

COUNCIL

23 May 2024
11.05 am - 5.50 pm

Present: Councillors Ashton, Baigent, Bennett, Bick, Bird, Blackburn-Horgan, Carling, Clough, Davey, Divkovic, Dryden, Gawthroe Wood, Gilderdale, Glasberg, Griffin, Hauk, Healy, Holloway, Hossain, Howard, Lee, Lokhmotova, Martinelli, McPherson, Moore, Nestor, Porrer, Pounds, Robertson, Smart, A. Smith, S. Smith, Thittala Varkey, Thornburrow, Todd-Jones, Tong, Wade and Young

Councillor Healy left the meeting before minute item 24/43/CNL.

Councillors A Smith and Todd Jones left the meeting before minute item 24/43/CNL.

Councillors Carling, Dryden and Howard left the meeting before minute item 24/54/CNL.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

24/35/CNL To elect a Mayor for the Municipal Year 2024/25

Councillor S Smith proposed, and Councillor Moore seconded the nomination of Councillor Baiju Thittala as Mayor for the Municipal Year 2024/25.

Resolved (unanimously) that:

Councillor Baiju Thittala be elected Mayor for the Municipal Year 2024/25.

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

24/36/CNL To elect a Deputy Mayor for the Municipal Year 2024/25

Councillor Carling proposed and Councillor Bird seconded the nomination of Councillor Dinah Pounds as Deputy Mayor for the Municipal Year 2024/25.

Resolved (unanimously) that:

Councillor Dinah Pounds be elected Deputy Mayor for the Municipal Year 2023/24.

Councillor Dinah Pounds then made the statutory declaration of acceptance for the Office of Deputy Mayor.

24/37/CNL To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meetings held on the 15 February and 29 February 2024

The minutes of 15 February and 29 February 2024 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

24/38/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 Ward: Naomi Bennett
Arbury Ward: Patrick Sheil
Castle Ward: Antoinette Nestor
Cherry Hinton: Mark Ashton
Coleridge Ward: Tim Griffin
East Chesterton Ward: Gerri Bird
King's Hedges Ward: Jenny Gawthrope Wood
Market Ward: Tim Bick
Newnham Ward: Hugh Clough
Petersfield Ward: Mike Davey
Romsey Ward: Dave Baigent
Queen Edith's Ward: Immy Blackburn-Horgan
Trumpington Ward: Nadya Lokhmotova
West Chesterton Ward: Sam Carling

24/39/CNL To Pass a Resolution of Thanks to the Outgoing Mayor

Resolved (unanimously) on the proposal of Councillor A Smith seconded by Councillor Davey

This Council expressed its appreciation of the manner in which duties of the Mayor and Mayor's consorts were discharged by Councillor Jenny Gawthrope Wood and consorts Nicholas Gawthrope, Saba Alai South, Hazel Maher and Cllr Dinah Pounds during their period of office.

24/40/CNL Mayor's announcements

The following announcements were made:

The Mott Sermon would take place at Holy Trinity Church on Sunday 26 May at 9.30am.

Midsummer Fair Proclamation had been scheduled for Wednesday 19 June.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Flaubert, Payne, Sheil and Swift.

24/41/CNL Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Healy	24/55/CNL	Personal: Member of the Palestine Solidarity Campaign
Councillor Bennett	24/54/CNL	Personal: Member of Disability Rights UK and Member of the Local Government Disability Champion Network.

24/42/CNL To elect from among the Members of the Council Four Bailiffs of the City for the Municipal Year 2024/25

Resolved (unanimously) to:

Appoint Councillors Gawthrope Wood, Dryden, McPherson, Blackburn-Horgan and Martinelli, Bailiffs of the City for the Municipal Year 2024/25.

24/43/CNL To elect a Leader of the Council

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

Elect Councillor Mike Davey as Leader of Cambridge City Council.

24/44/CNL To consider the recommendations of Committees for adoption

24/45/CNL Civic Affairs Committee - Committee Appointments

As there were two nominations for the role of Vice-Chair of Planning Committee, Council was asked to vote on these nominations before a vote on the Committee Appointments was taken.

Nomination: Councillor Porrer

5 votes to 20, with 1 abstention.

