

COUNCIL

25 May 2023
11.05 am - 5.00 pm

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

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

23/21/CNL To Elect a Mayor for the Municipal Year 2023/24

Councillor A Smith proposed and Councillor Thornburrow seconded the nomination of Councillor Jenny Gawthrope Wood as Mayor for the Municipal Year 2023/24.

Resolved (unanimously) that:

Councillor Jenny Gawthrope Wood be elected Mayor for the Municipal Year 2023/24.

Councillor Jenny Gawthrope Wood then made the statutory declaration of acceptance for the Office of Mayor.

23/22/CNL To Elect a Deputy Mayor for the Municipal Year 2023/24

Councillor S Smith proposed and Councillor Bird seconded the nomination of Councillor Thittala Varkey as Deputy Mayor for the Municipal Year 2023/24.

Resolved (unanimously) that:

Councillor Baiju Thittala Varkey be elected Deputy Mayor for the Municipal Year 2023/24.

Councillor Baiju Thittala Varkey then made the statutory declaration of acceptance for the Office of Deputy Mayor.

23/23/CNL To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on the 23 February and 2 March 2023

The minutes of 23 February and 2 March 2023 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

23/24/CNL To Note the Returning Officer's Report that the following have been elected to the Office of Councillor

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

Abbey – Elliot Tong
Arbury – Mike Todd-Jones
Castle – Antoinette Nestor
Castle – Cheney-Anne Payne
Cherry Hinton – Robert Dryden
Coleridge – Tim Griffin
Coleridge – Rosy Moore
East Chesterton – Alice Gilderdale
Market – Anthony Martinelli
Newnham – Jean Glasberg
Petersfield – Katie Thornburrow
Queen Edith's – Karen Young
Romsey – Mairead Healy
Trumpington – Ingrid Flaubert
West Chesterton – Rachel Wade

23/25/CNL To Pass a Resolution of Thanks to the Outgoing Mayor

Resolved (unanimously) on the proposal of Councillor Dryden seconded by Councillor Porrer.

This Council expresses its appreciation of the manner in which duties of the Mayor and Mayoress were discharged by Councillor Mark Ashton and Barbara Ashton during their period of office.

23/26/CNL Mayor's announcements

The Mott Sermon would take place at Holy Trinity Church on Sunday 4 June at 9.30.

The Midsummer Fair Proclamation would take place on Wednesday 21 June.

Tributes were made to Councillor Anna Smith to thank her for the work she has done as Leader of the Council.

Apologies were received from Councillors Divkovic and Payne. Councillor Carling provided apologies for lateness.

23/27/CNL To Elect from among the Members of the Council Four Bailiffs of the City for the Municipal Year 2023/24

Resolved (unanimously) to

Appoint Councillors Divkovic, Dryden, Lee and McPherson Bailiffs of the City for the Municipal Year 2023/24.

23/28/CNL To elect a Leader of the Council

On the nomination of Councillor Bird and seconded by Councillor Wade it was resolved to:

Elect Councillor Mike Davey as Leader of Cambridge City Council.

23/29/CNL To consider the recommendations of Committees for adoption

9a Civic Affairs Committee - Committee Appointments

Resolved (by 34 votes to 0) to:

i. Agree the appointments to city council committees and joint partner bodies below (as updated by the 'Update to Committee Appointments' document):

Environment and Communities Scrutiny Committee 8 (5 Labour + 2 Lib Dem + 1 Green and Independent)

Divkovic, Nestor, Swift, Wade, Pounds

Payne, Hauk

Glasberg

Alternates – Sheil, Griffin, Flaubert, Levien, Howard

Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee 8 (5 Labour + 2 Lib Dem + 1 Green and Independent)

Nestor, Baigent, Swift, Divkovic, TBC

Porrer, Bick

Davies

Alternates – Griffin, Pounds, Lee, Payne, Glasberg

Housing Scrutiny Committee 9 (6 Labour + 2 Lib Dem + 1 Green and Independent)

Pounds, Robertson, Thittala-Varkey, Wade, Holloway, Griffin

Martinelli, Lee

Tong

Alternates: Swift, Lab TBC, Howard, Porrer, Levien

Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee 8 (5 Labour + 2 Lib Dem + 1 Green and Independent)

