COUNCIL

1 October 2026
6.00 - 10.20 pm

Present: Councillors Ashton, Baigent, Bick, Bird, Bennett, Blackburn-Horgan, Cleminson, Clough, Dalzell, Davey, Davison, Dryden, Flaubert, Gawthrope Wood, Glasberg, Griffin, Grimwood, Haithcock, Hauk, Hossain, Illingworth, Martinelli, McPherson, Moore, Nestor, Nicmanis, Payne, Porrer, Sage, Sheil, Smart, Swift, Taylor, Thornburrow, Todd-Jones, Toye Scott, Wade, Whitmore and Young

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

26/72/CNL Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Fisher, Gardiner-Smith and Tong.

26/73/CNL Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Todd-Jones	All	Personal: Member of Unison.
Councillor Haithcock	All	Personal: Member of the National Education Union.

26/74/CNL Minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2026

Councillor Ashton noted that the minutes of Motion 10c did not contain the text of the approved Motion. The minutes regarding item 10c should be corrected to include the following additional text:

On being put to the vote, it was approved unanimously, and it was therefore RESOLVED to adopt the following motion:

This Council would like to express its dismay at the announcement made by Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Foundation Trust that it will stop providing services at the site in Apri 2028.
This Council notes:

- For over 27 years this 7.5-acre site has been providing training, therapeutic horticulture, animal husbandry and retail work for adults with learning disabilities and mental health challenges who are known as co-workers.
- There are currently 50 co-workers and 12 staff.
- Cambridgeshire County Council currently contract the service to the Trust and in April 2028 the Trust will no longer run the contract.
- The County Council will then have to be responsible for the well-being of the co- workers who love working at the site.
- The 2025, 10 Year NHS Health Plan (Fit for the Future) aims to shift from a system focused on treating sickness to one that prioritises prevention, encouraging healthier lifestyles and early intervention.

This Council calls:

- Cambridgeshire County Council to do all it can to keep the service on the current site.
- Request that the Council Leader write to the Chief Executive of the Trust, Steve Grange, to raise our concerns.
- Write to the MPs for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire to see what can be done to keep the service on the current site.
- The support from the local community for this much-loved service has been an encouragement to its staff, co-workers and volunteers. The Council now adds its voice to the campaign and doing what it can to secure the services future.

The minutes of 16 July 2026 were then approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

26/75/CNL Mayor's announcements

The Mayor noted that all Members had received a postcard from Chesterton Women's Institute, to give thanks for passing the Rights of the River Cam Motion.

The Mayor updated Council on recent engagements, including:

- Visit to Living Water Poetry and Clean Rivers Exhibition
- Opening of Stourbridge Fair
- Ukrainian Community Event
- Rowan Foundation dance performance
- Certificate presentation to longstanding Cambridge volunteers

- Mayor's screening of the People's Emergency Briefing

Upcoming engagements would include attendance at the High Sheriff's Justice Service, participation in an EcoHomes event, and a tour of Winter Comfort.

The Mayor permitted Councillor Davison to speak and deliver thanks to Councillor Bennett for the work undertaken during her time as Leader of the Green Group.

26/76/CNL Petition - Greater Cambridge Partnership

A petition had been received containing over 500 signatures.

Wayne Nightingale presented and spoke in support of the petition and made the following points:

i. The petition had been signed by 2,160 people.
ii. Cambridge was unaffordable.
iii. There should be provision of accessible, affordable parking in the city.
iv. Transport plans did not always match the city's changes. Planners should get the basics correct.
v. Authorities should talk to residents before development occurs.
vi. Residents felt that consultations took place after decisions had been made.
vii. For some residents, businesses, tradespeople and those with mobility needs; car ownership was a lifeline, not a privilege.
viii. Major road closures should be paused to consider their impact on traffic, residents, businesses and essential services.
ix. Mill Road Bridge closure review should look at the wider impact of the decision.
x. Consideration of infrastructure was essential before new developments go ahead.
xi. Cycling is important, but the reality is that many residents own cars.
xii. Development was removing the life and character of Cambridge.
xiii. Success would be a city where families could afford to stay and businesses could afford to open.
xiv. Called on Members to support a review of the combined impact of transport planning and development, taking into account the concerns raised by businesses and residents.
xv. An independent assessment of the evidence should be undertaken.

Councillors debated the issues raised for the allocated 15 minutes. The key points raised during debate were:

i. Acknowledged the importance of balanced growth, taking residents into account.
ii. Acknowledged frustrations of residents and their concerns about the future of the city.
iii. Accepted that Cambridge was undergoing change and authorities could either stop it, let it happen unchecked, or influence decisions.
iv. The Local Plan was an important document to ensure development was well-managed.
v. A unitary authority created under Local Government Reorganisation would enable a coordinated approach.

The Leader made the following comments in response to the debate:

i. Cambridge had undergone great change in recent decades.
ii. The Local Plan was important as it pulled together transport infrastructure, environmental capacity and well-being, and would be submitted to government soon. All material had been published, and consultation had been wide-ranging and meaningful.
iii. The Transport Strategy was the responsibility of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and was being managed with care by experts.
iv. The Council wanted Cambridge to have a future that was accessible, balanced, prosperous and worked for everyone.

Members noted the petition.

26/77/CNL Public questions time

Question 1)

The HMO petition debate on 16th July was evidence of a strong democratic mandate for an Article 4 Direction and the cross-party support for it was welcome: we await public confirmation that it will be enacted. However, as numerous other cities recognise, Article 4 alone is only a halfway measure for the following reasons:

- The argument is frequently made that Cambridge's high housing costs demand a highly flexible rental market. But this hands-off approach ignores the reality that the primary force driving the HMO market now is corporate young professionals from the tech and biotech industries. Within the last nine months there has been an alarming surge of HMO conversions in Romsey, with one developer in particular submitting

multiple planning applications simultaneously, giving rise to concern not just about the impact on social cohesion but about the actual quality of their so-called 'premium' accommodation for the tenants who live in them.

- An Article 4 Direction alone cannot stop this hollowing out of local communities: the draft policy is essentially subjective. There are no objective criteria by which to determine what constitutes "a negative impact on amenity" or "a harmful concentration". Applications will have to be determined on a time-consuming case by case basis, with all the attendant cost implications.
- The corporate developers currently targeting areas like Romsey and Petersfield are well funded. Inevitably, their planning lawyers will pick apart rejections, exposing the Council to costly, taxpayer-funded losses at the Planning Inspectorate. A fixed 10% density threshold within a 100m radius is the only legally defensible line that the lawyers cannot cross.
- While there is no dispute that transient workers make a vital contribution to our communities, the argument that Cambridge's housing supply has unique challenges which must exempt it from imposing an HMO threshold is not a solid one: Oxford and Durham are also historic university cities with a collegiate system, facing the same problems of rapid corporate and academic expansion. Imposing a threshold has not led to a collapse of their private rental sectors.
- Conversely, *not* imposing a threshold will make Cambridge more vulnerable to speculative developers who will continue to deplete the family housing stock by looking for maximum rental yields, and purposely submitting aggressive HMO conversions knowing that if they are refused, they can easily take the case to the Planning Inspectorate and succeed, costing the Council thousands. The middle and lower-income families and long-term workers who form the backbone of our local communities will be forced further and further afield as prices rise and neighbourhood amenity deteriorates.
- It is hoped that the Council will address the significant data-gap exposed by the map commissioned by the Guest Road Area Residents Assn (GRARA) and presented to Cabinet on 21st July. However, no matter how comprehensive the final density map may be it is just an observational data set. Without an officially adopted register of all HMOs, it holds zero weight as a statutory ground for refusal during a legal appeal; a policy threshold is the only way of giving officers the confidence to refuse planning applications. Furthermore, developers benefit because a firm threshold replaces an unpredictable planning process with predictability and financial stability.

- I ask this question on behalf of Romsey residents, but across the city there is also concern that without an accurate accompanying quantitative density threshold an Article 4 Direction will fail to protect the stability and social cohesion of local communities.

Therefore, can the Leader tell me what the Council's position is on pairing the Article 4 Direction with an explicit, legally enforceable 10%/100m radius localised density threshold?

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport said the following:

i. In preparation for the Local Plan, a study had been commissioned to explore the role of HMOs in meeting the housing needs of Greater Cambridge, the impact they have, and the potential solutions for managing them.
ii. Some local planning authorities had planning policies restricting HMOs by way of a percentage figure where the concentration exceeded a certain threshold in an area. Each place was unique and comparing datasets for different cities served to highlight the distinct characteristics of Cambridge, with a large proportion of students and young people relative to the total housing stock.
iii. It would not be correct to say that a 10% threshold acted as an absolute barrier to development. Each planning application must be considered on its merits.
iv. A policy position that incorporated a fixed threshold in Cambridge had been considered. However, it was believed the effect would be to restrict new HMOs across large areas of the city and push students and young people away from the centre of the city to more expensive areas or to locations that increase commuting levels.
v. Cabinet would consider proposals for an Article 4 Direction in October which would require smaller HMOs to gain planning permission, in addition to large HMOs. The precise format was yet to be resolved by the Council, but if progressed and confirmed, the local plan policy and direction would enable the council to consider amenity impacts and quality issues on a case-by-case basis, recognising the specific and distinct characteristics of our city.

Supplementary Question

It takes a minimum of 12 months to enact Article 4. So, that would be too little, too late to safeguard our communities. In the last two years, 10 local councils have imposed an immediate article 4 direction to prevent a land grab by developers. A clear possibility given the alarming escalation of HMO conversions in Romsey alone this year. I would urge the council seriously to think about a threshold, but as accurate data to determine one is vital, I suggest that the council considers an immediate Article 4 Direction, freezing new applications while reliable information is gathered on how many HMOs there are, starting with known hotspots in order to prepare an HMO limits within a given radius threshold.

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport replied:

i. During the Local Plan process additional work and studies had been undertaken on HMOs. The Guest Road Residents' Association had also gathered valuable information. This information would be useful when considering applications.
ii. Could not prejudge the debate at Cabinet.

Question 2)

This is a question about the Mission Street science park for 4,000 workers due to be built on the old landfill site off Coldham's Lane in Cherry Hinton. Phase One, four massive buildings up to 26 metres high, will start in the first quarter of next year. They will be very close to the houses in Kathleen Elliot Way.

This is a contentious project, with potential for pollution of Cherry Hinton Brook and the aquifer where we get our drinking water, from a cocktail of toxic chemicals already in the ground including many kinds of PFAS. The only construction method that is possible there will disrupt the ground with 20-metre deep piles being driven down to reach solid ground, for foundations. Cherry Hinton never wanted this science park – of 106 third party comments on the planning application, 102 were against.