Nomination: Councillor Baigent

22 votes to 5 votes, with 8 abstentions

Resolved (unanimously) to:

Agree the appointments to city council committees and joint partner bodies and appointment of Chairs and Vice-Chairs below (as updated by the 'Update to Committee Appointments' document contained within the Information Pack).

Environment and Communities Scrutiny Committee

Total: 5 Labour, 2 Lib Dem, 1 Green

Pounds (Chair), Nestor (Vice Chair), Swift, Divkovic, TBC

Payne, Hauk

Glasberg

Alternates: Griffin, Sheil, Martinelli, Flaubert, Tong

Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee

Total: 5 Labour, 2 Lib Dem, 1 Green

Nestor (Chair), Baigent (Vice Chair), Swift, Griffin, Divkovic

Porrer, Bick

Clough

Alternates: Pounds, Sheil, Lee, Lokhmotova, Bennett

Housing Scrutiny Committee

Total: 6 Labour, 2 Lib Dem, 1 Green

Griffin (Chair), Robertson (Vice Chair), Gawthrope Wood, Baigent, Swift,

Thittala Varkey

Martinelli, Lee

Tong

Alternates: Nestor, Pounds, Young, Porrer, Bennett

Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee

Total: 5 Labour, 2 Lib Dem, 1 Green

Robertson (Chair), Gawthrope Wood (Vice Chair), Sheil, Baigent, Todd-Jones

Bick, Young

Bennett

Alternates: Griffin, Lab TBC, Porrer, Martinelli, Clough

Civic Affairs Committee

Total: 4 Labour, 1 Lib Dem, 1 Green)

McPherson (Chair), Gawthrope Wood (Vice Chair), Sheil, Robertson

Young

Bennett

Alternate: Holloway, Bick, Clough

Employment (Senior Officer) Committee

Total 6 Labour, 1 Lib Dem, 1 Green

Davey, Carling, Gilderdale, Moore

Bick

Bennett

Alternates: Thornburrow, Porrer, Clough

Licensing Committee

Total: 6 Labour, 3 Lib Dem, 1 Green

McPherson (Chair), Bird (Vice Chair), Moore, Griffin, Pounds, Wade

Bick, Blackburn-Horgan, Young

Clough

Alternates: Davey, Flaubert, Bennett

Planning Committee

Total: 6 Labour, 2 Lib Dem, 1 Green

Smart (Chair), Baigent (Vice Chair), Thornburrow, Gilderdale, Carling, Dryden

Porrer, Lokhmotova

Bennett

Alternates: Nestor, Todd-Jones, Flaubert, Young, Howard

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board

Total: 1 Labour

A.Smith

Alternate: Davey

Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Total: 2 Labour

Divkovic, Gilderdale

Combined Authority Audit and Governance Committee

Total: 1 Labour

Todd-Jones,

Alternate: Carling

Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly

Total: 2 Labour, 1 Lib Dem

S.Smith, Thornburrow,

Bick

Joint Development Control Committee - Cambridge Fringes

Total: 4 Labour, 2 Lib Dem

S.Smith (Chair), Baigent, Smart, Thornburrow

Porrer, Flaubert,

Alternates: Gilderdale, Nestor, Young, Lokhmotova

Cambridge Joint Area Committee

Total: 4 Labour, 1 Lib Dem, 1 Green

Thornburrow, Robertson, Baigent, Moore

Young

Bennett

Alternates: Carling, Pounds, Martinelli, Tong

24/46/CNL Civic Affairs Committee - Governance Review Proposals

Resolved by (22 votes to 13, with 1 abstention):

- i. That the Council design and implement a revised 'Leader and Cabinet' model of decision making and authorises the Chief Executive to enable changes to be implemented from the Annual Council Meeting in May 2025.
- ii. To establish a member-officer design group with external technical support to develop a revised 'Leader and Cabinet' model with final proposals including an updated constitution being presented to the Civic Affairs Committee and then to full Council for adoption.

24/47/CNL Annual Statements

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

24/48/CNL Public questions timeQuestion 2

Does the leader of the Council feel that the Council's equality and diversity policies could be improved to help further protect victims of discrimination from

facing harassment or victimisation after raising concerns about discrimination with the Council?