Robertson, Baigent, Holloway, Gawthrope Wood, TBC

Bick, Young

Bennett

Alternates – Divkovic, Sheil, Payne, Nethsingha, Davies

Civic Affairs Committee 6 (4 Labour + 1 Lib Dem +1 Green & Independent)

McPherson, Davey, Sheil, Healy

Young

Bennett

Alternate – Moore, Davies, Bick

Employment (Senior Officer) Committee 6 (4 Labour +2 Lib Dem)

Healy, Moore, Davey, Carling

Bick, Porrer

Alternates: TBC

Licensing Committee 10 (7 Labour + 2 Lib Dem + 1 Green and Independent)

McPherson, Bird, Moore, Griffin, Carling, Pounds, Wade

Levien, Nethsingha

Bennett

Alternates – Davey, Hauk, Tong

Planning Committee 8 (5 Labour + 2 Lib Dem + 1 Green and Independent)

Smart, Baigent, Thornburrow, Carling, Dryden

Porrer, Levien

Bennett

Alternates – Gilderdale, Nestor, Flaubert, Nethsingha, Howard

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority - 1 seat

A.Smith

Alternate - Davey

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2 Labour

Smart, TBC

Alternates – Gawthrope Wood

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Audit and Governance Committee 1

Labour + one alternate

S.Smith

Alternate – Pounds

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly 3 (2 Labour + 1 Lib Dem)

S.Smith, Thornburrow, Bick

Joint Development Control Committee - Cambridge Fringes 6 (4 Labour+ 2 Lib Dem)

S.Smith, Baigent, Smart, Thornburrow

Porrer, Flaubert

Alternates – Gilderdale, Nestor, Levien, Nethsingha

Resolved (by 32 votes to 0) to:

ii. Approve nominations for Chairs and Vice-Chairs 2023/24

Environment and Communities Services

Chair - Divkovic

Vice-chair – Nestor

Planning and Transport

Chair – Nestor

Vice-chair – Baigent

Housing

Chair – Pounds

Vice-chair (nb. Tenant/Leaseholder is Chair of Part 1 of the meeting) - Robertson

Strategy and Resources

Chair-Robertson

Vice-chair - Baigent

Civic Affairs

Chair - McPherson

Vice-chair - Davey

Licensing

Chair - McPherson

Vice-chair - Bird

Planning

Chair - Smart

Vice-chair – Baigent

JDCC

Vice-Chair – S.Smith

23/30/CNL Annual Statements

Group Leaders spoke on their Group's priorities for action and objectives for the forthcoming year.

23/31/CNL Public questions time

Question 1

- i. Cambridge City Council operates a number of shared service arrangements with other nearby local authorities.
- ii. When officers of Cambridge City Council provide services or perform public functions as part of shared service arrangements, should officers continue to abide by the city council's Code of Conduct for Officers and the council's Comprehensive Equalities and Diversity Policy?
- iii. Or should officers feel at liberty to adapt to the more discriminatory policies and practices that may be favoured by some other local authorities?

The Leader provided the following written response:

All the shared services abide by the policies and processes of the Shared Service Host Authority, which is the employer of the staff in the service.

Question 2

- i. The Planning Inspectorate described the Anglian Water draft proposal for the relocation of the Anglian Water treatment plant as unsatisfactory.
- ii. Would ask the Council as requested by the Planning Inspectorate to consider that Northeast Cambridge Area Action Plan (NECAAP) not be predicated on the move of the sewage plant on environmental grounds.
- iii. Would ask if Council has explored alternative locations that do not involve such a huge carbon footprint given that NECAAP is said to have doing the right thing by the planet at its heart.

- iv. Would ask the Council not to give their full support to the Development Consent Order (DCO), given it was not in the best interests of the planet nor reflecting their Net Zero by 2030 Strategy.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Infrastructure responded with the following:

- i. It was important that the public engaged and asked questions on all planning matters and thanked the public speaker.
- ii. The Planning Inspectorate response sought further information and clarification on certain issues from Anglian Water on their application. This was not unusual for such a complex development as part of the planning process.
- iii. The Council had not been asked by the Planning Inspectorate to respond but the Council would make representation when required.
- iv. Understood that the Planning Inspectorate had now determined the application was valid and would expect the Council would be engaging on the next stage of the process.
- v. With regards to considering an alternative location, the Council had received over 650 proposals as part of the Local Plan call for sites process. Every single application had been scrutinised, reaching its conclusions on the location and scale of future sites required to best meet the growth needs of the area identified, and addressed the key principles underpinning the spatial strategy.
- vi. If the NEC (Northeast Cambridge) area was to be removed from the plan, or reduced in the contribution that it made, the Council would clearly need to reassign that growth to alternative locations that could meet as closely as possible the core objectives of the spatial strategy.
- vii. The Local Planning Authority would not be expected to be in a position to definitively assess the carbon impacts of all sites at the plan making stage. The application process (and associated EIA provisions) provided in most cases a more accurate assessment of the effects of a specific proposal, both from new build and any embodied or associated site preparation impacts.
- viii. The site location was the most sustainable location for growth, new buildings and jobs given its accessibility. The definition in the Council's view was accordingly appropriate. Nevertheless, would use the information provided and examined through the DCO process to help carefully consider the proposed site allocation as part of the plan making process and as already indicated in the sustainability appraisal of the first proposals.
- ix. The request for full support was noted but was not a commitment that the Council could make.

Supplementary public question:

- i. Would not describe the application as moving to a sustainable location.
- ii. There was a huge carbon cost to the environment to move the wastewater treatment plant only 1 mile away from the original location.
- iii. Stated the new tunnel alone (20metres deep and 2.4 meters wide) would require 40,000 tonnes of concrete, which was the equivalent of driving from Cambridge to London 1.5million times (taken from a report written by Mott McDonald 2020).
- iv. Referenced the Save Honey Hill Campaign.

Question 3

- i. There is plenty of discussion, demonstrations, and evidence around the city regarding the effects on the individual and the regressive nature of the proposed congestion tax on the poorest, sickest, and elderly, who rely upon family for support in our community; fully agreed with all of those comments.
- ii. Was a director of family business based on East Road since 1912, which dealt in large and often heavy awkward items requiring motorised transport to be moved. There was nothing about the likely effects on the small and medium sized independent trading businesses within the proposed congestion charge zone.
- iii. This proposed tax would make every independent business in the city less competitive and effectively drive business away from the family business directly towards competitors outside the zone. There was no alternative to have goods delivered daily.
- iv. The long-term effect would see many businesses either be forced to move or close.
- v. The GCP were due to deliver their long deliberated and (in my opinion) politically delayed results to the GCP Assembly tomorrow. The Executive Board would have had access to the results of the multiple-choice questions from the day after the deadline of responses and therefore be fully aware of the true level of public feeling on the proposals they put forward late last year.
- vi. Met with the majority of the GCP Executive Board for what they insisted should be regarded as a 'private meeting' so it would be most indiscreet to reveal what was said during that meeting. But could well understand why they wanted it to be kept 'private'.
- vii. This proposed tax would cost a wholesaler delivering to the family business daily an additional £13,000 per year. Costs would naturally be passed on to us and ultimately to the consumer.

- viii. The Council would undoubtedly have included an impact analysis on local business measuring the true cost to local businesses.
- ix. The business which on average receives between six and ten deliveries (taking 8 as the average) by lorry per day would be out of pocket by at least £104,000 pounds per year.
- x. Asked what the total cost for all Cambridge businesses that currently fall within the currently proposed congestion charge zone would be.

The Leader of the Council responded with the following:

- i. The current proposals outlined by the GCP consultation were not supported by the Labour Group.
- ii. Had publicly stated that the work on determining the impact of the congestion charge on small businesses had been inadequate; further work was needed.
- iii. The previous business case had looked at a range of impacts and the preferred option put out to consultation to get the views of the public and business owners. The results of the consultation were due to be published on 26 May.
- iv. It was important for the GCP and external partners to listen to what had been said in the consultation response and further conversations were needed. When looking at the data it was important to note what had been missed.
- v. The GCP Joint Assembly would meet on 8 June; the Council was keen to continue the dialogue with all participants.

Supplementary public question:

- i. Surprised that the effects on local business had not been sufficiently analysed to the degree that they should have been.