In April this year Mission Street promised that they would hold a meeting with residents before the work began. But no arrangements have yet been made. The company has answered some emails but with the bare minimum of information. We deserve to be kept informed. Is there anything the council can do to force the company to improve communications with us? (I presume you have a duty of care, given that it is your planning committee who approved the development.)

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport said the following:

i. The council recognised that residents had concerns about the environmental impacts of the approved development, including potential effects on groundwater, surface water and Cherry Hinton brook.
ii. These matters had been carefully assessed during the planning process and planning permission had been granted subject to a comprehensive range of planning conditions and controls. These included requirements relating to land contamination, groundwater protection, drainage, construction, environmental management and dust and noise control together with ongoing monitoring and mitigation measures where necessary.
iii. The development was subject to other statutory controls and oversight by relevant agencies.
iv. Mission Street had advised that the current expectation was that development would begin in the first quarter of 2027 and confirmed its commitment to keeping local residents informed as the project progresses.
v. Updates on the anticipated start date of the construction programme would be communicated through the Cherry Hinton Residents' Association, local Councillors, and a letter drop to nearby residents.
vi. Committed to writing to Mission Street to remind them of their commitment to hold a meeting with residents and Ward Councillors before works began and noted that work was not imminent.

Supplementary Question

Questioner presented 2023 figures from the Environment Agency for the landfill sites. They were obtained by Ian Rolls of Cambridge Friends of the Earth. In the groundwater, there's nearly three times the safe limit of arsenic in one sample. In another, 13 times too much cyanide.

Of the seven worst PAS forever chemicals, one sample was 179 times over the safe limit. In another, there were 387 times the safe limit for PCBs.

Developing this site is particularly unwise, particularly risky for residents and nature. If it contaminates our aquifer, that's our drinking water. I have seen no signs that Councillors or developers take this seriously.

With these risks, why does this science park have to be built? And why there?

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport replied:

i. Asked the questioner to send through the data outlined in the question, which would be passed to officers for consideration.

Question 3)

We are proud of Cambridge City Council's statements on the situation in Gaza and especially that our council was the first to call for an end to arms sales to Israel.

Last year the City Council resolved to fly the UN flag at the Guildhall on 29th November 2025 to mark the UN's International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People. This was a compromise on the request that the Palestinian flag was flown.

Cambridge PSC requests that the Palestinian flag is flown at the Guildhall this year on 29th November 2026.

Considering that:

- The UK formally recognised Palestine as an independent state on 21st September 2025
- In July 2024, the ICJ declared that Israel's presence in the occupied Palestinian territory is illegal. The ICJ confirmed that Gaza was still an occupied territory even after the settlements were dismantled in 2005. Israel’s 57-year-long occupation of the Palestinian territories is unlawful in its entirety

The UK has accepted these findings.

- On 8th September 2026, the UK announced sanctions on Israeli settlements. In response Israel ordered the closure of the British consulate in Jerusalem and banned 12 British MPs from entering the country.
- 14 countries, including Ireland and Spain, have filed a “declaration of intervention” in South Africa's case at the IJC, which accuses Israel of genocide in the Gaza Strip.

- Since 7th October 2023 more than 73,900 Palestinians have officially been recorded as killed in Gaza, more than 174,000 have been injured and up to 14,000 people are believed to be buried under rubble. Approximately 70% of those killed were women and children.
- Israel has restricted or denied the entry of the heavy machinery needed to clear rubble and recover bodies from collapsed buildings. On 15th September 2026, UN human rights chief Volker Türk, expressed concern about the IDF's clearing of rubble in Gaza, which shows no respect for the dead and potentially destroys evidence of war crimes.
- Since the “ceasefire” began on 10th October 2025, Israel's attacks on Gazan civilians have continued with over 1,000 killed by June 2026. On 6th August UNICEF reported that at least 300 children had been killed in Gaza in the 300 days following the “ceasefire.”
- The Conflict monitoring organisation, ACLED (Armed Conflict Location & Event Data) recorded a 35% increase in Israeli attacks in Gaza in the 5 weeks following the launch of the United States and Israel's war on Iran.
- Israel continues to hinder the passage of humanitarian aid into Gaza. Last week Jordanian Foreign Minister Ayman Safadi stated that aid intended for Gaza is expiring in warehouses due to Israel’s blockade while more than two million Palestinians still face severe deprivation.

Displacement and violence in the West Bank: An Oxfam analysis of data UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs found that between 2023 and 2025 1,244 Palestinians, including 268 children, were killed in the West Bank. Over the same period, nearly 46,000 Palestinians were displaced.

During the first eight months of 2026, 275 Palestinian communities were attacked.

Will the City Council fly the Palestinian flag on 29th November 2026?

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport said the following:

i. The Council had made a number of public statements since the events of the 7th of October 2023, which set out support for everyone who had suffered and continued to suffer in the Israel Palestine conflict.
ii. The Council had pressed the Government:
    a. for immediate and permanent ceasefire in Gaza, Israel, and the rest of Palestine,

b. to make every effort to resume the pre process, to work to ensure that international humanitarian law was upheld and that civilians were protected in accordance with those laws,
c. to work to ensure that civilians had access to humanitarian support, including unfettered access to medical supplies, food, fuel, and water,
d. and to immediately revoke all licenses for arms export to Israel and suspend arm sales to Israel.

iii. A flag flying protocol existed, which was most recently reviewed by the Civic Affairs and Audit Committee in February 2026. The purpose of the protocol was to provide a clear and transparent framework setting out the occasions when flags would be flown over the Guildhall. It allowed for due regard to be given to our statutory obligation to promote community cohesion and undertake appropriate risk assessments when required if flying particular flags would undermine the safety and well-being of any residents.
iv. The protocol listed flags that commemorate national and international occasions as well as flags associated with communities or causes.
v. The Council's Civic Affairs and Audit Committee would consider whether to amend this list to include flying the Palestinian flag at its meeting in October 2026 and a recommendation would be made to Full Council.

Supplementary Question
We are asking for the city council to uh state their support for campaign calling on the NHS to terminate the £330 million contract with the US Software Company Palantir. We should not partner with companies providing tech for Israeli military assaults.

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport replied:

i. Would speak to the Leaders of the Liberal Democrats and the Green Party regarding a response.

Question 4)
Are the City Councillors aware of the new report by a number of academics called "The register of British Slave Traders" published September 2026? It contains extensive information regarding Tobias Rustat who was a director of

the Royal African Corporation hugely involved in the slave trade. Does the council agree with me that the roads in the Coleridge ward of the city named for him - Rustat Road and Rustat Close - are a stain on our city and should be renamed and that process / consultation should begin immediately?

The Cabinet Member for Communities said the following:

i. The Council was aware of the recently published Register of British Slave Traders.
ii. The Council was a committed anti-racist council. In 2025 the Council signed the Unison Anti-Racism Charter.
iii. The Council recognised that councils had taken different approaches to this issue. Some had retained names, monuments, memorials and provided educational materials to put them in context relating links to slavery and colonialism. Others had pursued renaming streets where there had been strong local support.
iv. There had already been consultation amongst local residents in the Rustat Road area relating to renaming the street. The consensus had been to provide educational material regarding Tobias Rustat. Just off Rustat Road, the pocket park had been renamed Gloria Carpenter Park. The Council had installed an information board regarding Gloria Carpenter - the first black woman to officially earn a degree from the University of Cambridge. A section of the information board mentioned the streets around Rustat Road and referred to Tobias Rustat's links with the slave trade.
v. A community-led response would be required if the Council were to consider renaming the streets.

Supplementary Question

Cambridge has roads named after lots of famous people. I have to drive down Rustat Road to get to William Smith Close. We have had a summer of racist trouble in Cambridge and we need to be tough on racism and tough on the causes of racism. And one of the causes of racism is the fact I drive down a road named after a slave trader. It's 2026. We need to sort this out. Restart the conversation

The Cabinet Member for Communities replied:

i. Renaming a street affected residents, businesses, their addresses, legal documents, property records, public services and a range of public databases. It would not be a straightforward process.
ii. The Council would be open to consulting again.

Question 5)
Cambridge City Council rightly stands committed to a housing programme framed in the importance of making affordable housing and council housing central to its aims.

The North Cambridge Development is key to ensuring that Cambridge north of the River Cam provides housing of optimal standard for council housing residents, built to complement surrounding residential areas, and to maintain or add to green space, trees and play areas so that environmental standards are maintained and residents of the development live in housing that is, internally and externally, consistent with health, safety, and well-being. Key also is proportionate density of building and attention paid to infrastructure including transport access and road safety.

Cambridge City Council is therefore requested to:

(1) Consider Arbury Court, Kingsway, and Brackley Close together on building density, so that housing density is proportionate over the three sites – at present Arbury Court appears disproportionate in density, site capacity, and proposed housing.
(2) Further to (1) height presently existing at Arbury Court (one story (Library), two and up to four storeys (shops, flats) provides a good mix and, if it must be exceeded (which is disappointing), should be done to fit into the surrounding area, bearing in mind that Alex Wood Road and Hurst Park Avenue come directly onto the perimeter of Arbury Court, and in any event height should **not** rise to the level of six or seven storeys as is apparently being considered currently.
(3) Consult and collaborate with Cambridgeshire County Council on highway access, consistent with safety and security for all residents and, in particular (but not only), bearing in mind residents' concerns about safety, work with the County to ensure that the Mansell Way crossing be moved up further toward Arbury Road and away from the Alex Wood Road corner, as its location is dangerous for pedestrians and for motor vehicles coming around the bend confronted suddenly with the crossing.
(4) Consult and collaborate with Cambridgeshire County Council (in consultation with residents, and noting residents' concerns as dangers

of fast moving traffic coming around the corner from Roseford Road into Butler Way, and from Butler Way into Roseford Road) as to whether Butler Way (running alongside Kingsway Flats and with no housing frontages) might be decommissioned so that it can become a part of the North Cambridge Development, providing additional green space and trees for Kingsway residents by creating an additional grassed, treed panorama between existing residences and the redeveloped Kingsway Flats.

The Cabinet Member for Housing said the following:

i. The public consultation on the Kingsway and Arbury proposals would begin on 28 October 2026 and run until 20 November 2026.
ii. The proposals would provide much needed council housing in the area and would enhance the green space, shops and library at Arbury Court.
iii. The council successfully secured £96 million for the strategic partnership with Homes England and must now show how we could deliver more council housing.
iv. The project team would be guided by the requirements of the planning process including both national and local planning policies which would impact the design and density.
v. This would include considering the context and character of the area alongside all the other material planning considerations.
vi. The advice of the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service would assist the project team in developing the proposal for these sites.
vii. The project team was already in discussions with highways at the County Council and queries would be passed to the team.

