 20 March 2025.
Chalk Streams projects in Cambridge	176	82	(94)	94	0	Partner agreements and contracts signed. Entering delivery phase.
Minor Highway Improvement Programme	91	20	(71)	71		Delivery of programme of previously committed improvements undertaken by county council, who recharge for city council contributions each year as schemes complete. Remaining budget to carry forward to 2025/26, in order to meet the council's financial obligations towards schemes introduced.
Pevelopment Of land at Clay Farm	839	35	(804)	804		Scheme relates to cost of new units as part of wider development. Tenants are now in occupation of their temporary units. A building contractor is completing the works.
ectric vehicle charging points - taxis	86	22	(64)	64		This project is largely complete - no further chargepoints will be installed under the contract. We are looking to transition the running and maintenance part of the contract to our existing contract from SWARCO to Connected Kerb who manage our car park chargepoints. This transition will incur some legal fees and transition costs. There is one site (Great Eastern Street Car Park) where we will not progress and there is some remedial work needed to make good that site - we are awaiting a quote for that work Therefore the budget will need to be rephased into the coming financial year before closing down.
Redevelopment of Silver Street Toilets	620	238	(382)	382	0	The project is currently in the fit-out and build-out phases, with an expected completion date of end of August 2025.
Replacement air quality monitoring equipment	117	36	(81)	81		Site work is complete. We are currently processing final payments and wrapping up any outstanding spend. Project to be completed early 2025/26

Project	Final Budget 2024/25	Final Outturn 2024/25 £'000	Variance 2024/25	Carry Forward	Adjusted Variance 2024/25	
	£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000	
Residential electric charging points	60	0	(60)	0		This project is complete and benefited from significant government funding and funding in kind from the DNO UK Power Networks thus reducing the capital cost of the project to Cambridge City Council. There is no further work planned for this budget as the strategic management of chargepoint infrastructure now sits with the CPCA who will be progressing this work through LEVI funding.
Market Square project	170	15	(155)	155	0	Project on hold due to Civic Quarter project.
Market Square electrics upgrade	51	34	(17)	17	0	Phase 1 has been completed. Phase 2 is underway and will require the remaining budget. Target date end March 2026.
WREN solar project at Waterbeach	1,519	37	(1,482)	1,482	0	Construction works were delayed due to legal complexities surrounding the signing of the lease of land. Rephase unspent budget to 2025/26.
HS new community room at Abbey Leisure Centre	206	38	(168)	168	0	Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26
S106 Grant for St James' Church community kitchen upgrade	30	0	(30)	30	0	Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26
Property Management software	34	3	(31)	31	0	System now operational, some modules not yet progressed. Target completion March 2026.
Secure phone payments	24	0	(24)	24		The implementation of call secure is progressing as part of the new Income Management System roll out. The project is on track to be completed within the 2025/26 financial year and within the budget allocated.
Park Street car park development	64,262	31,465	(32,797)	32,797	0	Project delayed by external issues including power supplies but on track to complete by July 2025.

Project	Final Budget 2024/25	Final Outturn 2024/25	Variance 2024/25	Carry Forward	Adjusted Variance	Commentary
		£'000			2024/25	
	£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000	
EV infrastructure at the Cambridge City Council depot	57	0	(57)	57	0	Contract awarded, contract in progress & practical completion July 2025.
Network equipment refresh	63	(14)	(77)	0	(77)	The project has been completed and is now closed - full budget not required.
Colville Rd Phase 3 - replacement of commercial units	246	182	(64)	0	(64)	Project complete under-budget.
ICT & Digital Capabilities	124	0	(124)	124	0	Intention to spend remainder of budget by December 2025. Approval for £50k to be spent on grants portal for community wealth building.
an to CIP to purchase land south of Gambridge	6,777	6,750	(27)	27	0	Small variance against budget for drawdown of land loans in respect of Newbury Farm.
Laptop and desktop replacement	199	190	(9)	9	0	Under the device replacement program, 340 laptops have been replaced to date. In the financial year 2024/25, we replaced 220 laptops; for the financial year 2025/26, we plan to replace another 200 laptops. Therefore, we are requesting to carry forward the remaining budget.
Pathfinder House data centre equipment replacement - racks, power and cooling systems	110	0	(110)	110	0	Procurement for this project has concluded, and no tender was selected. The project has now been returned to the architecture team for reevaluation of options.
Sand Martin/Pathfinder House data centre refresh to hybrid environment	46	29	(17)	17	0	The refresh of the Sand Martin/Pathfinder House data center to a hybrid environment is 95% complete. The revised plan is to complete the full project in 2025/26 financial year.
Uninterruptible power supply replacement	33	21	(12)	12	0	The project is partially complete. The revised plan is to complete the full project in 2025/26 financial year.

Project	Final Budget 2024/25	Final Outturn 2024/25 £'000	Variance 2024/25	Carry Forward	Adjusted Variance 2024/25		
	£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000		
Contribution to GF from HRA for corporate IT investment	(74)	0	74	(74)	0	GF project costs recharge to HRA - no recharge in year therefore carry forward.	
The Public Switch Telephone Network (PSTN) switch-off	30	1	(29)	29		The revised plan is to complete the full project by the end of the 2025/26 financial year. So far, 87 lines have been cancelled.	
Meadows Community Hub and Buchan St retail outlet	0	160	160	0	160	Overspend on GF project due to professional fees being reallocated from Meadows HRA budget to GF. Professional fees were not originally included in GF.	
Sustainable Warmth Grant - Home Hograde Grant 2	9,028	4,390	(4,638)	4,638		External Govt funding. All site work is now complete and we are autho final payments as final inspections have been carried out and post installation documents raised. Target is to have budget wrapped up by 2025.	
ast Barnwell new centre	1,471	18	(1,453)	1,453		Delayed spend due to legal and planning delays affecting contractual spend profile. Rephase into 2025/26 with spend profile to be revised as part of budget setting.	
Loan to CIP - Murketts and Fanshawe Road development	0	463	463	0		Equity loans to CIP for preliminary works at Fanshawe Road and ATS/Murketts, following the approval of both schemes. The loan will be repaid from profits of the completed schemes.	
Development of the Civic Quarter	4,000	1,983	(2,017)	2,017	0	£3m funding was approved in November 2024, so the underspend relates to profiling as a significant portion of this allocation will be spent from 1/4/2025 to 30/11/2025 as the project progresses through RIBA stage 3.	
S106 grant to Junction - Urban Voices	187	0	(187)	187	0	PO Raised for S106 spend, contract being drafted for remaining S106 contributions, waiver required.	
[Withdrawn] Crematorium - cafe facilities	0	(47)	(47)	0	(47)	Budget removed - project withdrawn.	