Question 4

- i. The papers for the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly would be published this week and go to the Board in June.
- ii. Understood that the City Council Labour Group representatives on the Assembly and the Board would debate internally and vote as directed by their Labour Group colleagues, as confirmed by the previous Leader, Cllr Smith, in public statements during the recent elections.
- iii. Cambridge City Councillors were elected to represent residents across the City, and the Council consists of Labour, Liberal Democrat, Green and Independent Councillors.
- iv. Residents did not understand why a decision of this magnitude which impacted all residents would be decided internally within Labour Group

- councillors, excluding all other councillors from scrutinising and commenting on it as a Council until after decisions have been made.
- v. This was also the case during the consultation period from the Greater Cambridge Partnership with the City Council making no time within its committee schedule for councillors to consider a formal Council response to the Greater Cambridge Partnership.
 - vi. The new Leader of the Council has acknowledged the Labour Group needed a reset and had failed to listen to residents, so in that spirit, could the Leader of the Council please clarify the following:
 - Why had the City Council not responded to the consultation
 - Why in the process was there no opportunity for all the Councillors on Cambridge City Council, regardless of their political affiliation, to scrutinise and comment on the plans and agree how the City Council representatives should vote?

The Leader responded with the following:

- i. The matter had been discussed between parties informally. Councillor Bick was Chair of the GCP Assembly and would make the views of the Liberal Democrats known. The Green and Independent representatives were also involved in the discussions and each party had had the opportunity to express their opinions.
- ii. The City Council had not responded to the consultation as they were a partner in the Greater Cambridge Partnership, and keen to hear the public views in the first instance.
- iii. The opportunity to scrutinise the report on the consultation and other matters arising was provided at the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly.
- iv. Councillors, residents and others had had opportunities to make their views known and speak at the Joint Assembly and Board meetings.
- v. The Board was a joint committee under local government legislation where the partners jointly come to a decision, who would then advise Cambridgeshire County Council accordingly.

Supplementary public question:

- i. Former Councillor Alex Collis has said that the Labour Group had lost touch with residents; personally had held conversations with local residents and it was clear the congestion charge was not wanted.
- ii. Decisions made in the Council Chamber affected residents and hoped the Council could move forward with this in mind and respond to resident's needs.

The Leader responded:

- i. Would urge all to go through the results which would be published tomorrow, prior to further debate.

Question 5

- i. At the last meeting of full council, on March 2nd, this chamber had been told that Cambridge had (something like) the fourth worst air pollution in the country. That was not true at all.
- ii. In fact, as regards PM 2.5, the city council's own latest Air Quality Status Report noted the following:
'Source apportionment using the Defra Background maps shows that most background PM2.5 in Cambridge has a regional component (around 95%). The background estimates in Cambridge are around 10 micrograms per cubic metre (2019).
- ii. Whilst Gonville Place saw a similar reduction in 2020 due to the pandemic reducing from 14 microgrammes per cubic metre annual mean in 2019 to 11 microgrammes per cubic metre annual mean in 2020, levels remained above background suggesting there is an additional contribution of up to 4 micrograms per cubic metre PM2.5 due to vehicle emissions.
- iii. Cambridge City Council had considered setting targets for PM2.5 reduction and we welcome the introduction of targets under the Environment Bill, although the potential to achieve significant reduction is limited by the high regional contribution.
- iv. There were few measures that could be undertaken locally that would specifically reduce the small amount of PM2.5 produced locally. Regional, national and international measures will be more effective.'
- v. Were councillors aware that it was widely understood, outside this chamber, that, although the climate emergency was a pressing matter, the real necessity for the congestion charge, here and now, was to enable further speculative development of the city.
- vi. Did councillors know that the target, set out as one justification for the Congestion Charge for the GCP to help create 44000 jobs by 2031, was met in 2022?
- vii. Did Councillors know that the concomitant delivery of housing due by 2031, is merely on target?
- viii. Did councillors understand that development which eviscerates communities, and scatters them to the winds, and which entrenches and exacerbates inequality is, by definition, unsustainable? Is that what this council stands for?

The Leader of the Council responded with the following:

- i. Would have to take away the details provided to analyse and then make comment to the public speaker.

Supplementary public question:

- i. Thinking of organising a tour of the vacant commercial properties in and around the city, perhaps into London; 'nothing beats going out in the field' and would like to invite Councillors and planning officers, rather than look at data.
- ii. Questioned whether much of the growth planned for agricultural land could be relocated to vacant commercial properties and places where there were established transport systems.
- iii. It was important to consider alternatives to building on green belt land. Appropriate planned use of existing empty buildings should be considered if the Council was serious about sustainability.

23/32/CNL To deal with oral questions

1. Councillor Swift to the Leader

Can the Leader of the Council confirm that they would now become the council's representative on the GCP Board and the reasoning behind this change?