The Leader of the Council responded with the following:

- i. The Council had a comprehensive equality and diversity policy which outlined its commitment as an employer, service provider and community leader, promoting diversity equality and inclusion and all legal obligations under the Equality Act.
- ii. This policy as with all Council's policies was continually reviewed and updated.
- iii. As part of its legal obligations, the Council ensured harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Equalities Act was eliminated for staff and residents.
- iv. If the public speaker had any further concerns or queries on this issue to contact the Council.

Public Supplementary Question

- i. Thanked the Leader for their response.
- ii. The Council deserved considerable credit for its commitment to promote equality and inclusion for all members of the community.
- iii. The Council's work on these issues was a model that other Local Authorities would do well to follow.

The Leader thanked the public speaker for their contribution and reiterated to contact the Council should there be any further queries on this issue which he would be happy to take forward.

Question 3

What progress has been made in providing Transit site/(s) in Cambridge?

- i. Four years after the rhetorical statement by the then Executive Councillor for Equalities, Anti-Poverty and Wellbeing on the impact of the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill in criminalising the travelling way of life, the Council had still failed to provide any meaningful solution or change to their policy of eviction. We have argued that the threat of eviction is a blunt instrument when, under the new Police Act 2022,

Travellers could have their caravans seized and their children taken into care if they refused to leave. On the 14/5/24 in the case of Wendy Smith vs the King and Secretary of State for the Home Department, the High Court issued a declaration of incompatibility finding that provisions in the Police Act unlawfully discriminate against Gypsies and Travellers.

- ii. The decision was based on the lack of authorised transit site provision on which they could camp lawfully. We have continuously pointed this out while the Council have chosen instead to focus on a series of delayed and rejected GTANAs to tell them what was clearly right in front of their (collective) face: that it is the lack of transit sites that causes the greatest conflict between the Traveller and settled community. Now the High Court decision will force Parliament to review those provisions to ensure their compatibility with the ECHR. It seems incredible that the Council and partners have been unable to find a piece of ground for a transit site, roughly the size of a football pitch (1.6 acres). Such an area could accommodate 20 pitches based on government size design standards for permanent sites of 320sqm. The suggested number of pitches for transit sites is half that number.
- iii. Is this truly beyond the capability of the Council? English Romani and Irish Travellers have protected status under the ECHR which includes the right to a home.
- iv. Human rights are rights taken to be universal, of considerable importance, and relate to the individual and not collectively – rights that are denied Gypsies and Travellers under planning law. Now the High Court declaration of incompatibility further highlights the Council's failure to resolve this long-standing problem. Based on this new and compelling information, we ask you to provide a firm timetable for progress.

The Executive Councillor for Communities said the following:

- i. The Council's eviction policy for unauthorised encampments on Council land was only acted upon after an assessment had been undertaken which would take into consideration any welfare concerns.
- ii. The Council and neighbouring authorities had tried for many years to identify sites that could be potentially used for transit site provision, but due to multiple reasons, none of the identified sites had been able to be progressed.

- iii. Once the current Needs Assessment and report had been completed, the findings would be provided to the Strategic Steering Group, which would next meet in July.

Public Supplementary Question

- i. For the last four years the Council have been engaged in conversation regarding the lack of provision for Gypsy, Roma and Travellers in the City and Cambridgeshire.
- ii. The Council had failed in its responsibility to the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller community.
- iii. The High Court Case referenced in the original question stated that Local Authorities were ignoring the fact that they should not evict if there was no other provision.
- iv. The Council had shifted its position over time and had even spoken of a permanent site but what it did not recognise was the lack of transient sites which were the cause of the most conflict.
- v. The response just provided by the Executive Councillor had nothing to do with the issue raised in the original question, which has been highlighted repeatedly.
- vi. Now there was a legal requirement to address this issue immediately, a solution was required now.

The Executive Councillor responded with the following:

- i. Heard the frustration expressed and was aware that the matter had been going on for some time.
- ii. Was sorry had not given the answer that was wanted.
- iii. Once the current Needs Assessment and report had been read, would notify the public speaker to provide further information. The report would also refer to a permanent site as well as transitional.