Project	Final Budget 2024/25	-	Variance 2024/25	Carry Forward	Variance		
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	2024/25 £'000		
CHUB - community extension to Cherry Hinton library	427	334	(93)	93		Awaiting end of defects period in June 2025 to pay remaining retentions.	
Automation of Bishops Mill sluice gate	90	(2)	(92)	90	(2)	Given the lack of response from the current FRA consultant, alternative procurement is now being pursued.	
Logan's Meadow vehicular access	13	0	(13)	13	0	Installed. Awaiting guard rail installation spring 2025.	
Cambridge Food Distribution Hub	100	3	(97)	97	0	Feasibility study complete. New venue agreed. Business plan complete. Bill of quantities agreed. In process of contracting suppliers for capital works to take place. Project completion target: Dec 2025.	
06 Abbey Pool improvements	16	10	(6)	6	0	Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26.	
106 Byron's Pool ecological mitigations	20	6	(14)	14	0	First year woodland management work complete. Second year programmed for autumn/winter 2025/26.	
S106 Nine Wells ecological mitigations	72	0	(72)	72	0	Woodland management work contract signed. Work to begin Autumn 2025.	
Cambridge Corn Exchange - infrastructure improvements and upgrades	327	249	(78)	78	0	All money has been committed, including for the purchase and installation of new seating, but will not be paid until completion of work (September 2025).	
Creation of a new boat pumping station at Stourbridge Common	58	0	(58)	58	0	Project to be reviewed - rephase to 2025/26.	
Environmental Improvements Programme (EIP) options	416	131	(285)	285	0	Delivery of programme of previously committed improvements progressing well. Remaining budget to carry forward to 2025/26, in order to continue delivery as reaffirmed by Exec Cllr following Environment & Community Scrutiny on 20 March 2025.	

Project	Final Budget	Final Outturn	Variance	Carry	Adjusted	Commentary	
	2024/25	-	2024/25	Forward	Variance		
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	2024/25 £'000		
Introduction of car parking charges at Cherry Hinton Hall	19	2	(17)	17		Cherry Hinton car park hasn't opened yet due to differing political opinions on the operational detail of the project delaying project delivery.	
S106 The Art of Play and Playlaws Extended	63	7	(56)	56	0	Project contracted - further discussions required with artist on timescales. Estimated summer 2025.	
S106 Coldhams Common BMX track	95	82	(13)	13		The final work activities are scheduled for May/June 2025, with the project set to be completed by June 2025, culminating in the official track opening day. Project spend is in line with allocated amount.	
Closed churchyard wall repairs	45	40	(5)	5	0	One of the two walls is complete. Outstanding planning issue at Abbey Churchyard is delaying delivery. Rephase to 2025/26.	
3106 Mill Road Centre fit out	44	3	(41)	41	0	Awaiting invoice following completion of final works in April.	
06 Clay Farm community centre improvements	5	0	(5)	5	0	This is being repurposed for the Clay Farm AV Project and will be spent by end of August 2025.	
S106 public art grant for Solidarity and Community - The Pink Festival	15	0	(15)	15	0	Project contracted, delivery June 2025.	
Wetlands at Logan's Meadow LNR	331	134	(197)	197	0	Project near completion, minor works remain, due for completion August 2025.	
S106 public art grant for Park Street Residents' Association Art	11	0	(11)	11	0	Project incomplete and discussions required with applicant on change of scope of project.	
Decarbonisation works - Abbey pool, Parkside pool, Cherry Hinton village centre	785	29	(756)	756	0	Ongoing works - now have APSE reports for some sites. Phase 2 works over 2025/26.	

Project	Final Budget 2024/25	-	Variance 2024/25	Carry Forward	Variance		
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	2024/25 £'000		
Recommended maintenance at Abbey pool, Parkside pool and Cherry Hinton village centre	286	159	(127)	127		Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26.	
Essential repairs to Jesus Green river bank	854	9	(845)	845	0	Survey work is ongoing. The topographical and utilities survey phase is nearing completion.	
National Lottery grant for DiversiTREE project	73	30	(43)	43	0	We are in the second and final year of the project. One claim made. Total grant budget awarded £84k.	
S106 grant for Netherhall sports gym: Cambridge Dive for specialist equipment for diving training	9	6	(3)	3	0	Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26.	
Urban Tree Challenge Fund Treeing Up Round 5	32	15	(17)	17	0	Second (of four) claim submitted for £23k. Second year's maintenance currently out for quotation.	
Local Authority Treescape Fund - Round 3 Replacements 2	23	15	(8)	8	0	Third (of five) claim submitted for £15k. Penultimate year's maintenance out for quotation.	
Cycle parking improvements at Queen Anne Terrace car park	114	0	(114)	114	0	Evaluation of tender submissions currently underway with a view to award soon after. Works expected to complete before the end of 2025.	
S106 Cambridge Dive Club: diving facility improvements	16	0	(16)	16	0	Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26.	
S106 Ross Street Community Centre: kitchen improvements	28	24	(4)	4	0	Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26.	
S106 Coldham's Common: outdoor fit kit storage	8	6	(2)	2	0	Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26.	