The Leader responded:

- i. The congestion charge was the most significant issue facing us in the City at the moment and was divisive.
- ii. Due to this, the City Council Leader was nominated to become the council's representative on the GCP Board. Would work in conjunction with Councillor Bick.

2. Councillor Porrer to the Executive Councillor for Open Spaces

Could the Executive Councillor responsible for Open Spaces please explain why mowing has taken place on commons and across the city in May 2023 despite the council's clear commitment to No Mow May?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. No Mow May was a very worthy national campaign and the flowers it left were welcome food sources for insects emerging from hibernation.
- ii. The Council's commitment to No Mow May was referenced in our Biodiversity Strategy 2022-2030.

- iii. Our commitment was 'where practical' as there were some situations where regular mowing was required. For example critical sight lines on verges around play areas and within designated amenity spaces.
 - iv. Midsummer Common was one of the city's historic grazing commons and was managed by the council for the benefit of both people and wildlife.
 - v. Midsummer Common was mown in preparation for Strawberry Fair. The Streets and Open Spaces Team cut some targeted areas of grass. This was necessary for safety reasons for visitors to the Fair.
 - vi. Streets and Open Space staff were provided with a map of areas of nettle and cow parley to retain, we keep a balance of these on the common recognising their importance as a nectar source and insect foodplant but also that both species were classified as signs of poor grassland management when allowed to spread and dominate.
 - vii. The council has undertaken a grassland restoration trial on an area of Midsummer Common, with the aim of increasing grassland species interest and so the area's overall habitat value. The trial work was being delivered in partnership with the Wildlife Trust, with funding from Natural England administered through the Green Recovery Fund and secured in partnership with the Cambridge Nature Network.
 - viii. The cows remain on the common and would be moved before Strawberry Fair.
 - ix. The Operations Team would undertake fewer cuts in line with highways policy.
3. Councillor Baigent to the Executive Councillor for Environment Climate Change and Biodiversity (asked by Councillor Griffin in meeting)

After the heat wave last summer followed by the unusually cold weather before Christmas, increasing numbers of residents were more concerned about the climate crisis. How was our council's work on reaching the target of becoming a net zero council going?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. We had a target to be a net zero council by 2030.
- ii. The Carbon Management Plan set out how this would be achieved.
- iii. Council swimming pools had been the largest sources of emissions so measures had been installed to mitigate this. This should reduce overall council emissions by 9.6%.
- iv. The second largest source of emissions was the council's vehicle fleet including shared waste service lorries. The intention was to replace these vehicles with electric ones in future.

4. Councillor McPherson to the Executive Councillor for Finance Resources and Transformation

Could the Executive Councillor provide an update on CIP's site acquisitions.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The Cambridge Investment Partnership purchased a site on Histon Road in December 2022. It was at an advanced stage of acquiring an adjoining site.
- ii. The two sites were expected to be combined to form a development of 77 houses late in 2023.
- iii. The Cambridge Investment Partnership was completing the purchase of a site in Queen Edith's Ward. 150 homes could be sited here. A planning application was expected to be submitted at the end of 2023.
- iv. These were part of a series of development sites spread across the city.

5. Councillor Wade to the Executive Councillor for Recovery Employment and Community Safety

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Region of Learning was launched in July 2022. Can the Executive Councillor give us an update on the progress of the project over the past year?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. We were 1 of 7 councils within the Cities of Learning Movement and were sharing good practice with others.
- ii. The Region of Learning launched several projects to close skill gaps in 2022. These should help with job opportunities.
- iii. Young people would have the opportunity to navigate informal learning channels with partner organisations alongside the formal courses they participated in.
- iv. The Region of Learning were delivering on the ground careers advice through partner organisations for young people aged 15-24 years who were not in education or training. Funding had been ringfenced for this.
- v. The Region of Learning were working with local colleges to include digital badges in some of their training courses.
- vi. The Region of Learning were looking at how they could work with the Combined Authority in future to expand the program.

6. Councillor Levien to the Executive Councillor for Finance Resources and Transformation

Could the Executive Councillor for Finance, Resources and Transformation update us on progress of the report initiated in late 2022 on the numerous problems with the construction and commissioning of the Clay Farm Centre?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. There were major problems at the Clay Farm Centre and homes above it at Christmas time.
- ii. The practical problems related to the heating system. This had a particular impact on council property tenants.
- iii. It became apparent that communication channels between the different parties were not working effectively. This has now been rectified.
- iv. Councillors Davey and Levien put together a report with the Director of Neighbourhoods and Communities on how Clay Farm was structured and how the relationship between the various parties could work more effectively. It was currently in draft form but was expected to be shared by mid-June 2023.