Supplementary Question

I have four points.

1. The play park. May we have a confirmation that the play park will remain as is in its three constituent parts. Toddlers, older children, and teenagers. We do not want a sign no ball games allowed.
2. A paved courtyard is absolutely essential for the singing of carols during the festive season and at other times. Public meetings and community interaction is far more possible with a paved courtyard. We do not want children singing carols with wet feet in wet grass.
3. Notification. It would be appreciated if the steps that have been taken by the City Council in notifying residents of Arbury Court, Kingsway Flats

and Brackley Close Mason. Have those notifications been regular and of what have they consisted?

4. Accountability and transparency are essential for local government for two reasons. One, it's a responsibility to be accountable and be transparent. And two, transparency and accountability mean that rumour and gossip are not the way that matters are relayed. therefore, I ask if everybody on the Council's email list could be informed regularly about progress of the project.

The Cabinet Member for Housing replied:

i. The Council had already outlined that the open spaces in the play park would move slightly. A community panel made up of children, teenagers, parents with children, and older people had met monthly to work on the design. Once complete, designs would be published to allow for more discussion.
ii. The Courtyard would be paved, again based on designs by the Community Panel.
iii. The Community had been and could continue to be kept up to date on meetings and dates.
iv. Bi-monthly meetings had taken place with traders regarding the design of the shops.

Question 6)

Cambridge is a City of Sanctuary and welcomes refugees, consistently committing to support the work of the Cambridge chapter of City of Sanctuary in work and partnership with The Cambridge Convoy Refugee Action Group and Cambridge Refugee Resettlement Campaign – as Cambridge City website attests, 'to build a culture of hospitality and welcome for refugees arriving in Cambridge'.

Cambridge 'Stand Up to Racism' applauds this work and stands with the City in a pledge to ensure that refugees in Cambridge can, in resettling, 'feel safe, welcome and part of our community'.

Unity Rallies are being held this Autumn across the United Kingdom to affirm **anti-racism** and the principle and practice of **unity**. Cambridge 'Stand Up to Racism' requests that Cambridge City Council stands with Stand Up to Racism' in supporting the major **Unity Demonstration and Rally** to be held in

Cambridge assembling at Jesus Green on **Saturday 17 October** to stand with our neighbours, communities, and fellow residents for the right of all people to be held in respect and comradeship, entitled to human rights, freedom and dignity, without racism in any form being accepted or tolerated as a part of our City.

We request that this pledge be proclaimed by Cambridge City Councillors cross-party, so that all political parties that are a party of Cambridge City Council stand with the people of Cambridge and Stand Up to Racism to affirm our City as a City of sanctuary, friendship and community for all.

The Cabinet Member for Communities said the following:

i. The City Council was proud that Cambridge was a city of sanctuary.
ii. Since 2015, the Council had directly supported over a thousand refugees who now called Cambridge their home.
iii. The Council had a long history of standing up against all forms of racism and discrimination. The Council was a co-founder and signatory of the Cambridge Equality Pledge.
iv. The Council believed in the dignity of all people and their right to respect and equality of opportunity and valued the diversity and positive contribution that all residents brought to the city of Cambridge.
v. Hoped all groups in would support the rally on 17 October.

Supplementary Question

Could you delegate someone to come and speak at the rally? Could Members take leaflets and distribute them to their networks and show solidarity?

The Cabinet Member for Communities Replied:

i. Offered to speak at the rally and discuss it with other groups across the Council.

Question 7)

The Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, Paul Bristow, has set a Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) policy to "triple our local economy" by 2050. Whether people like it or not, the policy he has decided will mean a very substantial increase in the number of people and jobs (including offices, labs, etc.). This is in a City that already has a very large amount of driving beyond the limited road space available, so a tripling of activity will present huge challenges for transport provision. Under Mr Bristow's

policy, Cambridge will be a new “Global City Cambridge” Opportunity Zone, with huge expansion of industry (such as labs and offices) and housing.

https://www.easternpowerhouse.uk/post/mayor-bristow-launches-landmark-local-growth-plan-to-supercharge-cambridgeshire-peterborough

Does council agree that, in transport terms, the only way that the Mayor's tripling of growth policy could possibly be workable is by reallocation of roadspace towards non-car modes of transport, such as public transport, cycling, and walking, for the simple reason that there is not physical space for even more driving between all the new houses and labs/offices his policy will result in?

Furthermore, does the council agree with your own Emerging Local Plan's top transport policy statement that "Development must be designed through a vision-led approach which reflects the road user hierarchy"? The road user hierarchy, as defined by UK government, prioritises pedestrians, then cyclists, then public transport, then cars last.

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport said the following:

i. Non-car transport should be boosted in whatever way possible.
ii. Expressed support for the road user hierarchy and had pushed for it on the planning committee and in the Local Plan.
iii. The Mayor's and Combined Authority’s ambition set out in the local growth plan was a shared ambition amongst all the CPCA partners. This ambition would be expressed in the spatial development strategy (SDS), which will be underway imminently.
iv. Alongside the SDS, the joint Local Plan promoted levels of new development designed to meet the needs identified for new homes and jobs across the area. The local plan was supported by the CPCA work on a transport strategy for greater Cambridge. This strategy promoted a vision-led approach to transport in the future. This would require greater emphasis on sustainable transport choices whilst making provision for private car users to transition from their cars to use infrastructure such as public buses and park and ride. The final version of the Greater Cambridge transport strategy was anticipated in November to accompany the Local Plan submission to the government in December.
v. The implementation of some of the infrastructure required to deliver that strategy was already underway through the Greater Cambridge Partnership Program.

vi. The Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy would also identify a range of additional measures to be promoted by the CPCA with partners, including a range of sustainable and active travel measures consistent with a vision-led strategy.

Supplementary Question
Does the council support tripling of the economy in the area and is it willing to take the very hard decisions that means because, simply, you can't fit more vehicles in?

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport replied:

i. Supported evidence-based decision-making. The Local Plan had been modified based on evidence about infrastructure.
ii. Future plans would be based on evidence and what is shown to be actually achievable, while recognizing the risks of the delivery and knowing modifications may be required.

Question 8)
Since the start of the market project, the key message from Councillors and officers has been “a 7 day a week market”. But the Sunday market is full of stalls and traders; most of whom are only there for the one day, on a Sunday. It is a discrete entity, a vibrant, eclectic 1 day a week market. But in spite of repeated questions, queries, and prompts, both Councillors and officers have pushed the Sunday market under the carpet. Nor is it even mentioned anywhere in the current planning application 26/03254/FUL for the temporary market.

This repeated ignoring of their existence has brought many of the Sunday traders to the place where they have had enough. They are disappearing from our market altogether. The latest loss means you can no longer buy fresh fish on a Sunday.

When will the Councillors wake up, and understand that the plans that have been presented to them for the market, do not work for them; do not work for their constituents; and most vitally do not work for the traders? As councillors they have set a pattern for the destruction of what was once our thriving, traditional, and diverse vibrant market.

But all is not yet lost. Although planning permission has been granted (by appallingly few councillors) for the market redevelopment, the Council as owner and manager of the market can amend its proposals.

As has been said before, the market is the beating heart of our historic city. A market has been serving the people of Cambridge since Saxon times, long before the University. A thriving, traditional eclectic market would continue to be a huge asset to our City going forward. Instead, the extent to which the Council's plans are destroying the market are becoming more vivid every day.

It is time for all councillors to get involved, and make it clear that they will not countenance the destruction of our traditional market.

The following response was provided by Cabinet Member for Inclusive Economy and Skills outside of the meeting as the 30-minute time for public questions had expired:

i. The Council had been meeting traders on a monthly basis to go through proposals for the new market and the temporary market when works are in place. These meetings provided an opportunity for traders to raise concerns.

ii. The local produce and Arts and Craft stalls were now part of the 7 day a week general market. Sunday trading had been picked up at the meetings and through correspondence with councillors. It was essential that the local produce and Arts and Craft stalls continued to be a vibrant part of the market. Designs were flexible and allowed for the market to thrive now and evolve in the future.

iii. With plans approved, the project team would now work through the technical designs and operational aspects of the new market as well as through the temporary market application.

Question 9)

Heatwaves of the degree and intensity of this summer have resulted in the tragic loss of huge numbers of recently planted trees, notably on Milton Road where many trees are now marked for felling which is a travesty. Given that the heatwaves we had are likely to be the new normal, will the council be doing a survey of which trees have survived and not survived to ensure that only species appropriate trees with the highest chance of survival of current and future heatwaves are planted as part of the ongoing tree strategy? What other techniques will the council employ to try and prevent future tree losses?

The following response was provided by Cabinet Member for Nature, Open Spaces and City Services outside of the meeting as the 30-minute time for public questions had expired:

i. The prolonged periods of exceptionally hot and dry weather this summer had placed significant stress on trees across Cambridge, especially younger and recently planted trees whose root systems were not yet fully established. The Council shared the concern about these losses and recognised both the environmental value of these trees and the investment that had gone into establishing them.
ii. Responsibility for trees across Cambridge was shared between a number of organisations and landowners. In the case of Milton Road, many of the trees associated with the highway improvement scheme had been transferred to Cambridge City Council. In this scenario the watering frequency had been increased, nevertheless, the experience across the city provided important evidence to learn from.
iii. The Council's Urban Forest Strategy 2026–2036 specifically recognised climate change, increasing temperatures, drought, pests and disease as significant challenges to Cambridge's tree population. Greater emphasis had been placed on climate resilience, species diversity and evidence-led management and planting.
iv. The Council would continue to monitor the condition and establishment of trees within the Council's own tree stock, including understanding patterns of failure. This information would help inform future planting decisions. However, this would not simply be a question of identifying individual species which survived this particular summer. A diverse urban forest would be required, rather than relying on a small number of apparently drought-tolerant species, because resilience also required consideration of future pests and diseases, biodiversity, local soil conditions, available rooting space and the characteristics of individual planting sites.
v. Species selection should therefore be only one part of the response. The Council should continue improving how new trees are established. This included appropriate planting specifications, adequate soil volumes and rooting environments, mulching to retain soil moisture, appropriate staking and protection, watering and monitoring during the crucial first years after planting. The Council would continue to consider how water could be used more efficiently and how planting design could give trees the best possible opportunity to establish during increasingly hot and dry summers.
vi. Our recently adopted Urban Forest Strategy provided a framework for doing precisely this. It established a 2025 baseline covering matters

including species mix, risks and opportunities, alongside measurable indicators through which delivery could be monitored.

vii. There would inevitably be some tree losses, particularly following weather conditions as extreme as those experienced in 2026, and it would be unrealistic to suggest that these can be eliminated entirely. The objective would be to learn from those losses, improve establishment rates and ensure that the trees planted today had the best possible prospect of developing into the mature, healthy and diverse urban forest Cambridge will need in a warmer climate.