Project	Final Budget 2024/25	Final Outturn 2024/25 £'000	Variance 2024/25	Carry Forward	Adjusted Variance 2024/25	
	£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000	
S106 Kings Hedges Learner Pool: pool- based fitness equipment	20	0	(20)	20	0	Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26.
S106 Nightingale Rec: public art project	40	27	(13)	13	0	Artist contracted, artist has given a project timeline. Engagement work to start in April.
New equipment to support zero herbicides policy	180	139	(41)	41	0	As part of our commitment to more sustainable and environmentally friendly practices, we have invested in a range of equipment designed specifically for non-chemical weed removal. A dedicated team will be responsible for manually removing weeds and carrying out deep street cleansing operations. This initiative will be fully implemented following the completion of the City Services transformation.
kating and street sport facilities - match funding	25	0	(25)	25	0	Project not yet started as awaiting further dialogue with Cam Skate on the use of the funding - rephase to 2025/26.
S106-funded former EIP-projects around improvements in Cambridge City	49	32	(17)	17	0	Ongoing programme - recent committee decision in March 2025 to finish projects in flight & review of programme in summer 2025.
S106 funded tree planting in Petersfield ward	15	10	(5)	5	0	Planting completed. First of three years' watering in progress.
S106 play area improvements in Petersfield - Flower Street and Ravensworth Gardens	40	22	(18)	18	0	Orders have been raised, awaiting delivery form the contractor. Rephase to 2025/26.
S106 open space improvements in Petersfield - various	55	31	(24)	24	0	The flowering meadow has been delivered. Rephase to 2025/26.
S106 grant for Kelsey Kerridge Sports Centre new equipment	35	0	(35)	35	0	Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26.

Project	Final Budget 2024/25	-	Variance 2024/25	Carry Forward	Variance	
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	2024/25 £'000	
S106 Pickleball markings across various City tennis courts	10	0	(10)	10		Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26.
S106 Coldham's Common New Gaelic football posts	3	2	(1)	1	0	Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26.
S106 Additional tables and chairs at 4 Bowls Clubs Cambridge	10	0	(10)	10	0	Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26.
S106 Jesus Green Skate Park flood lighting and CCTV coverage	20	0	(20)	20	0	Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26.
6106 3G artificial pitch at Abbey Leisure Complex	850	11	(839)	839	0	Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26.
\$106 Planting 14 semi-mature trees in ambridge	60	36	(24)	24	0	Planting completed. First of three years watering in progress.
S106 public art grant for Trials of Democracy	40	38	(2)	2	0	Project contracted, project underway, completion summer 2025.
Urban Tree Challenge Fund: Priority, people, planting, parks	82	25	(57)	57	0	Post planting claim (first of four) submitted for £25k. First year's maintenance out to quotation.
CPCA grant domestic energy efficiency and low carbon heating	950	45	(905)	905	0	Budget is nearly fully committed. Installations are now taking place and first batches of properties are now being completed with some payments made. Project is due to come to close at the end of June 2025.
S106 Nightingale Rec Ground playing pitch improvements	58	0	(58)	58	0	Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26.

Project	Final Budget 2024/25	Final Outturn 2024/25	Variance 2024/25	Carry Forward	Variance	
		£'000			2024/25	
Footpath improvements at Five Trees open space in Chesterton	£'000		£'000 (10)	£'000	£'000	Expected completion May 2025.
S106 Brown's Field Community Centre furnishings & equipment	10	1	(9)	9	0	The S106 award was granted towards the end of 2024/25. All remaining purchases are expected to be completed by July 2025 and the budget should be rephased accordingly.
S106 equipment and storage upgrade at Trumpington Pavilion	27	0	(27)	27	0	This project is currently underway and we hope to complete by the end of August 2025.
S106 grant to Netherhall Sports Centre - D digital display and scoreboard	25	4	(21)	21	0	Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26.
106 new football goals across various recreation grounds	16	0	(16)	16	0	Ongoing project - rephase to 2025/26.
S106 Romsey Rec garden renovation	26	6	(20)	20	0	PO raised and contractor on site, works scheduled to take 6 weeks.
Digital Grants Platform	31	0	(31)	31		The total cost of the 'set up' is £31k. PO was raised in March 2025, but the supplier is invoicing monthly as the work is completed. The first payment of £4k has been approved. The work will be completed in 2025/26 and the budget should therefore be carried forward to allow project completion.
S106 Reilly Way play area improvements	10	0	(10)	10	0	Project funding recently committed and project will be delivered in Winter 2025.
Structural Holding Repairs & Lift Refurbishment - Car Parks	109	27	(82)	82	0	Works not yet started but will begin when Deputy Ops Manager is in post.
Building Control software	120	40	(80)	80	0	The migration project has been slightly delayed due to unforeseen technical challenges. The new project completion date is late July 2025.

Project	Final Budget 2024/25 £'000	Final Outturn 2024/25 £'000	Variance 2024/25 £'000	Carry Forward £'000	Adjusted Variance 2024/25 £'000		
OZEV grant for electric charge points in Council car parks	133	376	243	0	243	We have completed phase 1 and 2 - ORCS are due to release the 25% (£38k) of the funding for phase 2.	
Fire management compliance at the Grand Arcade car park	180	18	(162)	162	0	Fire door replacement works are due to start early 2025/26.	
S106 Harvest Way area - public realm improvements	35	31	(4)	4	0	Project funding recently committed and project will be delivered in Winter 2025.	
Repairs Assistance (Owner Occupiers)	195	53	(142)	142	0	Presently grant available exceeds demand. Policy has been amended April 2025 to widen possible applicants, balance to be reprofiled to 2025/26.	
Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants (6)Tenants)	404	260	(144)	144	0	Presently grant available exceeds demand. Policy has been amended April 2025 to widen possible applicants, balance to be reprofiled to 2025/26.	
Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants (Dwner Occupiers)	404	208	(196)	196	0	Presently grant available exceeds demand. Policy has been amended April 2025 to widen possible applicants, balance to be reprofiled to 2025/26.	
Relocation Grant (Tenants)	0	5	5	(5)	0	0 Variance needs to be seen with Repairs Assistance budget above giving variance of £137k.	
Other capital projects	1,887	1,930	43	0	43	Closed projects and those with no carry forward request where variance <£50k.	
Total General Fund capital programme	112,444	57,931	(54,513)	55,172	659		

Housing Revenue Account Outturn 2024/25

Appendix B(i)