7. Councillor Flaubert to the Executive Councillor for Planning and Infrastructure

Could the Executive Councillor for Planning and Infrastructure advise on how the council and planning authority were working to ensure that developers provide secure and robust storage for cycles, noting the recent thefts in Trumpington where thieves were able to access secure areas to remove valuable cycles.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. There had been some problems for several years with supposedly secure cycle stores, particularly in new developments.
- ii. A Cycle Crime Task and Finish Group was set up in response to look at reported cycle crime and how it happened.
- iii. Attention has also been focused on the cycle store at Cambridge Railway Station by the Police, Planning Officers, City Council Officers and Active Travel County Council Officers. Proposals to address issues:
 - a. Installation of CCTV.
 - b. Planning applications to increase security.
- iv. The Planning Committee raised the issue of cycle security and the need to get it correct on planning applications.

- v. Undertook to liaise with Councillor Flaubert and/or Porrer to review latest cycle theft details in their areas to see if needed changes to planning policy in the future in order to prevent further occurrences.

- 8. Councillor Divkovic to the Executive Councillor for Equalities, Anti-Poverty and Wellbeing (asked by Councillor Thornburrow at the meeting)

Can you update on progress in relation to our GRT work, in relation to sites, community engagement and Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GATANA)?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The City Council's consultants had commenced work on the GATANA in the greater Cambridge area. Results were expected to be reported back in January 2024.
- ii. Community engagement and consultation had started as part of this process.
- iii. A system of infrastructure was already in place in addition to the GATANA such as a cross party working group that included South Cambs, City and County Councillors plus a representative from the Traveller community. A strategic Group and Officer Working Group had also been formed.
- iv. Temporary and permanent camp sites were being reviewed.
- v. A member of the GRT community had been brought on board and would work out of the Brownsfield Community Centre.

- 9. Councillor Holloway to the Executive Councillor for Recovery Employment and Community Safety

On the 22nd May, the government's consultation on the 'Relationship between Community Safety Partnerships and Police and Crime Commissioners, the role of Community Safety Partnerships and Police and Crime Commissioners in tackling anti-social behaviour and the expansion of anti-social behaviour powers' was closed. Did the City Council submit a response to this, and what were the council's suggestions?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The City Council responded independently and also as part of the Community Safety Partnership.
- ii. Responses:
 - a. The Community Safety Partnerships were non-political partnership bodies, whereas Police and Crime Commissioners were

political/elected. Any changes to the two should reflect these differences and not impact on their working relationship.

b. Opposed the following proposals:

1. Local Authorities having expanded dispersal powers as emergency services were better placed to respond to incidents.
2. Police being able to drug test people in public as they had stop and search powers already.

10. Councillor Pounds to the Executive Councillor for Housing

Can the Housing Executive give an update on Repairs and Voids.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The backlog of voids had been addressed so the Council was at the manageable level of 30-35 at any one time. In 2022 the level was around 150+.
- ii. There were voids coming in that cost more (to resolve) and took longer to complete.
- iii. The level of voids was expected to decline in 2023/24.
- iv. The number of repairs in 2022 was the same as prior to the pandemic.
- v. Damp and mould compensation enquiries were starting now. Officers were reviewing hotspots based on historic data.

A full list of oral questions including those not asked during the meeting can be found in the Information Pack, which is published on the meeting webpage [Agenda for Council on Thursday, 25th May, 2023, 11.05 am - Cambridge Council](#).

23/33/CNL To consider the following notices of motion, notice of which has been given by:

13a Councillor Levien - New electric two wheeled scooters and mo-peds

Councillor Levien withdrew motion 13a under Council Procedure Rule 13.3 (withdrawal of motion upon not being moved).

A composite motion to replace motions 13a and 13c was proposed by Councillor Levien and seconded by Councillor Carling.