26/78/CNL To deal with oral questions

1. From Cllr Young to the Leader

Can the Leader please explain the administration's strategy for community centres across the city, in particular those being built as required under the local plan and in accordance with good community practice?

The Cabinet Member for Communities responded with:

i. A Community Centre strategy had been published some time ago. It established a clear strategic direction looking at where community provision was most needed and also how facilities could be managed and sustained.

ii. Most of the principal actions had now been delivered. The approach had deliberately been a hybrid one. The Council directly operated centres where that was the appropriate model, whilst also investigating where community spaces could be managed by community partners. Community-led stewardship could be effective and enabled spaces to be shaped by their communities.

iii. The Council would work with the old city strategy and potentially amend it if necessary.

iv. The City Council had been working with South Cambridgeshire District Council and specialist consultants on the updated greater Cambridge approach. The Council was sensitive to the needs of the community and what would work best for them.

2. From Cllr Illingworth to the Leader

Does the Leader agree with me that after the government established such momentum and focus behind its proposals to reorganise local government, first its failure to decide between proposed options for this area and then its suspension of the whole programme here and elsewhere, suggests the whole project descended into a shambles? What has been the cost of this to the Council?

The Leader of the Council responded with:

i. The program had not been suspended. Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) had been paused while the government conducted a review.
ii. The Council understood that it was still the government's intention to proceed.
iii. Discovery work with partner councils in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough helped identify how local government services were delivered in the area. This work will would be valuable when the LGR program resumed.
iv. During 2025/26 and 26/27, the Council spent a net amount of £227,000 on LGR, which included costs associated with developing the option B proposal to government and initial preparatory work for reorganisation.
v. Councils in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough would prepare a joint compensation claim to government for ongoing costs that would be incurred during the pause period.

3. From Cllr Glasberg to the Cabinet Member for Nature, Open Space and City Services

At the last Council meeting there was unanimous support for our motion to declare the Rights of the River, and a report has now come to the Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet setting out all the work that the Council is undertaking to protect and enhance it.

Under the heading, ‘Planning, Water Resources and Sustainable Growth', the report states that, 'Water availability is a strategic constraint for Greater Cambridge. The issue is particularly important because of the relationship between groundwater abstraction and the chalk aquifer which supports the area’s chalk streams ’. Water availability is also a potential constraint on the substantial growth proposed in the emerging Local Plan.

This issue is recognised as key by the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service, which has undertaken considerable work on this area in preparing the Local Plan. It is also recognised by the Government, which set up a Water Scarcity Group to look at ways to address this problem, which is a potential block on the major growth planned for this region.

Although it seems water credits are not being pursued further at present, a range of other measures is being considered, including water-efficiency and retrofit programmes, water reuse, the proposed Grafham transfer, the Fens

Reservoir and agricultural reservoirs. However, these measures have different delivery dates and remain subject to significant assumptions.

Can the Executive Councillor set out the evidence on which the Council relies to conclude that sufficient water will be available to meet the needs of the existing population and planned development throughout the Local Plan period, without further damage to our chalk streams?

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport responded with:

i. Water availability was one of the most significant constraints facing Greater Cambridge and it should not be suggested that having enough water for the whole local plan period is somehow guaranteed. An evidence base did not say that.
ii. A much stronger body of evidence existed about the scale of the challenge that identified a pathway based on three things: reducing demand for water, providing new strategic water supplies, and reducing abstraction from the chalk aquifer.
iii. A range of measures therefore needed to be taken including greater water efficiency in new developments, retrofitting existing buildings, reducing leakage, increasing metering and opportunities for water reuse. Demand reduction alone would not resolve the problem.
iv. The principal medium-term intervention would be the proposed transfer from Grafham reservoir, which Cambridge Water's current water resources management plan expected to provide 26 million litres per day from 2031/32 until the larger Fen Reservoir resource could provide Cambridge with around 44 million litres per day. Cambridge Water’s statutory plan assumed supply from that reservoir in 2036/37.
v. Overall, the position was not that sufficient water was guaranteed regardless of what happened, but that there was a credible pathway supported by evidence and that pathway depended upon major infrastructure, ambitious water efficiencies and continued environmental protection being delivered.

4. Cllr Nicmanis to the Leader (Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport)

Thank you, Cambridge city councillors, for voting unanimously in favour of an Article 4 Direction on 16th July. This was an important first step in the direction of controlling the proliferation of Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs) in our residential areas which create increased wealth for the few off the back of those in our city who cannot afford to get on the housing ladder.

We must understand that this escalating problem is contributing to further economic inequality in our unfair city.
HMOs are a necessary part of the Cambridge housing mix but their recent rapid spread due to the opportunistic grab by property investors to make huge profit margins from people studying and working in our city must be curbed.
10% is understood nationally as the accepted 'tipping point' at which community cohesion and access to local amenities become irreversibly damaged. Numerous other university cities with similarly sized student populations like York, Bath, Durham, Leeds, Bristol and Leicester recognise that a 10%/100m radius cap based on measurable data is essential in order to:

1. protect community stability against high-rent housing trends
2. freeze excessive expansion as developers learn to avoid properties where a conversion would not be permitted
3. prevent expensive planning appeals
4. protect council officers from spending hours on planning reports
5. protect planning members from having to make decisions on vague criteria like "harm to neighbourhood character" or "amenity impact" whose subjectivity developers can exploit with bespoke bike storage, noise management plans, and waste management plans.

Will the council re-confirm their commitment to supporting the inclusion of a 10%/100m threshold and communicate what steps have been taken towards this end since our commitment made at the July Full Council?

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport responded with:

i. Article 4 would be brought to Cabinet soon.
ii. No commitment had been made to refuse planning permissions for new HMOs if 10% or more of the residential properties within a 100-metre radius of the application sites were already in operation as HMOs.
iii. The proposal for this threshold had been raised at the scrutiny committee as part of its review of the local plan policies prior to consultation. This included explicit consideration of the matter of HMOs, noting the specific characteristics of Cambridge and its surroundings. At that meeting, the committee did not request a 10% over 100 metres threshold and it was not under active consideration.
iv. The recommendations of that scrutiny committee were taken into a revised local plan and included the inclusion of splash pads, a new policy on gambling, support for the principle of meanwhile use, commending the neurodiversity measures referred to in the policy and requiring a masterplan for the Cambridge Biomedical Campus.

v. Feedback from the regulation 19 consultation on the soundness of the local plan would be considered by the Cabinet and the Council later this year prior to the submission of the plan to the government, and the test of the plan and its policies at a public examination next year. Only minor changes could be made at that point.

26/79/CNL To consider the recommendations of the Executive for adoption

26/80/CNL River Cam, Chalk Streams and Tributaries – Strategic Review and Environmental Projects

Resolved unanimously to:

i. Approve an increase in the Jesus Green River wall project budget from the £850,000 approved in October 2024 to a maximum of £2.441 million, to enable the stabilisation and replacement works to proceed and the competitive procurement process to commence.
ii. Approve the additional capital provision being funded from reserves, with financing implications incorporated into the Council's Medium-Term Financial Strategy.

26/81/CNL Budget Outturn 2025-26

Councillor Bennett requested that the carry forward request for the budget line relating to the Development of the Civic Quarter, contained within Appendix D – General Fund Capital Outturn 2025/26, be voted on as a standalone item.

Resolved (28 votes to 11, with 0 abstentions) to carry forward the Development of the Civic Quarter fund.

Resolved unanimously to:

i. Approve of the revenue budget carry forwards greater than £50,000 listed at Appendix C of the Officer's report.
ii. Approve the creation of a new earmarked reserve for asset compliance, and the transfer into this reserve of the net 2025/26 General Fund underspend of £1.930 million.
iii. Approve the General Fund capital budget carry forwards listed at Appendix D, together with the carry forward of associated resources to finance this expenditure (including £1.767 million of planned revenue contributions to capital).
iv. Approve the Housing Revenue Account capital budget carry forwards listed at Appendix F of the Officer's report.

26/82/CNL Development Loan to Cambridge Investment Partnership

Resolved unanimously to:

i. Increase the maximum developmental loan amount to be drawn down by Cambridge Investment Partnership LLP in respect of Newbury Farm, ATS/Murketts Histon Rd, and Fanshawe Road, by £12 million.
ii. Approve a corresponding increase of £12 million to the total investment counter-party limit with CIP in the Treasury Management Strategy.

26/83/CNL To consider the following notices of motion, notice of which has been given by:

9a Councillor Flaubert: From Commitment to Action on Racial Equality
Resolved (by 37 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions) to approve the following motion.

From Commitment to Action on Racial Equality

Council notes

That Cambridge is a diverse city and that Black, Asian and other ethnic-minority communities make a significant contribution to the life, culture and economy of Cambridge.

That the Council supported the Black Lives Matter motion in July 2020 and recognises the significant work undertaken since then to address racial inequality, including workforce equality monitoring, engagement with staff and communities, and the development of the Race Equality Toolkit.

That the Council endorsed the UNISON Anti-Racism Charter in October 2025 and signed the Charter in January 2026, building on work already undertaken by the Council to promote racial equality within its workforce. The Charter includes commitments relating to workforce and ethnicity pay-gap reporting, anti-racism training, recruitment and promotion, and monitoring disciplinary and grievance outcomes.

That the Council's 2024/25 Equality in Employment Workforce Report demonstrates progress in some areas, including increased ethnic-minority representation among employees, apprentices and those receiving promotions. It also shows that ethnic-minority representation changes at different stages of the recruitment process.

That differences in representation at different stages of recruitment do not, by themselves, demonstrate discrimination. However, significant or persistent disparities should prompt the Council to understand whether barriers exist and whether existing measures are effective.

That legitimate scrutiny, political debate, journalism and freedom of expression are fundamental to a democratic society, while bullying, harassment, discriminatory abuse, intimidation and threats should not be confused with legitimate scrutiny.

Council believes
That the progress made since 2020 should be recognised and welcomed.

That commitments to racial equality are most meaningful when they result in measurable improvements in people's experiences and opportunities.

That the next stage should therefore be to move from commitment and representation towards measurable outcomes, action and accountability, building on the work already being undertaken by the Council.