Service Grouping	Final Budget		Variance	Carry	Adjusted
	2024/25	2024/25	2024/25	Forward	Variance 2024/25
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Income					
Rental income (dwellings)	(49,373)	(49,232)	141	0	141
Rental income (other)	(2,609)	(2,781)	(172)	0	(172)
Service charges	(3,390)	(4,018)	(628)	0	(628)
Contribution towards expenditure	(451)	(451)	0	0	0
Other income	(462)	(390)	72	0	72
Jotal Income	(56,285)	(56,872)	(587)	0	(587)
t) Expenditure					
Supervision & management - General Supervision & management - Special	5,581	4,896	(685)	280	(405)
Supervision & management - Special	4,871	4,403	(468)	0	(468)
Repairs & maintenance	12,497	16,176	3,679	0	3,679
Depreciation	11,922	12,094	172	0	172
Other expenditure	2,047	1,898	(149)	0	(149)
Total Expenditure	36,918	39,467	2,549	280	2,829
Net cost of HRA services	(19,367)	(17,405)	1,962	280	2,242
Interest receivable	(1,062)	(958)	104	0	104
HRA (surplus)/deficit for the year	(20,429)	(18,363)	2,066	280	2,346
Other movements in the HRA balance					
Loan interest	9,287	7,942	(1,345)	0	(1,345)
Direct revenue financing of capital	11,044	10,121	(923)	0	(923)
Transfer to/(from) earmarked reserves	270	306	36	0	36
(Surplus)/deficit for year	172	6	(166)	280	114

Category	Line Item	Cost Centre	Reason for Variance	Over/ (under)spend £'000
Income	Rental income (dw	vellings)	Rental income is impacted by a number of factors, including the number and length of voids, number of relets, number of new builds handed over and number of right-to-buy sales. The underachievement here is relatively small in percentage terms (0.3%), and is to some extent compensated by an overachievement of rental income on temporary accommodation of £79k, included under Rental income (other) below. This implies greater use of HRA stock for temporary accommodation purposes, which will reduce the availability of stock for general needs. As part of the planned review of the 30 Year Business Plan over the summer, we will review the current assumptions around rental income and update if necessary.	141
	Rental income (oth	ner)	Includes £79k overachievement of temporary accommodation income as above, and £103k overachievement of commercial income. This follows an overachievement of commercial income of £43k in the previous year, and the budget will be reviewed as part of next year's budget setting round.	(172)
Page 73	Service charges		Includes £518k charged to leaseholders in respect of 2023/24. We are required to set service charges to leaseholders in advance based upon best estimates of actual costs, but then there is a reconciliation exercise after year-end to compare against actual costs and either collect any underpayment or refund any overpayment. For 2023/24, actual costs incurred were significantly higher than initially estimated, resulting in extra income being invoiced in 2024/25. Also includes £66k overachievement of service income on temporary accommodation, which is in line with the £79k overachievement in temporary accommodation rent set out above.	(628)
	Other income		The budget includes a recharge of £84k from the HRA to the GF in respect of emergency accommodation services - however within the outturn this has been accounted for as a reduction to HRA expenditure, so there is a corresponding underspend on the Temporary Accommodation expenditure line below.	72
Expenditure	diture Supervision & Housing Transformation General		The underspend is due to the housing transformation not being fully completed in 2024/25, and also part needs to fund the Building Services overspend below. The net amount of £280k has been requested to be carried forward to support further transformation work in 2025/26.	(356)
		City Homes Expenditure	Underspend in employee costs due to vacancies within the team and recruiting to vacant posts at lower points on the pay scale. Funding included to allow works to mitigate the risk of domestic violence has also not been fully spent.	(174)
		HRA General - Overheads	Corporate underspend in other areas of the business resulting in reduced recharges to the HRA.	(177)

Category	Line Item	Cost Centre	Reason for Variance	Over/ (under)spend £'000
Expenditure (contd)	Supervision & management - Special	Temporary Accommodation	Costs reduced by £84k in respect of amounts recharged to the General Fund which were budgeted in income - corresponding overspend on Other income line above.	(66)
		Ditchburn Place	£56k underspend across all utiltiies. Additional catering management charge income received due to couples occupying a number of flats (we budget based on singles). Budgets to be reviewed in 2025/26.	(75)
		HRA Special - Overheads	Corporate underspend in other areas of the business resulting in reduced recharges to the HRA.	(158)
		Third Party Management and Estate Costs	Business plan funding for the increased costs associated with third party management company services are yet to be allocated to schemes that have recently handed over or are due to hand over before March 2025 but have been delayed until June 2025.	(60)
Page	Repairs & maintenance	Building Services - Indirect	The overspend is caused by the cost of the housing restructure - will be funded from the underspend on Housing Transformation above.	75
74		Asset Management	Overspend is largely due to the use of waking watch at multiple sites for the year. This will continue as there is deemed a fire risk to the sites.	771
		Client and Third Party Repairs	Includes costs relating to the Kingsway and Sackville fires.	426
		Citywide Schemes	Overspend largely due to additional electrical repairs arising from electrical testing programme.	252
		Repairs Day to Day	Variance due to the increase in legal disrepair claims received and the damp, condensation and mould referrals received requiring remedial repairs in the preparation for the release of Awaab's Law in October 2025 and an increase in labour and material costs.	1,566
		Voids	Variance due to an unexpected influx of void properties and an increase in labour and material costs.	465
		Heat and Hot Water Servicing	Variance due to an increase in the servicing numbers required for the year.	236

Page		
75		

Category	Line Item	Cost Centre	Reason for Variance	Over/ (under)spend £'000
Expenditure (contd)	Repairs & maintenance (contd)	•	Corporate underspend in other areas of the business resulting in reduced recharges to the HRA.	(250)
		Estate Investment Scheme	Temp surveyor salary costs have resulted in the overspend.	64
Interest receivable			Capital spend has reduced HRA cash balances, and therefore the share of the council's investment income attributable to the HRA.	104

Subject to approval by full council

Category	Line Item	Cost Centre	Variance 2024/25	Carry Forward	Adjusted Variance 2024/25	
			£	£	£	
Expenditure	•	Housing Transformation	(355,641)	280,000		The Housing Transformation Fund was increased in 2023/24 to allow the HRA to both prepare for housing regulation and contribute to the costs of corporate transformation. Although work has progressed in both areas, there is still a huge amount to complete. As a result, a carry forward is requested to supplement the funding already available in 2025/26 to ensure that improvements can be delivered as quickly as possible.