Council notes:

1. The rapid expansion in the use of novel, primarily electrically powered, two-wheeled vehicles, many of significant size and weight and capable of high speeds;
2. That this innovation, used responsibly, has the welcome potential to broaden travel opportunities;
3. The need to tackle growing antisocial use of these vehicles on Cambridge's roads, shared use paths, public spaces and footpaths, risking safety – particularly that of elderly and disabled people;
4. That apart from those vehicles expressly licensed by the Combined Authority, some of these types of vehicle remain illegal to use on the public highway, and that as a result of little government regulation of these vehicles, there's a lack of clarity over their status;
5. That a large number of electric moped drivers are engaged in food and other delivery operations where the employment and management model seems to avoid responsibility for driver behaviour, whilst implicitly encouraging the cutting of corners in the interests of speed.

Council believes:

1. A national regulatory approach needs urgently to be put in place to enable responsible use in appropriate places of vehicle classes assessed to be safe, and to prevent irresponsible use, empowering local authorities and the police to enforce accordingly.

Council welcomes:

1. That in the meantime the Council has commenced a three-way partnership with Cambridgeshire Police and the County Council to tackle the misuse of these vehicles in public places.

Council resolves:

1. To request a report to the Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee within the next 6 months on the progress of the three-way partnership, identifying means by which the city council and partners might take this forward, exercising influence over, and potentially co-ordinating, the best use of existing powers in a concerted fashion to mitigate the adverse, and channel the positive effects of the phenomenon, including but not limited to engagement with:
 - The Police on the use of existing enforcement powers;
 - Highways and Trading Standards at the County Council;

- The city council's own services with responsibility for public open spaces, (building on the recent initiative for 'Respect' signage on Midsummer Common), environmental enforcement and community safety;
 - The Combined Authority as local sponsor of the Voi licensed pilot in Cambridge
 - Delivery companies whose services utilise the novel vehicles
 - Interest groups in the city representing established users of spaces now also used by novel vehicles.
2. To instruct the Chief Executive to write to the relevant government minister (copying in the city's MPs, the CPCA Mayor, the PCC and the LGA) in order to:
 1. Request the urgent creation of a national regulatory framework for the novel vehicles, which recognises the need for controls over safety and anti-social use and empowers local authorities and the Police to take effective enforcement action;
 2. Express the Council's concerns about the impact of the gig economy model on this issue and seek measures which also address that.

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

Council notes:

1. The rapid expansion in the use of novel, primarily electrically powered, two-wheeled vehicles, many of significant size and weight and capable of high speeds;
2. That this innovation, used responsibly, has the welcome potential to broaden travel opportunities;
3. The need to tackle growing antisocial use of these vehicles on Cambridge's roads, shared use paths, public spaces and footpaths, risking safety – particularly that of elderly and disabled people;
4. That apart from those vehicles expressly licensed by the Combined Authority, some of these types of vehicle remain illegal to use on public highways, and that as a result of little government regulation of these vehicles, there's a lack of clarity over their status;
5. ~~That a large number of electric moped drivers are engaged in food and other delivery operations where the employment and management model seems to avoid responsibility for driver behaviour, whilst implicitly encouraging the cutting of corners in the interests of speed.~~

That a large number of electric moped drivers are employees of food and other delivery companies, working on zero-hours or other insecure contracts in a gig economy which does little to ensure good working conditions for employees, and that these drivers are therefore incentivised to cut corners in the interest of speed as a result of this model.

Council believes:

A national regulatory approach needs urgently to be put in place to enable responsible use in appropriate places of vehicle classes assessed to be safe, and to prevent irresponsible use, empowering local authorities and the police to enforce accordingly.

Council welcomes:

That in the meantime the Council has commenced a three-way partnership with Cambridgeshire Police and the County Council to tackle the misuse of these vehicles in public places.

Council resolves:

1. To request a report to the Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee within the next 6 months on the progress of the three-way partnership, identifying means by which the city council and partners might take this forward, exercising influence over, and potentially co-ordinating, the best use of existing powers in a concerted fashion to mitigate the adverse, and channel the positive effects of the phenomenon, including but not limited to engagement with:
 - The Police on the use of existing enforcement powers;
 - Highways and Trading Standards at the County Council;
 - The city council's own services with responsibility for public open spaces, (building on the recent initiative for 'Respect' signage on Midsummer Common), environmental enforcement and community safety;
 - The Combined Authority as local sponsor of the Voi licensed pilot in Cambridge
 - Delivery companies whose services utilise the novel vehicles
 - Interest groups in the city representing established users of spaces now also used by novel vehicles.