Question 5

- i. For the first time global warming has broken the 1.5-degree limit set by the 2015 Paris Agreement over the course of an entire year. Cambridge has already passed the point of 'sustainable growth' and the 2030 Net Zero targets of Cambridge City Council are evidently out of reach. Our local water crisis has drawn the serious concern of the Environment

Agency who are sensibly stepping in to object to the placing of ever greater strain on our local resources.

- ii. Isn't it time that Cambridge City Council fully acknowledges the gravity of the climate breakdown accelerating around us and therefore adopts a realistic approach to planning for this city's future? We know that Mr. Gove is knocking on our door with completely unfeasible growth plans so now is the time to go firmly in a new direction. We need a new vision, a new attitude that sets out what we consider to be realistic limits to the city's growth. The current Government's plans serve corporate interests; they will not help our existing local communities to thrive in the coming years. We are in desperate need of strong local leadership that will help us all to get through the challenges that certainly lie ahead.
- iii. Would this City Council accept that 'sustainable growth' is an oxymoron, and will it say no to Mr. Gove's development plans, and politely suggest that he redirect his department's levelling up efforts towards those parts of the country who are crying out to have their brownfield sites developed in order to rejuvenate their own communities?

The Leader of the Council responded with the following response:

- i. In 2019, Cambridge City Council announced a climate emergency, shared a vision for Cambridge, developed a plan to become net zero carbon, accordingly, working with external partners.
- ii. The Council was now the second greenest District Council in the United Kingdom.
- iii. Work had begun to develop a sustainable vision for the future with South Cambridgeshire District Council. There were challenges which needed to be addressed such as the issue of water availability and housing.
- iv. The new Greater Cambridge Local Plan would include ambitions around climate change, improving accessibility and wellbeing for everyone in the city.
- v. Did not accept that 'sustainable growth' was an oxymoron. Sustainable growth was possible but had to be carefully considered and managed. Unless managed effectively there could be damage to the climate.
- vi. Without effective growth it would not be possible to significantly change what's better for the city and for the country.

- vii. The Council had developed several initiatives with external partners, particularly with Manchester City Council and Officers were working to deliver those initiatives.
- viii. In conclusion, there were parts of the question which could agree with, but other parts of the public question undermined what was possible for the city. The Council in conjunction with South Cambridgeshire District Council could achieve these possibilities through to 2050.
- ix. Did object to some of the proposals outlined by Mr. Gove's development plans, 250,000 new homes were not a feasible option. Work was needed to be undertaken to change that.
- x. How would the Council bring forward their vision. Had already began working with Peter Freeman (Chair of Homes England); the Council had established the first steps to address the water crisis.

Public Supplementary Question

- i. This week the Leader of the Council claimed that every action to Mr. Gove's growth agenda needed to be challenged and wanted to ensure that an alternative narrative was heard.
- ii. Agreed it was time for a new story and to shape this new narrative.
- iii. The citizens of Cambridge wanted to leave behind the environmentally damaging thinking that lead to growth at all costs.
- iv. Traditional economic thinking would do nothing to help survive the climatic changes that were already upon us. It also left no space for existing residents to thrive, for example, local people had said they were suffering in the inequality crisis which would not be remedied by a growth agenda.
- v. In this time of climate emergency, Cambridge City Council must lead; lead Cambridge in a transition away from the fixation on economic growth which did have a limit, the environment set those limits.
- vi. To halt further environmental degradation, the traditional economic theory and its linear way of thinking needed to be left behind.
- vii. The Council's priority must be to protect the city and the planet, not to support a fatally flawed philosophy wrapped up in such terms as 'fast growth cities, sustainable growth and good growth'.
- viii. Would the Council be willing to leave the green washing terminology of sustainable growth behind and focus on looking after the current residents of Cambridge.

- ix. Local people were already fostering a new mode of operating which embraced a cyclical circular economy.
- x. Urged to look at the Cambridge resilience website where 178 organisations could be found. These organisations were run by people of Cambridge for the people of Cambridge, who operated according to the principles of self-sufficiency, regeneration, conservation, community resilience and community care.