Appendix B(iv)

Project	Final Budget 2024/25 £'000	£'000	Variance 2024/25 £'000	Carry Forward £'000	Adjusted Variance 2024/25 £'000	
Decent homes programme						
Capitalised Officer Fees - Decent Homes	540	622	82	0	82	With the increase in capital works completed during the year along with the increase in capital program, this took up a greater portion of staff time. Thus resulting in the overspend at year end when capitalising the officer fees as a percentage of their time.
Insulation / Energy Efficiency	14,049	9,544	(4,505)	4,505	0	Ongoing project in progress on site, rephase all to 2025/26.
Asbestos Removal	53	168	115	0	115	The Risk and Compliance team have been proactively removing asbestos to reduce risk and this has resulted in an overspend.
entral Heating / Boilers	2,174	1,545	(629)	629	0	Large number of refusals in programme of work - budget will be required in future years.
Electrical / Wiring	990	550	(440)	440	0	The full year programme was placed with the contractor, but access issues resulted in an underspend being reported for the year - budget to be carried forward.
Roof Covering	2,156	907	(1,249)	1,249	0	Large underspend due to difficulties for contractor to gain access to shed roofs. Request that underspend is carried forward to 2025/26.
External Doors	1,242	362	(880)	880	0	Fire door programme was put on hold last year due to change in fire door specification. Request that underspend is carried forward to 2025/26.
Kitchens	996	419	(577)	577	0	The annual programme was placed with the contractor, but there were large numbers of refusals and omissions from the programme - request to carry forward budget.

Project	Final Budget 2024/25	•	2024/25	Carry Forward	Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	2024/25 £'000
Decent homes programme (contd)					
Bathrooms	1,199	652	(547)	547	DEntire programme was ordered with contractor, but access has proven to be a significant issue. Additionally a limited number of bathrooms were fitted in voids. Request to carry forward budget.
Roof Structure	577	6	(571)	571	O This is required for Upperhall Court roof latent defects. Work was procured in 2024/25 but had not yet started on site - carry forward.
Other Health and Safety Works	107	0	(107)	0	(107) No works last year. Underspend used to partially cover overspend on Fire Prevention / Fire Safety Works below.
Sulphate Attacks D	109	0	(109)	0	(109) No work undertaken/identified. Underspend used to partially cover overspend on Fire Prevention / Fire Safety Works below.
HSRS	693	122	(571)	0	(571) Decision made to utilise this budget to cover urgent communal ceiling replacements as reported under Communal Areas Uplift below.
Wall Structure	2,399	1,492	(907)	907	Underspend to be carried forward to 2025/26 to cover costs of structural works at Bermuda Terrace.
Decent Homes Planned Maintenance Contractor Overheads	2,069	1,080	(989)	989	O Underspend in specific other spend on HRA stock work elements results in a corresponding underspend in contractor overheads - this will need to be carried forward since the majority of contractor underspends have also been carried forward and overheads will arise.
PVCu Windows	2,923	872	(2,051)	2,051	O Request that unused budget is rephased to 2025/26 for window replacements to EWI/Net Zero Properties.
Decent Homes Backlog	84	0	(84)	84	O This budget was not required in 2024/25 and will need to be re-phased into later years of the programme.

Project	Final Budget 2024/25 £'000	Final Outturn 2024/25 £'000	Variance 2024/25 £'000	Carry Forward £'000	Adjusted Variance 2024/25 £'000	
Decent homes programme (contd)						
Other capital projects	384	356	(28)	0	(28)	Closed projects and those with no carry forward request where variance <£50k.
Total decent homes programme	32,744	18,697	(14,047)	13,429	(618)	
Other spend on existing stock						
Disabled Adaptations	830	928	98	0		The last financial year was exceptionally busy for the Disabled Adaptations service, reflecting both increased demand and rising costs. A total of over 100 cases were managed in collaboration with TSG, alongside nearly 50 additional cases involving other essential adaptations. These included the installation of new through-floor lifts and other complex works to support residents with significant accessibility needs.
©ommunal Areas Uplift	108	659	551	0		Urgent communal ceiling replacements required for H&S reasons. To be covered from underspend in HHSRS above.
Communal Areas Floor Coverings	107	164	57	0		Some additional urgent works required to communal landings/stairs due to H&S hazards.
Fire Prevention / Fire Safety Works	444	1,138	694	0		Large programme of work arising for fire risk assessment was delivered. Overspend is partially offset by underpends in other areas (Communal Entrance / Enclosure Doors + Glazing, Other Health and Safety Works and Sulphite Attacks).
Lifts and Door Entry Systems	206	85	(121)	121	0	Limited work was undertaken in relation to these workstreams during the year due to resource issues - request to carry forward.

Project	Final Budget 2024/25	Final Outturn 2024/25 £'000	Variance 2024/25	Carry Forward	Adjusted Variance 2024/25	
	£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000	
Other spend on existing stock (contd)						
Estate Investment	1,519	447	(1,072)	1,072	0	Project to continue into next year as further estate improvments have been identified.
Communal Electrical Installations / Fire Systems / Communal Lighting	889	128	(761)	761		This is required for work at Markham and St Kilda flats and Bermuda Terrace. Programmes of work are specified but there were delays starting work on site.
Communal Entrance / Enclosure Doors + Glazing	344	30	(314)	0		Underspend utilised to partially offset overspend on Fire Prevention / Fire Safety Works
Other capital projects	944	969	25	0	25	Closed projects and those with no carry forward request where variance <£50k.
total other spend on existing stock	5,391	4,548	(843)	1,954	1,111	
New build schemes						I .
New Build Decent Homes	1,127	0	(1,127)	1,127	0	This budget was not required in 2024/25 and will need to be rephased into later years of the programme.
New Build - Kendal Way	452	4	(448)	448	0	Delay to programme due to staffing capacity shortage. Rephase into 2025/26 and review as part of budget setting.
New Build Colville Road (Phase 2)	820	478	(342)	342		Retention held. Overall underspend however remediation works likely. Rephase into 2025/26 and review as part of budget setting.
New Build - Meadows and Buchan Street	7,877	6,836	(1,041)	1,041		Overspend assessment ongoing. Retention held. Remediation works likely. Rephase into 2025/26 and review as part of budget setting.