That equality of opportunity does not mean lowering standards. It means ensuring that everyone has a fair opportunity to demonstrate their skills, experience and ability, with consistent and proportionate standards applied fairly.

That tackling racial inequality requires both good quality data and meaningful engagement with the people affected by inequality.

Council resolves
1. Strengthen accountability for existing commitments
To build on the Council's Anti-Racism Charter, Equality in Employment reporting and Inclusion and Equity Panel work by introducing a clearer annual assessment of progress on racial equality.

Using existing data wherever possible, and subject to legal requirements and appropriate statistical safeguards, the assessment should identify significant or persistent disparities across the employment journey, including:
● recruitment and appointment;
● progression and promotion;
● training and development;
● representation at senior levels;
● pay;

● disciplinary and grievance outcomes; and
● retention and departures.

2. Turn evidence into action
Where significant or persistent disparities are identified, the Council should adopt an **"identify, analyse, act and evaluate"** approach:

Identify the disparity → Analyse possible causes → Act to address potential barriers → Evaluate whether the action worked.

Where appropriate, the annual assessment should identify:
● the issue or disparity identified;
● the evidence considered;
● the action proposed or taken;
● the service or team responsible;
● the timescale for action; and
● the outcome or measurable change.

Progress should be reported to the Inclusion and Equity Panel and made publicly available.

3. Strengthen safeguards against harassment
To review existing arrangements for employees and elected Members to raise concerns about bullying, harassment, discriminatory abuse, intimidation or threats.

The review should consider whether reporting routes are clear, accessible and trusted, and whether staff and Members understand how concerns will be dealt with.

In doing so, the Council should expressly protect legitimate journalism, political debate, criticism, peaceful protest and democratic scrutiny.

4. Strengthen training and leadership
To build on existing anti-racism and equality commitments by ensuring that elected Members, managers and staff have appropriate opportunities to understand racial inequality, discrimination and harassment, and their responsibilities in addressing them.

Training should be practical, proportionate and relevant to people's roles, with particular attention where appropriate to recruitment, promotion, management, complaints and responding to concerns about discrimination or harassment.

The Council should periodically assess the effectiveness of this training and use feedback from staff and Members to improve future provision.

5. Widen opportunities for young people

To build on existing Council youth, skills and careers programmes by working with schools, colleges, young people, employers and community organisations to widen access to:

- mentoring;
- diverse role models;
- workplace visits;
- meaningful work experience;
- apprenticeships; and
- careers opportunities.

Particular attention should be given to young people who may have less access to professional networks and opportunities.
Young people should be involved in designing and evaluating this work.

6. Work with Cambridge employers and business partners

To use the Council's civic, convening and partnership role to encourage employers, business partners, suppliers and organisations working with the Council to improve transparency around racial equality in employment.
Where appropriate and lawful, the Council should encourage organisations to publish or share anonymised equality data, including workforce representation, recruitment, progression, pay and retention, and to consider what action is being taken where significant disparities are identified.

The Council should promote the sharing of good practice and encourage organisations it works with to consider how their recruitment, work experience, apprenticeship, mentoring and progression opportunities can be made accessible to a wider range of people.

The Council should also consider, within the requirements of procurement law and its existing procurement policies, whether appropriate equality and transparency considerations can be incorporated into future commissioning and partnership arrangements.

The Council should report annually on the steps it has taken to engage with employers and business partners and, where possible, the progress achieved.

7. Make racial equality a continuing priority
To ensure that the work set out in this motion becomes part of the Council's continuing approach to equality rather than a one-off programme.

The Council should provide an annual update on progress against this motion and its existing Anti-Racism Charter commitments.

The update should clearly distinguish between:
● actions completed;
● actions underway;
● actions that have not delivered the intended outcome; and
● areas requiring further action.

The Council should continue to engage staff, residents, young people and community organisations in shaping and evaluating its approach, including people with relevant lived experience.

The Council should use the evidence from this annual review to inform future equality objectives, workforce planning and policy development.

8. Council notes that the majority of actions in this motion build on existing commitments, structures and programmes, and resolves that implementation of these actions should proceed within existing resources where possible and should not be made contingent on the outcome or timing of Local Government Reorganisation.

9b Councillor Payne: Herbicide-Free Weed Management
Councillor Dryden left the meeting before this item was considered and did not return.

Councillor Payne proposed and Councillor Young seconded the following motion.

Council notes:

- That Cambridge Liberal Democrats called for the Council to adopt and trial herbicide-free weed management, both through the declaration of a Biodiversity Emergency in 2019 and through a motion proposing trials in two wards in 2021.

- That the Liberal Democrat motion received unanimous Council support and was welcomed by local environmental organisations and community groups.

- The important contribution made by Pesticide Free Cambridge and others in developing and supporting Cambridge's herbicide-free ambition.

- That the trials demonstrated the environmental benefits of reducing herbicide use, but also identified significant operational challenges associated with replacing chemical treatment with mechanical and manual methods.

- That mechanical and manual weed removal is more labour-intensive, is affected by weather, seasonal growth, parked vehicles and accumulated detritus, and requires repeat visits because it does not prevent regrowth.

- That, following the trials and investment in specialist equipment, the Council moved to extend herbicide-free weed management across the city.

- That, since then, implementation has been slow, reflecting the difficult and time-consuming nature of herbicide-free weed removal and the need to tackle years of accumulated detritus alongside the visible growth. Consequently, a substantial number of areas are still awaiting treatment, and residents are understandably concerned about the condition of streets and public spaces.

- That responsibility for weed management is divided between Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and other landowners, requiring stronger coordination and clearer information for residents.

Council believes:

- That the Council-led ambition to end the routine use of herbicides remains the right approach for Cambridge and should not be abandoned because its implementation has proved more difficult than anticipated.

- That herbicide-free weed management supports the Council's commitments to biodiversity, environmental protection and more sustainable management of public spaces.

- That environmental ambition must be matched by effective implementation, sufficient resources, suitable equipment and an honest assessment of what is required to deliver the service successfully.

- That Cambridge residents are entitled to streets and public spaces that are safe, accessible, properly maintained and attractive.

- That priority must be given to weed growth that obstructs footways, affects accessibility, restricts drainage, creates a safety concern or risks damage to highways and other infrastructure.

- That some vegetation can be tolerated where it does not affect safety, accessibility, drainage, infrastructure or the reasonable enjoyment of public space.

- That residents should be given clear information about the standards they can expect from an herbicide-free service, including the greater likelihood of seasonal growth and regrowth between treatments.

- That the present difficulties require decisive corrective action and additional support for the service, rather than any retreat from the Council's herbicide-free commitment.

Council therefore calls on the Leader and Executive Councillor to:

- Reaffirm the Council's commitment to the Liberal Democrat-led ambition of ending the routine use of herbicides on land managed by the City Council.

- Commission an urgent officer review of the current weed-management programme, identifying:
    - the reasons for departure from the original programme;
    - the extent of the outstanding work;
    - the staffing, equipment and financial capacity required;
    - the effectiveness and whole-life cost of the different mechanical and manual methods;
    - the frequency of repeat treatment needed;

  - seasonal and weather-related constraints;
  - the effect of parked vehicles and other access restrictions; and
  - opportunities for better coordination with the County Council, contractors, communities and other landowners.

- Bring forward a costed, non-recurring recovery programme to blitz outstanding priority areas and establish a manageable baseline for future maintenance.

- Ensure that any short-term intervention is supported by a sustainable annual maintenance programme, so that areas cleared through the recovery work receive appropriate repeat treatment.

- Develop a risk-based approach that prioritises safety, accessibility, drainage, transport routes and the protection of public infrastructure.

- Continue to test and evaluate new equipment and working methods, drawing on operational evidence from Cambridge and good practice elsewhere.

- Bring forward any necessary budget bid for 2027-28, clearly distinguishing between the one-off cost of recovering the service and the recurrent resources required to maintain it.

- Publish a clear statement for residents setting out responsibilities, priorities, expected service standards, seasonal constraints and how urgent concerns should be reported.

- Introduce transparent performance reporting covering areas completed, outstanding initial treatments, repeat visits, complaints, service requests, costs and operational learning.

- Report the findings of the review, together with costed options and a revised delivery programme, to the relevant scrutiny committee within an agreed timescale.

Councillor Smart proposed and Councillor Moore seconded the following amendment (deleted text struck through and additional text underlined):

Council notes:

- That in 2019 the Council unanimously supported calling a Biodiversity Emergency, which has since then been put into practice with the Council's Biodiversity Strategy.

- That in 2021 the Council unanimously supported a herbicide-free trial in two wards which has since then progressed to the adoption of the council's city-wide Herbicide-Free Weed Strategy in 2025.

- ~~That Cambridge Liberal Democrats called for the Council to adopt and trial herbicide-free weed management, both through the declaration of a Biodiversity Emergency in 2019 and through a motion proposing trials in two wards in 2021.~~

- ~~That the Liberal Democrat motion received unanimous Council support and was welcomed by local environmental organisations and community groups.~~

- That Cambridge City Council has been successful in stopping the use of herbicides.

- Certain widely used formulas, such as glyphosate, have been linked by various health organisations and studies to chronic issues, including potential carcinogenic risks and hormone disruption. The World Health Organisation's International Agency for Research on Cancer classified glyphosate as "probably carcinogenic to humans".

- Herbicides are therefore potentially dangerous to all plant life including edible foodstuffs, as well as animals, including pets.

- It is the policy of this Council to cultivate a healthy, nature-positive urban environment that supports local wildlife and ecosystems.

- That there has been continuing cross-party support for developing a herbicide-free approach in Cambridge.

- Recognises the important contribution made by Pesticide Free Cambridge, On the Verge and others in developing and supporting Cambridge's herbicide-free ambition.

- That the trials ~~demonstrated the environmental benefits of reducing herbicide use,~~ provided evidence supporting the environmental case for reducing routine herbicide use but also identified significant operational

challenges associated with replacing chemical treatment with mechanical and manual methods.

- That mechanical and manual weed removal is more labour-intensive, is affected by weather, seasonal growth, parked vehicles and accumulated detritus, and requires repeat visits because it does not prevent regrowth.

- That, ~~following the trials and investment~~ the Council has invested in specialist equipment, ~~the Council moved~~ in order to extend herbicide-free weed management across the city.

- That the Council's approved 2025 Herbicide-Free Weed Management Work Programme identified an initial backlog of weed growth requiring intensive treatment before moving to a programme of regular scheduled maintenance

- That, since then, implementation has been challenging ~~slow~~, reflecting the difficult and time-consuming nature of herbicide-free weed removal and the need to tackle years of accumulated detritus alongside the visible growth. Consequently, ~~a substantial number of~~ some areas that are between ~~are still awaiting~~ treatments~~, and~~ can cause residents to be ~~are~~ understandably concerned about the condition and accessibility of streets and public spaces.