The Leader of the Council said:

- i. Agreed it was time to approach things differently and hoped a new Labour Government would be part of that process, if successful in the July elections.
- ii. Anticipated a Labour Government would look to make sure that Cambridge was used in a way that would be productive for the nation and that residents were part of that process and wealth was genuinely shared; the Community Wealth Building Programme was so important as it gave people back a resource of wealth from the city.
- iii. The work that had been undertaken with Manchester City Council provided a platform to genuinely level up across the nation. This could not be done without linking closely with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and other external partners to ensure that the relevant resources went back into the City.
- iv. As referenced, work had been undertaken and would continue which would start to become much more open about 2050 in the next few weeks. Had repeatedly gone back to Peter Freeman and Micheal Gove to stress the importance of the City Council representing the Community.
- v. The democratic responsibility of a Council was to speak on behalf of its residents, the core of this was to tackle inequality and make sure that the growth that came to Cambridge went into affordable homes, affordable council homes, all of which were sustainable, and jobs for local people, who for too long had not benefited from the wealth that was in the city.

The following two questions would receive a written response from the Executive Councillor as the members of public were not in attendance.

Question 1

- i. Would like to address the Council about the way in which the café at the Meadows Community Centre is run by the nominated charity-based company called: 'Royal Voluntary Services' (RVS).
- ii. As a member of the public, who has lived in Cambridge all my life and have visited the cafe numerous times over the past few months, I really think that a conscious review about how the RVS is suited to the long-term needs of the Meadows Community Centre and with the very lack of suitability, to have any external company running this centre?
- iii. Having the: 'Meadows Cafe', being run by its own staff and structure, seems to be the right way to go. It would bring in one hundred percent more revenue, because it would be controlled: "In-House". Which would give much more flexibility to the needs of the people living nearby. Even "Charity Companies", must make profit to sustain the expenses of catering laws and employing permanent staff, to run the company.
- iv. In conclusion I ask the Council to review this matter and allow the Meadows Cafe to be run internally and under its own needs that would greatly benefit the said communities of Arbury and Kings Hedges combined.

Question 4

At the most recent Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee meeting, the Executive Councillor for Communities stated in response to a public question:

– Council officers had received the first draft Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTANA) report at the end of the previous week and were already working through the initial findings.

– A publication date for after the May elections would need to be agreed between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.

This was two months ago. The May elections have come and gone. When will the GTANA report be published? Additionally, given that this GTANA is already coming four years late, will Cambridge City Council expedite the implementation of its findings?

24/49/CNL To deal with oral questions

Question 1

Councillor Hauk to Executive Councillor for Community Wealth Building and Community Safety.

What does the Executive Councillor think inequality means for Cambridge, and what is she planning to do to address it?

The Executive Councillor responded with the following the comments:

- i. Inequality meant a lack of fairness and would point to the age of austerity under Central Government.
- ii. Under the Conservative Government, 800 libraries had closed, 1300 children centres and reportedly an extra 600,000 children were in poverty.
- iii. Would campaign to ensure the Conservative party would leave Government on July 4.
- iv. Would continue the hard work undertaken to make sure that residents accessed regular food via Cambridge Sustainable Food (CSF), obtained advice from the Citizen's Advice Bureau and had a warm place to visit via the Council's community centres.
- v. Would maintain the exemplar community grant funding. £1.5million had been awarded with the primary outcome to reduce social and economic inequality and empower residents. There was also a continuous emphasis to bring about improved health and wellbeing, bringing the community together.
- vi. Would continue to build on the Council's Youth Strategy so young people felt that Cambridge was for them.
- vii. Would continue to sustain the Council's Cultural Strategy and work with youth engagement.
- viii. Planned to consolidate the Community Wealth Building Strategy using the Council's resources, assets, and powers to build community wealth for a more inclusive sustainable economy enabling residents and communities.
- ix. In conclusion, if you compared what Council's Officers and Councillors had achieved in the last ten years for the residents of Cambridge, we should be running the Government.

Question 2

Councillor Glasberg to Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services.

Cambridge Water were still unable to agree a Water Management Plan to ensure that we have drinking water without further adverse impact on the chalk streams and the environment. The proposed interventions cannot be delivered

until 2032 and 2036. Would the Executive Councillor update us on what representations the Council intends to make to the water authorities (OFWAT, Environment Agency and Water Resources East in particular) and on the Council's own assessment of the partial contribution that might be made to the Water Scarcity Group's proposed measures?