Project	Final Budget 2024/25	Final Outturn 2024/25 £'000	Variance 2024/25	Carry Forward	Adjusted Variance 2024/25	Commentary
	£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000	
New build schemes (contd)	•					
New Build - Colville Road III	3,432	3,218	(214)	214		Retention retained in lieu of closing outstanding works. Underspend forecast but additional remediation works may come forward. Rephase into 25/26.
New Build - Fen Road	0	(81)	(81)	81		Retention retained in lieu of closing outstanding works. Underspend forecast but additional remediation works may come forward. Rephase into 2025/26.
New Build - Ditton Fields	0	(56)	(56)	56		Retention retained in lieu of closing outstanding works. Underspend forecast but additional remediation works may come forward. Rephase into 2025/26.
Riew Build - Aragon Close	1,525	1,322	(203)	203		Underspend forecast but yet to be verified. Retention remaining for payment. Awaiting final account. Rephase to 2025/26.
New Build - Sackville Close	1,617	1,522	(95)	95		Underspend forecast but yet to be verified. Retention remaining for payment. Awaiting final account. Rephase to 2025/26.
New Build - Borrowdale	0	(43)	(43)	43		Retention retained in lieu of closing outstanding works. Underspend forecast but additional remediation works may come forward. Rephase into 2025/26.
New Build - Aylesborough Close	11,092	10,407	(685)	685	0	Underspend due to build programme delays. Rephase into 2025/26.
New Build - St Thomas's Road	1,649	49	(1,600)	1,600		Scheme redesign under consideration leading to significant delay. Rephase into 2025/26 with spend profile to be revised as part of budget setting.
New Build - Paget Road	720	16	(704)	704		Delay to programme due to staffing capacity shortage. Rephase into 2025/26 and review as part of budget setting.

Project	Final Budget 2024/25	Final Outturn 2024/25	Variance 2024/25	Carry Forward	Adjusted Commentary Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	2024/25 £'000
New build schemes (contd)	1 000		£ 000	£ 000	£ 000
Fanshawe Road	6,672	2,772	(3,900)	3,900	O Delayed spend due to legal and planning delays affecting contractual spend profile. Rephase into 2025/26 with spend profile to be revised as part of budget setting.
Princess and Hanover	4,611	3,005	(1,606)	1,606	O Decant/leasehold buybacks progressing behind schedule. Variance to be rephased to 2025/26. Profile to be revised as part of budget setting.
New Build - East Road	1,584	201	(1,383)	1,383	O Scheme redesign under consideration leading to significant delay. Rephase into 2025/26 with spend profile to be revised as part of budget setting.
New Build - Eddeva Park	3,805	17	(3,788)	3,788	O Delayed spend due to legal and planning delays affecting contractual spend profile. Rephase into 2025/26 with spend profile to be revised as part of budget setting.
New Build - East Barnwell	3,257	2,013	(1,244)	1,244	O Delayed spend due to legal and planning delays affecting contractual spend profile. Rephase into 2025/26 with spend profile to be revised as part of budget setting.
New Build - Newbury Farm	8,763	7	(8,756)	8,756	O Delayed spend due to legal and planning delays affecting contractual spend profile. Rephase into 2025/26 with spend profile to be revised as part of budget setting.
New Build - ATS, Histon Road	4,153	4	(4,149)	4,149	O Delayed spend due to legal and planning delays affecting contractual spend profile. Rephase into 2025/26 with spend profile to be revised as part of budget setting.
New Build - Ekin Road	1,019	1,308	289	(289)	O Decant/leasehold buybacks progressing ahead of schedule. Variance to be deducted from 2025/26 budget. Profile to be revised as part of budget setting.

Project	Final Budget 2024/25	Final Outturn 2024/25 £'000	Variance 2024/25	Carry Forward	Adjusted Variance 2024/25	
	£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000	
New build schemes (contd)						
New Build - Davy Road	1,416	526	(890)	890	0	Decant/leasehold buybacks progressing behind schedule. Variance to be rephased to 2025/26 . Profile to be revised as part of budget setting.
Other capital projects	338	316	(22)	0	(22)	Closed projects and those with no carry forward request where variance <£50k.
Total new build schemes	65,929	33,841	(32,088)	32,066	(22)	
Acquisitions						
Acquisitions & Disposals	1,096	(1)	(1,097)	1,097	0	Budget needs to be reprofiled to 2025/26 to enable any identified/necessary acquisitions to be funded. This is offset by receipts from disposals.
cal Authority Housing Fund Acquisitions	2,016	69	(1,947)	1,947	0	Acquisitions proceeding behind schedule, with three completions missing 2024/25 deadline due to legal delays. Rephase into 2025/26 with spend profile to be revised as part of budget setting.
Total acquisitions	3,112	68	(3,044)	3,044	0	
Other HRA capital spend						
Shared Ownership Repurchase	300	0	(300)	300	0	This budget needs to be held to allow any shared ownership homes to be bought back if the need arises.
Orchard Upgrade	74	2	(72)	72	0	Budget needs to be reprofiled to 2025/26 to enable any identified upgrades to Orchard to be funded.
HRA Corporate IT Contribution	76	0	(76)	76	0	No recharge this year - rephase to 2025/26.