- That there is currently no sufficiently clear and publicly accessible picture of the outstanding backlog, broken down by ward and priority, or of actual delivery against the treatment programme provided in 2025.

- That responsibility for weed management is divided between Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and other landowners, requiring strong ~~stronger~~ coordination and clear ~~clearer~~ information for residents.

Council believes:

- That the Council-led ambition to end the routine use of herbicides ~~remains the right approach for Cambridge and should not be abandoned because its implementation has proved more difficult than anticipated.~~ Should be maintained, while recognising that its success depends on a properly resourced, sustainable and effective weed management service.

- That herbicide-free weed management supports the Council's commitments to biodiversity, environmental protection and more sustainable management of public spaces.

- That environmental ambition must be matched by effective implementation, sufficient resources, suitable equipment and an honest assessment of what is required to deliver the service successfully.

- That Cambridge residents are entitled to streets and public spaces that are safe, accessible, properly maintained and attractive.

- That priority must be given to weed growth that obstructs footways, affects accessibility, restricts drainage, creates a safety concern or risks damage to highways and other infrastructure**,** though not an exclusive list

- That some vegetation can be tolerated where it does not affect safety, accessibility, drainage, infrastructure or the reasonable enjoyment of public space, though not an exclusive list

- That residents should be given clear information about the standards they can expect from an herbicide-free service, including the greater likelihood of seasonal growth and regrowth between treatments.

- That the present challenges will not cause ~~difficulties require decisive corrective action and additional support for the service, rather than~~ any retreat from the Council's herbicide-free commitment a clear recovery plan for outstanding work, followed by a sustainable recurring maintenance programme, rather than a retreat from the Council's commitment to ending the routine use of herbicides.

Council therefore calls on the Leader and Executive Councillor to:

- Reaffirm the Council's commitment to **cross-party support for** ~~the Liberal Democrat-led ambition of~~ ending the routine use of herbicides on land managed by the City Council.

~~Commission an urgent Officer review of the current weed-management programme, identifying:~~ Require Officers to report on delivery against the Council's approved 2025 Herbicide-Free Weed Management Work Programme, identifying:

- the work originally planned and the work actually delivered to date;
- the current ~~outstanding~~ backlog of outstanding work, broken down by ward and priority;
- the reasons for any material delays or variance from the approved programme;
- the staffing, equipment and financial capacity currently available and the capacity required;
- the effectiveness and whole-life cost of the different mechanical and manual methods;
- the frequency of repeat treatment required to maintain acceptable standards;
- seasonal and weather-related constraints;
- the effect of parked vehicles and other access restrictions; and
- opportunities for better coordination with the County Council, contractors, communities and other landowners.
- Any additional costs to the City Council of cutting the County Council's verges on their behalf.

~~• the reasons for departure from the original programme;~~
~~• the extent of the outstanding work;~~
~~• the staffing, equipment and financial capacity required;~~
~~• the effectiveness and whole-life cost of the different mechanical and manual methods;~~
~~• the frequency of repeat treatment needed;~~
~~• seasonal and weather-related constraints;~~
~~• the effect of parked vehicles and other access restrictions; and~~
~~• opportunities for better coordination with the County Council, contractors, communities and other landowners.~~

~~• Bring forward a costed, non-recurring recovery programme to blitz outstanding priority areas and establish a manageable baseline for future maintenance.~~

~~• Ensure that any short-term intervention is supported by a sustainable annual maintenance programme, so that areas cleared through the recovery work receive appropriate repeat treatment.~~

- Bring forward an options appraisal for a non-recurring recovery programme to blitz outstanding priority areas and establish a manageable baseline for future maintenance

- Bring forward an options appraisal for ~~and~~ a sustainable annual maintenance programme, so that areas cleared through the recovery work receive appropriate repeat treatment, including appropriate treatment frequencies for different categories of location.

- Develop a risk-based approach that prioritises safety, accessibility, drainage, transport routes and the protection of public infrastructure.

- Adopt a transparent risk-based prioritisation framework, giving priority to safety, accessibility, drainage, transport routes and the protection of public infrastructure, with clear service standards and target response times.

- Continue to test and evaluate new equipment and working methods, drawing on operational evidence from Cambridge and good practice elsewhere.

- Present ~~Bring forward~~ any ~~necessary~~ suggested budget bid for 2027-28, clearly distinguishing between the one-off cost of recovering the service and the recurrent resources required to maintain it, so that Councillors can make an informed decision weighing up the costs of any necessary bid with any additional savings that will need to be made elsewhere

- Publish a clear statement for residents setting out ~~responsibilities, priorities, expected service standards, seasonal constraints and how urgent concerns should be reported.~~ the division of responsibilities between te City Council, County Council and other landowners; service priorities and standards; seasonal constraints; and how urgent concerns should be reported and escalated.

- Introduce transparent performance reporting covering areas completed, outstanding initial treatments, repeat visits, complaints, service requests, costs and operational learning.

- Report the findings of the review, together with costed options and a revised delivery programme, to the relevant scrutiny committee within an agreed timescale.

The amendment was carried by 21 votes in favour to 13 against, with 4 abstentions.

Councillor Davison proposed and Councillor Clough seconded the following amendment (deleted text struck through and additional text underlined):

Council notes:

- That ~~Cambridge Liberal Democrats~~ called ~~for to adopt and trial herbicide-free weed management, both through the declaration of a Biodiversity Emergency in 2019 and through a motion proposing trials in two wards in 2021~~ the Council declared a Biodiversity Emergency in 2019 and subsequently supported the introduction and trial of herbicide-free weed management in Cambridge.

- That the Liberal Democrat motion received unanimous Council support and was welcomed by local environmental organisations and community groups.

- The important contribution made by Pesticide Free Cambridge and others in developing and supporting Cambridge's herbicide free ambition.

- That the trials ~~demonstrated the environmental benefits of reducing herbicide use~~, provided evidence supporting the environmental case for reducing routine herbicide use but also identified significant operational challenges associated with replacing chemical treatment with mechanical and manual methods.

- That mechanical and manual weed removal is more labour intensive, is affected by weather, seasonal growth, parked vehicles and accumulated detritus, and requires repeat visits because it does not prevent regrowth.

- That, following the trials and investment in specialist equipment, the Council moved to extend herbicide-free weed management across the city.

- That the Council's approved 2025 Herbicide-Free Weed Management Work Programme identified an initial backlog of weed growth requiring

intensive treatment before moving to a programme of regular scheduled maintenance

- That, since then, implementation has been slow, reflecting the difficult and time-consuming nature of herbicide-free weed removal and the need to tackle years of accumulated detritus alongside the visible growth. Consequently, ~~a substantial number of areas are still awaiting treatment, and residents are understandably concerned about the condition of streets and public spaces~~. there remains outstanding work in some areas, and concerns have been raised about the condition and accessibility of streets and public spaces.

- That there is currently no sufficiently clear and publicly accessible picture of the outstanding backlog, broken down by ward and priority, or of actual delivery against the treatment programme approved in 2025.

- That responsibility for weed management is divided between Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and other landowners, requiring stronger coordination and clearer information for residents.

- That the proposed Civic Quarter capital redevelopment project relies on taking on over £60 million in external borrowing at last estimate, alongside drawing on the Council's general reserves.

- That while there has been adjustment in plans for the Civic Quarter in light of both recent consultation and higher-than-anticipated borrowing costs, concerns remain among traders, residents, and stakeholder groups about disruption caused by the project, as well as project costs and the financial risks associated with a major capital scheme.

Council believes:

- That the Council-led ambition to end the routine use of herbicides ~~remains the right approach for Cambridge and should not be abandoned because its implementation has proved more difficult than anticipated.~~should be maintained, while recognising that its success depends on a properly resourced, sustainable and effective weed management service.

- That herbicide-free weed management supports the Council's commitments to biodiversity, environmental protection and more sustainable management of public spaces.

- That environmental ambition must be matched by effective implementation, sufficient resources, suitable equipment and an honest assessment of what is required to deliver the service successfully.

- That Cambridge residents are entitled to streets and public spaces that are safe, accessible, properly maintained and attractive.

- That priority must be given to addressing weed growth that obstructs footways, affects accessibility, restricts drainage, creates a safety concern or risks damage to highways and other infrastructure.

- That some vegetation can be tolerated where it does not affect safety, accessibility, drainage, infrastructure or the reasonable enjoyment of public space.

- That residents should be given clear information about the standards they can expect from an herbicide-free service, including the greater likelihood of seasonal growth and regrowth between treatments.

- That the present difficulties require ~~decisive corrective action and additional support for the service, rather than any retreat from the Council's herbicide-free commitment.~~ a clear recovery plan for outstanding work, followed by a sustainable recurring maintenance programme, rather than a retreat from the Council's commitment to ending the routine use of herbicides.

- That a commitment of over £60 million in external borrowing, as well as significant draw on the Council's general reserves, for a major redevelopment project while basic street maintenance is failing due to underfunding reflects flawed financial and civic priorities.

Council therefore calls on the Leader and Executive Councillor to:

- Reaffirm the Council's commitment ~~to the Liberal Democrat-led ambition~~ of ending the routine use of herbicides on land managed by the City Council.

- ~~Commission an urgent officer review of the current weed management programme, identifying~~: Require Officers to report on delivery against the Council's approved 2025 Herbicide-Free Weed Management Work Programme, identifying:
  - the work originally planned and the work actually delivered to date;

- the current outstanding backlog of outstanding work, broken down by ward and priority;
- the reasons for any material delays or variance from the approved programme;
- the staffing, equipment and financial capacity currently available and the capacity required;
- the effectiveness and whole-life cost of the different mechanical and manual methods;
- the frequency of repeat treatment required to maintain acceptable standards;
- seasonal and weather-related constraints;
- the effect of parked vehicles and other access restrictions; and
- opportunities for better coordination with the County Council, contractors, communities and other landowners.

- ~~the reasons for departure from the original programme;~~
- ~~the extent of the outstanding work;~~
- ~~the staffing, equipment and financial capacity required;~~
- ~~the effectiveness and whole-life cost of the different mechanical and manual methods;~~
- ~~the frequency of repeat treatment needed; o seasonal and weather-related constraints;~~
- ~~the effect of parked vehicles and other access restrictions; and~~
- ~~opportunities for better coordination with the County Council, contractors, communities and other landowners~~.