2. To instruct the Chief Executive to write to the relevant government minister (copying in the city's MPs, the CPCA Mayor, the PCC and the LGA) in order to:
 1. Request the urgent creation of a national regulatory framework for the novel vehicles, which recognises the need for controls over safety and anti-social use and empowers local authorities and the Police to take effective enforcement action;
 2. Express the Council's concerns about the impact of the gig economy model on this issue and seek measures which also address that.

Councillor Bennett requested that the term 'employees' was changed to 'workers' in paragraph 5 under the heading 'Council notes'. This amendment was agreed nem con.

On a show of hands the amendment was carried by 22 votes to 0.

Resolved (by 33 votes to 0) that:

Council notes:

1. The rapid expansion in the use of novel, primarily electrically powered, two-wheeled vehicles, many of significant size and weight and capable of high speeds;
2. That this innovation, used responsibly, has the welcome potential to broaden travel opportunities;
3. The need to tackle growing antisocial use of these vehicles on Cambridge's roads, shared use paths, public spaces and footpaths, risking safety – particularly that of elderly and disabled people;
4. That apart from those vehicles expressly licensed by the Combined Authority, some of these types of vehicle remain illegal to use on public highways, and that as a result of little government regulation of these vehicles, there's a lack of clarity over their status;
5. That a large number of electric moped drivers are workers of food and other delivery companies, working on zero-hours or other insecure contracts in a gig economy which does little to ensure good working conditions for employees, and that these drivers are therefore incentivised to cut corners in the interest of speed as a result of this model.

Council believes:

A national regulatory approach needs urgently to be put in place to enable responsible use in appropriate places of vehicle classes assessed to be safe, and to prevent irresponsible use, empowering local authorities and the police to enforce accordingly.

Council welcomes:

That in the meantime the Council has commenced a three-way partnership with Cambridgeshire Police and the County Council to tackle the misuse of these vehicles in public places.

Council resolves:

1. To request a report to the Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee within the next 6 months on the progress of the three-way partnership, identifying means by which the city council and partners might take this forward, exercising influence over, and potentially co-ordinating, the best use of existing powers in a concerted fashion to mitigate the adverse, and channel the positive effects of the phenomenon, including but not limited to engagement with:
 - The Police on the use of existing enforcement powers;
 - Highways and Trading Standards at the County Council;
 - The city council's own services with responsibility for public open spaces, (building on the recent initiative for 'Respect' signage on Midsummer Common), environmental enforcement and community safety;
 - The Combined Authority as local sponsor of the Voi licensed pilot in Cambridge
 - Delivery companies whose services utilise the novel vehicles
 - Interest groups in the city representing established users of spaces now also used by novel vehicles.
2. To instruct the Chief Executive to write to the relevant government minister (copying in the city's MPs, the CPCA Mayor, the PCC and the LGA) in order to:
 1. Request the urgent creation of a national regulatory framework for the novel vehicles, which recognises the need for controls over safety and anti-social use and empowers local authorities and the Police to take effective enforcement action;
 2. Express the Council's concerns about the impact of the gig economy model on this issue and seek measures which also address that.

13b Councillor Glasberg - Rights of the River Cam

Councillor Bennett withdrew motion 13b under Council Procedure Rule 13.3 (withdrawal of motion upon not being moved).

13c Councillor Carling - Tackling e-mopeds / scooters on pedestrian paths

Councillor Carling withdrew motion 13c under Council Procedure Rule 13.3 (withdrawal of motion upon not being moved). See minute reference 23/33/CNLa.

13d Councillor Bick - Experience of new voter photo ID requirement

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor Young seconded the following motion:

Members of the council note their experience of the recent election campaign as the first occasion where those without specific forms of photo ID were not permitted to exercise what was otherwise their democratic right. In addition to the data formally collected by polling station staff of those who were turned away in Cambridge, council also notes the potentially far greater number who were deterred from going to a polling station at all because they did not have any of the appropriate forms of photo ID, of which many of us will be individually aware.

This experience prompts re-affirmation of Council's demand of Government to scrap the new voter ID requirement and return to the tried and tested, inclusive approach which has maximised turn-out whilst avoiding malpractice in elections over many years - and to scrap it before any further test of electoral opinion is suppressed in a similar way.

Resolved (unanimously) to support the motion.

23/34/CNL Written questions

The Mayor advised that no written questions had been received.

The meeting ended at 5.00 pm

CHAIR