To
Ū
ag
е
84

Project	Final Budget	Final Outturn	Variance	Carry	Adjusted	Commentary
	2024/25	2024/25	2024/25	Forward	Variance	
		£'000			2024/25	
	£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000	
Other HRA capital spend (contd)						
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Commercial Property	122	21	(101)	0	(101)	No works identified by Property Services in 2024/25.
Other capital projects	0	1	1	0		Closed projects and those with no carry forward request where variance
						<£50k.
Total other UDA conital mond	572	24	(F40)	440	(100)	
Total other HRA capital spend	5/2	24	(548)	448	(100)	
Total HRA capital programme	107,748	57,178	(50,570)	50,941	371	
<u>L</u>						

Monday, 30 June 2025

CIVIC AFFAIRS AND AUDIT COMMITTEE

30 June 2025 5.30 - 6.45 pm

Present: Councillors McPherson (Chair), Gawthrope Wood (Vice-Chair), Bennett, Bick, Dalzell, Robertson and Sheil

FOR ADOPTTION BY THE COUNCIL

Proposed Amendments to Members Allowances

The Committee agreed the following recommendations to Council.

Resolved (by 4 votes to 3) to recommend that Council:

1. The uplift in the Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) to the Leader to 4 times the basic allowance.

Resolved (by 4 votes to 3) to recommend that Council:

2. Amend the overall number of SRA's that can be claimed to a maximum of 3.

Resolved (unanimously) to recommend that Council:

3. Removal of the allowance paid by the City Council to members of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) for those sitting on the CPCA Overview & Scrutiny and Audit & Governance Committees.

The meeting ended at 6.45 pm

CHAIR





REPORT TITLE: Proposed Amendments to Member Allowances

To:

Civic Affairs & Audit Committee (30 June 2025)

Report by:

Dan Kalley, Democratic Services Manager Email: dan.kalley@cambridge.gov.uk

Wards affected:

None

Director Approval: Assistant Director Tom Lewis confirms that the report author has sought the advice of all appropriate colleagues and given due regard to that advice; that the equalities impacts and other implications of the recommended decisions have been assessed and accurately presented in the report; and that they are content for the report to be put to the Committee.

1. Recommendations

- 1.1 That Civic Affairs & Audit Committee recommend to Full Council:
 - 1. The uplift in the Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) to the Leader to 4 times the basic allowance.
 - 2. Amend the overall number of SRA's that can be claimed to a maximum of 3.
 - Removal of the allowance paid by the City Council to members of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) for those sitting on the CPCA Overview & Scrutiny and Audit & Governance Committee's

2. Purpose and reason for the report

2.1 This report is being presented to the Civic Affairs & Audit Committee following the agreement of the Members Allowance Scheme at the Annual Meeting on 22 May 2025, which contained an agreement for the allowances to be reviewed during the course of the Municipal Year.

There are some proposed amendments to the Member Allowance Scheme as outlined in the recommendations in 1.1 of the report.

2.2 Any proposed changes need to be recommended to Full Council as part of the remit of the Civic Affairs & Audit Committee.

3. Alternative options considered

- 3.1 1. To do nothing and to keep the current allowances as agreed at Full Council.
 - 2. To change all the allowances in line with the increase proposed to the Leader's Allowance, although it is felt that this would require further re-calculations to a scheme that was generally acceptable as part of the recommendations made by the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) in March of this year.

4. Background and key issues

- 4.1 As part of the revised governance arrangements, the IRP were appointed to review allowances received by members, based on the proposed changes. This was to ensure an independent and transparent review of allowances were carried out.
- 4.2 At the Civic Affairs Committee in May 2025, there was agreement to recommend on to Full Council the adoption of the IRP recommendations, with an additional part of the recommendation that the allowances were reviewed as part of the Committee's work in 2025/26.
- 4.3 There have now been some proposed amendments to the scheme as outlined in the recommendations. This is namely to increase the Leader's allowance to 4 times that of the basic allowance (£7,819 x 4 = £31,276), this therefore being an increase of £7,819 to the current figure.

It is not proposed that the monetary value of any of the other SRA's currently in place are altered. This means that SRA's paid to other positions remains the same irrespective of the proposal to uplift the Leader's allowance.

4.4 There is also proposal to amend the number of SRA's that a member can receive from 1 internal SRA & 1 external SRA, to return this to what was part of the previous scheme in that members can claim up to 3 SRA's (whether that is sitting on a committee of the Council, or as part of any joint arrangements).

Increasing SRA's allowed to be claimed to 3 has an impact on the monetary level of SRA's paid and increases the budget on this element in the region of £20k

4.5 Finally, there is a further proposal to remove the SRA paid by the City Council for members who sit on the CPCA Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Audit & Governance Committee as these positions are now paid by the CPCA. This was agreed as part of their independent review into allowances and a report from the Combined Authority can be found here.

This would provide a saving of $(£1,172 \times 3 = £3,516)$

- 4.6 All of the above would increase the cost by around £25k.
- 4.7 Attached at Appendix A is the updated allowance figures that were agreed at the Annual Meeting, with the exception of the above.
- 4.8 Members of the Committee are reminded that the IRP will review member allowances in December/January as part of their work to align how the new governance structures are working in practice.

5. Corporate plan

5.1 The role of members is key to the Council being able to carry out its priorities, as both decision-makers and holding those with decision making powers to account.

6. Consultation, engagement and communication

6.1 The Leader of the Council has consulted with other group leaders. Members of the Civic Affairs & Audit Committee form part of the consultation before any recommendations are made to Full Council.

7. Anticipated outcomes, benefits or impact

7.1 If recommendations are agreed at Full Council there will be an amendment to the Members Allowance Scheme. This will have a slight increase in the budget to member allowances as outlined in the financial implications of the report.

8. Implications

8.1 Relevant risks

Members will need to be aware of any reputational risks in terms of awarding allowances, however this is within the remit of members to decide at Full Council.

Financial Implications

8.2 The proposed amendments do increase the overall figure of allowances paid to members of the Council in region of £25k compared to the scheme that was agreed by the Council in May 2025.

The current budget and figure for allowances is £576k, the proposed changes if all agreed increase this to £601k.

Legal Implications

8.3 The Council is required to have in place an allowance scheme which can be amended from time to time.

Equalities and socio-economic Implications

8.4 It is proposed that these amendments do not place restrictions to the local community wishing to become an elected representative.

Net Zero Carbon, Climate Change and Environmental implications

8.5 There are none.

Procurement Implications

8.6 There are none.

Community Safety Implications

8.7 There are none.

9. Background documents

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

9.1 Link to Annual Council meeting webpage containing all reports and associated appendices for when the report was agreed.