• Bring forward a costed, ~~non-recurring recovery programme to blitz outstanding priority areas and establish a manageable baseline for future maintenance.~~ time-limited recovery programme to clear the outstanding priority backlog and establish a measurable baseline for future maintenance.

• ~~Ensure that any short-term intervention is supported by a sustainable annual maintenance programme, so that areas cleared through the recovery work receive appropriate repeat treatment.~~ Establish a sustainable recurring maintenance programme, including appropriate treatment frequencies for different categories of location, so that areas cleared through the recovery programme do not return to an unsustainable backlog.

- ~~Develop a risk-based approach that prioritises safety, accessibility, drainage, transport routes and the protection of public infrastructure~~. Adopt a transparent risk-based prioritisation framework, giving priority to safety, accessibility, drainage, transport routes and the protection of public infrastructure, with clear service standards and target response times.

- Continue to test and evaluate new equipment and working methods, drawing on operational evidence from Cambridge and good practice elsewhere.

- ~~-~~Bring forward any necessary budget bid for 2027-28, clearly distinguishing between the one-off cost of~~ recovering the service and the recurrent resources required to maintain it~~. clearing the existing backlog and the recurrent staffing, equipment and other resources required to maintain the service thereafter, and setting out the consequences of different funding levels.

- Instruct officers to conduct an immediate financial review of the planned Civic Quarter project aimed at scaling back borrowing and capital allocations, with such resources as needed for the above budget bid to be reallocated to frontline street cleansing, gully clearing, and manual weed management teams.

- Publish a clear statement for residents setting out~~ responsibilities, priorities, expected service standards, seasonal constraints and how urgent concerns should be reported.~~ the division of responsibilities between the City Council, County Council and other landowners; service priorities and standards; seasonal constraints; and how urgent concerns should be reported and escalated.

- Introduce transparent and regular performance reporting covering~~ areas completed, outstanding initial treatments, repeat visits, complaints, service requests, costs and operational learning~~ the outstanding backlog by ward, initial treatments completed, repeat visits, compliance with service standards, complaints and service requests, expenditure, cost per treatment, and operational learning.

- Report the findings~~ of the review, together with costed options and a revised delivery programme, to the relevant scrutiny committee within an agreed timescale~~ current backlog, costed recovery options, proposed recurring maintenance programme and measurable service standards to

the relevant scrutiny committee within an agreed timescale, with subsequent regular reporting on delivery against those commitments.

The amendment was lost by 27 votes against to 11 votes in favour.

Resolved (36 in favour to 2 against, with 0 abstentions) that:

Council notes:

- That in 2019 the Council unanimously supported calling a Biodiversity Emergency, which has since then been put into practice with the Council's Biodiversity Strategy.
- That in 2021 the Council unanimously supported a herbicide-free trial in two wards which has since then progressed to the adoption of the council's city-wide Herbicide-Free Weed Strategy in 2025.
- That Cambridge City Council has been successful in stopping the use of herbicides.
- Certain widely used formulas, such as glyphosate, have been linked by various health organisations and studies to chronic issues, including potential carcinogenic risks and hormone disruption. The World Health Organisation's International Agency for Research on Cancer classified glyphosate as "probably carcinogenic to humans".
- Herbicides are therefore potentially dangerous to all plant life including edible foodstuffs, as well as animals, including pets.
- It is the policy of this Council to cultivate a healthy, nature-positive urban environment that supports local wildlife and ecosystems.
- That there has been continuing cross-party support for developing a herbicide-free approach in Cambridge.
- Recognises the important contribution made by Pesticide Free Cambridge, On the Verge and others in developing and supporting Cambridge's herbicide-free ambition.
- That the trials provided evidence supporting the environmental case for reducing routine herbicide use but also identified significant operational challenges associated with replacing chemical treatment with mechanical and manual methods.
- That mechanical and manual weed removal is more labour-intensive, is affected by weather, seasonal growth, parked vehicles and accumulated detritus, and requires repeat visits because it does not prevent regrowth.
- That, the Council has invested in specialist equipment in order to extend herbicide-free weed management across the city.

- That the Council's approved 2025 Herbicide-Free Weed Management Work Programme identified an initial backlog of weed growth requiring intensive treatment before moving to a programme of regular scheduled maintenance
- That, since then, implementation has been challenging, reflecting the difficult and time-consuming nature of herbicide-free weed removal and the need to tackle years of accumulated detritus alongside the visible growth. Consequently, some areas that are between treatments, can cause residents to be understandably concerned about the condition and accessibility of streets and public spaces.
- That there is currently no sufficiently clear and publicly accessible picture of the outstanding backlog, broken down by ward and priority, or of actual delivery against the treatment programme provided in 2025.
- That responsibility for weed management is divided between Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and other landowners, requiring strong coordination and clear information for residents.

Council believes:

- That the Council-led ambition to end the routine use of herbicides should be maintained, while recognising that its success depends on a properly resourced, sustainable and effective weed management service.
- That herbicide-free weed management supports the Council's commitments to biodiversity, environmental protection and more sustainable management of public spaces.
- That environmental ambition must be matched by effective implementation, sufficient resources, suitable equipment and an honest assessment of what is required to deliver the service successfully.
- That Cambridge residents are entitled to streets and public spaces that are safe, accessible, properly maintained and attractive.

- That priority must be given to weed growth that obstructs footways, affects accessibility, restricts drainage, creates a safety concern or risks damage to highways and other infrastructure**,** though not an exclusive list.
- That some vegetation can be tolerated where it does not affect safety, accessibility, drainage, infrastructure or the reasonable enjoyment of public space, though not an exclusive list.
- That residents should be given clear information about the standards they can expect from an herbicide-free service, including the greater likelihood of seasonal growth and regrowth between treatments.

- That the present challenges will not cause any retreat from the Council's herbicide-free commitment'
- That the present challenges require a clear recovery plan for outstanding work, followed by a sustainable recurring maintenance programme, rather than a retreat from the Council's commitment to ending the routine use of herbicides.

Council therefore calls on the Leader and Executive Councillor to:

- Reaffirm the Council's commitment to cross-party support for ending the routine use of herbicides on land managed by the City Council.
- Require Officers to report on delivery against the Council's approved 2025 Herbicide-Free Weed Management Work Programme, identifying:
    - the work originally planned and the work actually delivered to date;
    - the current backlog of outstanding work, broken down by ward and priority;
    - the reasons for any material delays or variance from the approved programme;
    - the staffing, equipment and financial capacity currently available and the capacity required;
    - the effectiveness and whole-life cost of the different mechanical and manual methods;
    - the frequency of repeat treatment required to maintain acceptable standards;
    - seasonal and weather-related constraints;
    - the effect of parked vehicles and other access restrictions;
    - opportunities for better coordination with the County Council, contractors, communities and other landowners;
    - any additional costs to the City Council of cutting the County Council's verges on their behalf.
- Bring forward an options appraisal for a non-recurring recovery programme to blitz outstanding priority areas and establish a manageable baseline for future maintenance.
- Bring forward an options appraisal for a sustainable annual maintenance programme, so that areas cleared through the recovery work receive appropriate repeat treatment, including appropriate treatment frequencies for different categories of location.
- Develop a risk-based approach that prioritises safety, accessibility, drainage, transport routes and the protection of public infrastructure.

- Adopt a transparent risk-based prioritisation framework, giving priority to safety, accessibility, drainage, transport routes and the protection of

public infrastructure, with clear service standards and target response times.
- Continue to test and evaluate new equipment and working methods, drawing on operational evidence from Cambridge and good practice elsewhere.
- Present any suggested budget bid for 2027-28, clearly distinguishing between the one-off cost of recovering the service and the recurrent resources required to maintain it, so that Councillors can make an informed decision weighing up the costs of any necessary bid with any additional savings that will need to be made elsewhere
- Publish a clear statement for residents setting out the division of responsibilities between the City Council, County Council and other landowners; service priorities and standards; seasonal constraints; and how urgent concerns should be reported and escalated.
- Introduce transparent performance reporting covering areas completed, outstanding initial treatments, repeat visits, complaints, service requests, costs and operational learning.
- Report the findings of the review, together with costed options and a revised delivery programme, to the relevant scrutiny committee within an agreed timescale

9c Councillor Thornburrow: Impact Assessment and Data Sharing for Citywide Roadworks

Councillor Thornburrow proposed and Councillor Moore seconded the following motion:

As residents of Cambridge, City Councillors experience the impact of roadworks first hand, whether we are walking, cycling, using public transport or driving. We know that this causes frustration and delays, adds to the costs for businesses, makes parents late to pick up children, or simply adds to the friction of daily life. While proper maintenance of the city's infrastructure is vital, with better planning and clearer information at least some of the burden could be reduced. However, it appears that the County Council has no interest in limiting the impact of utility works and its own scheduled works on the residents of Cambridge, despite our significance within Cambridgeshire.

The purpose of this motion is to create a closer working relationship between City and County Councils with a view to managing the process more effectively. It will also support the planned creation of a unitary authority.

This Council notes:

- Cambridge City Council receives regular roadworks bulletins, including 50 planned works and 18 full road closures between 16–30 September.
- These works affect roads, pavements and cycleways.
- There is currently no comprehensive modelling of how cumulative works and closures impact congestion, movement across the city, bus reliability, or air quality.

This Council believes:

- Robust data gathering, modelling and impact analysis are essential for effective transport planning.
- Uncoordinated closures without clear assessment place unnecessary strain on residents, public transport operators and businesses, and worsen air quality.

This Council resolves:

- To write to Cambridgeshire County Council, as Highway Authority, requesting full liaison with Cambridge City Council and the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority to ensure:
  1. Systematic data gathering and impact analysis of roadworks and closures, shared between authorities.
  2. Integration of this data into current and future transport and infrastructure planning.

- To request continued liaison with the CPCA on the best use of this data for forward planning.

Councillor Bick proposed and a Councillor seconded the following amendment (deleted text struck through and additional text underlined):

As residents of Cambridge, City Councillors experience the impact of roadworks first hand, whether we are walking, <u>wheeling,</u> cycling, using public transport or driving. We know that this causes frustration and delays, adds to the costs for businesses, makes parents late to pick up children, or simply adds to the friction of daily life. While proper maintenance of the city's infrastructure is vital, with better planning<u>, co-ordination</u> and clearer information <u>of roadworks for all reasons</u> at least some of the <u>cumulative</u> burden could be reduced. ~~However, it appears that the County Council has no interest in limiting the impact of utility works and its own scheduled works on the residents of Cambridge, despite our significance within Cambridgeshire.~~

The purpose of this motion is to create a closer working relationship between City and County Councils with a view to managing the process ~~more~~ <u>as</u>

effectively as possible. ~~It will also support the planned creation of a unitary authority.~~ It seeks to ensure full use of roadworks, transport and environmental data, identify gaps in the evidence base and ensure that cumulative impacts are considered in future planning

This Council notes:

- Cambridge City Council receives regular roadworks bulletins, including 50 planned works and 18 full road closures between 16–30 September.
- These works affect roads, pavements and cycleways and can have wider impacts on public transport, accessibility, air quality and movement across the city
- ~~There is currently no comprehensive modelling~~ Skilled, data-based judgement is necessary of how cumulative works and closures impact congestion, movement across the city, bus reliability, or air quality.
- Full use of highways authority legal powers in managing the rights of private developers and utilities companies, together with the scheduling of highways improvement projects are needed to minimise disruption to road users including walking, wheeling and cycling accessibility.