Annual Council May 2025

10. Appendices

10.1 Appendix A – Option including uplift Leaders Allowance, 3 SRA's and removal of CPCA allowance (Overview & Scrutiny, Audit & Governance).

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact Dan Kalley, email: dan.kalley@cambridge.gov.uk

	Option IRP but (uplift Leader and 3 SRA's and removal of CPCA Scrutiny & Audit & Governance)			
Allowance			Number	
Basic (BA)				
Total Basic:	£7,819		42	£328,398
Special Responsibility:				
Leader of the Council	£31,276	400% of BA	1	31276
		To remain as agreed at Full		
Deputy Leader	£17,594	Council	1	17594
Executive Members	£14,075	""	8	£112,600
Leader of Main Opposition Group	£8,210	""	1	8210
Minority Group Leaders	£3,519	""	1	3519
Scrutiny Committee Chairs	£7,038	1111	2	£14,076
Scrutiny Committee Vice-Chairs	£3,519	1111	2	£7,038
Scrutiny Opposition Spokesperson	£2,346	1111	3	£7,038
Scrutiny Minority Spokespersons	£2,346	""	2	£4,692
Planning Committee Chair	£7,038	""	1	7038
Planning Committee Vice Chair	£3,519	""	1	3519
Planning Committee Member	£2,111	""	6	£12,666
Licensing Committee Chair	£2,346	···	1	2346
Licensing Committee Member	£704	111	Dep on number of meetings attended	
Joint Development Control Chair and City				
Spokesperson	£3,519	IIII	1	3519
Joint Development Control Members	£1,055	IIII	5	£5,275
Civic Affairs Chair	£3,519	III	1	3519

Chair of the Council	£3,519	IIII	1	3519
Employment Committee Chair	£2,346	···	1	2346
Housing Board Chair	£3,519	···	1	3519
Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership Board				
Member	£3,519	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	3519
Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership Board				
Assembly Member	£1,172	1111	2	2344
Combined Authority Cabinet Member	£5,865	III	1	5865
Combined Authority Committee Members	£1,172	···	4	£4,688
Police and Crime Panel Members	£1,172	III	1	1172
Independent Person	£1,172	····	1	1172
Deputy Independent Person Allowance	£586	····	1	586
Co-Optees Allowance	£12.60	Real Living Wage		
Cabinet Assistants	N/A			
Overall (inc basic)	£601,053			

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4.8, the Leader of the Council gives notice to the Council, following consultation with the Monitoring Officer, of the following Cabinet member portfolios with effect from 22 May 2025 (annual meeting of Council):

Leader

- Leadership of Council
- Overall lead on corporate objectives, policy, strategy, and Transformation
- Democratic services and oversight of civic functions
- Leading on external partnerships and visibility within city, Combined Authority and beyond
- Responsible for all items of the Council's business, and default lead on any item not covered by another Executive.
- GCP Board member and CPCA Board member (unless agreed otherwise)
- Leading on external partnerships and visibility within the City, University, Combined Authority, and National Government
- Emergency planning and resilience

Deputy Leader

- Deputy for the leader
- Lead on communications
- Specific roles as deputised by the Leader and agreed with the Leader and the Executive
- Focus on supporting the leader with implementation of Council policies agreed and promoted in the Council's corporate objectives
- Oversight of Equity Policy across the Council EQIAs
- Equality Panel Member

Cabinet Member for Culture, Economy and Skills

- Lead on inclusive economy and good growth
- Lead on skills, including relationships with jobs, skills and education providers.
- Learning and training, support into and between work
- Business liaison
- Tourism and the visitor economy
- BID Board
- Culture and arts development in the city (Junction, Corn Exchange, Folk Festival etc.)

Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

- Finance and the General Fund budget
- HR and relations with council unions
- Overview of Shared services (governance and financing) with lead responsibility for 3C ITC
- Council owned property and investments
- Customer services
- Procurement
- CIP Board Member
- Health and Safety

Cabinet Member for Nature, Open Space and City Services

- Commons, reserves, nature reserves and open spaces, including their maintenance Council's responsibilities for sewerage and drainage
- Rivers and other water recreation areas, adopted watercourses and drainage, including working with Cam Conservator representatives
- Allotments
- Nature conservation delivery and EIP
- Public Toilets
- Parking operations
- Street Cleansing, including litter bins
- Crematoria

Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Environment

- Climate Change Strategy and Net Zero target
- Biodiversity Strategy
- Home retrofitting and energy efficiency, including Cambridgeshire Energy Retrofit Partnership
- Environmental Health
- Hackney carriages and private hire
- Shared Waste service and RECAP The Market services and street trading (excluding the Market redevelopment)
- Fleet & Garage

Cabinet Member for Communities

- Community grants & Community centres
- Equity including the Single Equalities scheme
- Supporting refugees and asylum seekers
- Lead on cross-cutting issues (e.g. GRT inclusion)
- Food justice and food hubs
- Council owned or operated community facilities Overseeing and implementing
 Community Wealth Building approach (including circular economy and social value)
- Community Development
- Relationship with voluntary and community sector

Cabinet Member for Housing

- Housing strategy
- Building council homes
- Maintaining and improving existing homes, including retrofit of council homes
- The city's responsibility re: private rental and housing associations
- Housing Revenue Account Budget
- Member for complaints (as per the Housing Ombudsman)
- CIP Board Membership

Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport

- Land use planning, including implementing the adopted Local Plan and developing local planning briefs and supplementary planning guidance
- Development of future planning policy including the Joint Local Plan with South Cambridgeshire District Council
- Planning delivery, including review of the planning service
- Development and Building Control
- Infrastructure and transport Liaison with County
- Parking Strategy and Charges

Cabinet Member for Safety, Wellbeing & Tackling Homelessness

- Homelessness and rough sleeping
- Public Safety
- Community Safety Partnership
- Police and Crime Panel member
- Health, wellbeing and health inequalities (Cambridge University Hospitals Board)
- Leisure and Sports
- Lead on Council's developing role with NHS/Integrated Care system