This Council believes:

- Robust data gathering, modelling and impact analysis are essential for effective transport and infrastructure planning.
- ~~Uncoordinated closures without clear assessment place unnecessary strain on residents, public transport operators and businesses, and worsen air quality.~~
  - Effective co-ordination and assessment of significant roadworks and closures helps reduce unnecessary disruption to residents, public transport operators and businesses, and support consideration of impacts on air quality

This Council resolves:

- To recommend the Chair of the Performance, Assets & Strategy Overview & Scrutiny Committee to invite representatives of the County Highways Authority to a public scrutiny session to discuss their current powers and processes for regulating works on the city's road network and opportunities to optimise the performance for all road users through further co-operation with the city council and other stakeholders
- At this session to encourage members to seek a shared understanding of:

- The data sources that are utilised, the role of modelling and the potential impact on outcomes of expanding these;
- Public information practices and the scope to publish a long range plan;
- The parameters for the highways authority to regulate, based on its legal powers and the rights of other parties, and the existence of realistic alternative approaches which could improve the user's experience.

- ~~To write to Cambridgeshire County Council, as Highway Authority, requesting full liaison with Cambridge City Council and the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority to ensure:~~
  1. ~~Systematic data gathering and impact analysis of roadworks and closures, shared between authorities.~~
  2. ~~Integration of this data into current and future transport and infrastructure planning~~.
- ~~To request continued liaison with the CPCA on the best use of this data for forward planning.~~

The amendment was lost with 27 votes against and 11 votes in favour.

Councillor Flaubert proposed and Councillor Nicmanis seconded the following amendment (deleted text struck through and additional text underlined):

As residents of Cambridge, City Councillors experience the impact of roadworks first hand, whether we are walking, cycling, using public transport or driving, wheeling, cycling, using public transport or driving.

We know that this causes frustration and delays, adds to the costs for businesses, makes parents late to pick up children, or simply adds to the friction of daily life. While proper maintenance of the city's infrastructure is vital, with better planning and clearer information at least some of the burden could be reduced. However, it appears that the County Council has no interest in limiting the impact of utility works and its own scheduled works on the residents of Cambridge despite our significance within Cambridgeshire. better coordination of utility works and the County Council's own scheduled works could reduce their cumulative impact on residents, businesses, public transport, walking, wheeling and cycling across Cambridgeshire.

The purpose of this motion is to create a closer working relationship between City and County Councils with a view to managing the process more effectively. It seeks to make better use of existing roadworks, transport and

environmental data, identify gaps in the evidence base, and ensure that cumulative impacts are considered in future planning. It will also support the planned creation of a unitary authority.

This Council notes:

- Cambridge City Council receives regular roadworks bulletins, including 50 planned works and 18 full road closures between 16–30 September.
- These works affect roads, pavements and cycleways. and can have wider impacts on public transport, accessibility, air quality and movement across the city.

- ~~There is currently no comprehensive~~ modelling The Council does not currently have a comprehensive assessment of how cumulative works and closures impact congestion, movement across the city, bus reliability, or air quality. Including walking, wheeling and cycling accessibility.

This Council believes:

- Robust data gathering, modelling and impact analysis are essential for effective transport and infrastructure planning.
- Uncoordinated closures without clear assessment place unnecessary strain on residents, public transport operators and businesses, and worsen air quality. Effective coordination and assessment of significant roadworks and closures can help reduce unnecessary disruption to residents, public transport operators and businesses, and support consideration of impacts on air quality.

This Council resolves:

- To write to the Cambridgeshire County Council, as the Highway Authority, to explain exactly how this coordination has been organised to date: whose role is it to timetable the utility works and the county council's own scheduled works; and, what strengths, weaknesses and opportunities the county council's relevant employees have identified with this process so far.
- To write to Cambridgeshire County Council, as Highway Authority, requesting full liaison with Cambridge City Council and the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority to ensure:

1. Systematic data gathering and impact analysis of roadworks and closures, shared between authorities A shared assessment of existing roadworks, traffic, public transport and active travel data, identifying gaps in the evidence base and providing additional data or modelling where necessary to assess the cumulative impacts of roadworks and closures. This should include, where available, the location, duration, type and scale of works, traffic flows and journey times, bus journey times and reliability, pedestrian and cycle movements, accessibility impacts and air quality.

2. That the County Council identifies which existing systems and datasets will be used for this purpose, including existing street works permitting and roadworks information systems, and avoids duplication of data collection where suitable information already exists.
3. That the assessment considers the cumulative impact of concurrent or sequential works on the same corridor, neighbourhood or alternative routes.
4. Integration of this data into current and future transport and infrastructure planning. To consider how the resulting analysis could inform current and future transport and infrastructure planning, including the sequencing, timing and coordination of works to minimise unnecessary disruption to public transport, walking, wheeling and cycling routes.
5. That the Highway Authority coordinates the underlying roadworks data and that the agreed analysis is shared with Cambridge City Council and the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority.
6. To request continued liaison with the CPCA on the best use of this data for forward planning, including identifying and mitigating the cumulative impacts of planned works across the city, with findings reviewed at regular intervals and used to inform future roadworks coordination and transport planning.
7. That the Highways Authority shares the next 12 month programme of works for Cambridge city only in advance with city councillors showing how it is coordinated with the various work programmes/contractors including the dates of the works. This task should start immediately and recur annually so city councillors and therefore residents are better informed about roadworks in our city.

The amendment was carried by 24 votes to 11, with 3 abstentions.

Resolved by 25 votes to 0, with 13 abstentions:

As residents of Cambridge, City Councillors experience the impact of roadworks first hand, whether we are walking, wheeling, cycling, using public transport or driving.

We know that this causes frustration and delays, adds to the costs for businesses, makes parents late to pick up children, or simply adds to the friction of daily life. While proper maintenance of the city's infrastructure is vital, with better planning and clearer information, at least some of the burden could be reduced. However better coordination of utility works and the County Council's own scheduled works could reduce their cumulative impact on residents, businesses, public transport, walking, wheeling and cycling across Cambridgeshire.

The purpose of this motion is to create a closer working relationship between City and County Councils with a view to managing the process more effectively. It seeks to make better use of existing roadworks, transport and environmental data, identify gaps in the evidence base, and ensure that cumulative impacts are considered in future planning.

This Council notes:

- Cambridge City Council receives regular roadworks bulletins, including 50 planned works and 18 full road closures between 16–30 September.
- These works affect roads, pavements and cycleways and can have wider impacts on public transport, accessibility, air quality and movement across the city.
- The Council does not currently have a comprehensive assessment of how cumulative works and closures impact congestion, movement across the city, bus reliability, or air quality. Including walking, wheeling and cycling accessibility.

This Council believes:

- Robust data gathering, modelling and impact analysis are essential for effective transport and infrastructure planning.
- Effective coordination and assessment of significant roadworks and closures can help reduce unnecessary disruption to residents, public transport operators and businesses, and support consideration of impacts on air quality.

This Council resolves:

- To write to Cambridgeshire County Council, as the Highway Authority, to explain exactly how this coordination has been organised to date; whose

role is it to timetable the utility works and the county council's own scheduled works; and, what strengths, weaknesses and opportunities the county council's relevant employees have identified with this process so far.

- To write to Cambridgeshire County Council, as the Highway Authority, requesting liaison with Cambridge City Council and the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) to ensure:

1. A shared assessment of existing roadworks, traffic, public transport and active travel data, identifying gaps in the evidence base and providing additional data or modelling where necessary to assess the cumulative impacts of roadworks and closures. This should include, where available, the location, duration, type and scale of works, traffic flows and journey times, bus journey times and reliability, pedestrian and cycle movements, accessibility impacts and air quality.
2. That the County Council identifies which existing systems and datasets will be used for this purpose, including existing street works permitting and roadworks information systems, and avoids duplication of data collection where suitable information already exists.
3. That the assessment considers the cumulative impact of concurrent or sequential works on the same corridor, neighbourhood or alternative routes.
4. Integration of this data into current and future transport and infrastructure planning. To consider how the resulting analysis could inform current and future transport and infrastructure planning, including the sequencing, timing and coordination of works to minimise unnecessary disruption to public transport, walking, wheeling and cycling routes.
5. That the Highway Authority coordinates the underlying roadworks data and that the agreed analysis is shared with Cambridge City Council and the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority.
6. To request continued liaison with the CPCA on the best use of this data for forward planning, including identifying and mitigating the cumulative impacts of planned works across the city, with findings reviewed at regular intervals and used to inform future roadworks coordination and transport planning.
7. That the Highways Authority shares the next 12-month programme of works for Cambridge city only in advance with city councillors showing how it is coordinated with the various work programmes/contractors including the dates of the works. This task should start immediately and recur annually so city councillors and therefore residents are better informed about roadworks in our city.

26/84/CNL Councillor Baigent: Greater Cambridge Partnership

Councillor Baigent proposed and Councillor Nicmanis seconded the following motion:

Council notes that millions of pounds of public money are currently being committed through the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP), with limited transparency and scrutiny.

Council believes that significant expenditure decisions should be subject to appropriate democratic oversight and that elected members should have the opportunity to consider and approve major projects involving substantial public expenditure.

Council therefore resolves that, from the date of this motion, the Council's appointed board member on the Greater Cambridge Partnership shall not vote in favour of any GCP project involving expenditure of **£100,000 or more** unless that project has first been considered by Full Council.

Council further resolves that the relevant officer(s) shall establish an appropriate process to ensure that proposals meeting this threshold are brought before Full Council for consideration before the Council's board member is required to vote on them.

The motion fell with 24 votes against, 12 for and 1 abstention.

26/85/CNL Proportionality Update

Council noted the changes in political composition of the Council and the proportionality on committee seats.

26/86/CNL Written questions

Council noted the responses to written questions.

The meeting ended at 10.20 pm

CHAIR