The Executive Councillor for Planning, Building Control and Infrastructure answered with the following:

- i. This issue had been raised many times by the Labour Group over the last five years since the publication of the last Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP).
- ii. A second revision of the Cambridge Water Company's WRMP had been issued in February 2024. The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs would determine whether it could be adopted, advised by the Environment Agency and the Office of Water Services (OFWAT).
- iii. The Council had responded to the earlier draft plan almost a year ago after consideration with members of the Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee. The Committee's joint response with South Cambridgeshire District Council was then published on the City Council's website.
- iv. It was simply not possible to use more water than was available, under the previous Labour Government, the Environment Agency had been well funded with plans and regulations to help achieve water neutrality. The last fourteen years with the Conservative Government had resulted in the current situation.
- v. The population increase was as expected, but the improvement required for the infrastructure had never been placed on a statutory basis and profits for developers had been put first.
- vi. There would be a long wait for the major interventions of a connection to resources at Grafham Water and the construction of the Fen Reservoir.
- vii. The Council were not waiting for the anticipated review of building regulations but were already seeking enhanced water saving measures in major schemes through the development management process.
- viii. The Council were aware of how to build in ways that reduced water usage and would continue to engage with the Water Scarcity Group.
- ix. Hoped that it was seen how seriously the matter was being taken but there were limits on what could be done. The right legislation and regulations were required, and the Council would press the next Prime Minister to make them a priority.

Question 3

Councillor Porrer to Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services.

Could the Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services please update members on progress on our policy, as agreed at Council in October 2021, to remove single use plastics from events on Council owned land.

The Executive Councillor said the following:

- i. The Council had made significant strides in implementing the removal of single use plastics from events on our land.
- ii. Following the Council's agreement in October 2021, clear guidelines and criteria for events held on Council-owned land had been established.
- iii. Event organisers were bound by the Council's terms and conditions of hire which required the elimination of single-use plastics from their activities.
- iv. Officers had engaged extensively with event organisers to communicate the new requirements and provide support in adopting them. This included offering and suggesting alternatives to single-use plastics, such as biodegradable or reusable options, and connecting organisers with suppliers who could meet these needs.
- v. When events were inspected, Officers checked that measures were in place to ensure compliance with the Policy. Council staff conducted spot checks and reviews of events to ensure single-use plastics were not being used.
- vi. Officers had confirmed that all events held on Council-owned land since the policy's implementation had successfully eliminated single-use plastics. Positive feedback had been received from both organisers and attendees, who appreciated the Council's commitment to sustainability.
- vii. Looking forward, the Council would continue to build on this progress by further refining the guidelines, enhancing support for event organisers, and exploring new ways to promote and facilitate sustainable practices.
- viii. The Council remained committed to its goal of making all events on Council-owned land free from single-use plastics and would keep all Members updated on the ongoing efforts and achievements.

Question 4

Councillor Blackburn-Horgan to Executive Councillor for Housing and Homelessness.

How, after the Council set up the private renters' forum, did the Executive Councillor believe the Council could influence the exorbitant costs of renting a single room in a small, licensed HMO, now reaching £1350 per month in Queen Edith's Ward?

The Executive Councillor said the following:

- i. Was acutely aware of the affordability challenge within the City, the Council were delivering one of the largest social housing building programmes in the UK.
- ii. Whilst work was undertaken to influence and enforce the standards of private rented properties, particularly HMO's across the City, the rent levels were not an area that the Council could influence.
- iii. The programme for affordable housing delivery remained ambitious which was the best way for the Council to make housing as affordable for as many people as possible.

Question 5

Councillor Young to The Leader of the Council.

How does the Council track officer's response times to Councillors emails? The target is a response within 5 working days. Is that target being met?

The Leader of the Council responded:

- i. As set out in the guidance document Officers had a commitment to ensure that all Councillors received a response within seven working days.
- ii. Officers did try to respond quicker than the seven-day deadline, particularly for specifically urgent issues or issues outlined as time sensitive.
- iii. The Council did not track Officer response time, but trust that Officers responded promptly.
- iv. Asked that if Councillors experienced issues with Officer's response times to highlight this and would bring this to the attention of the Chief Executive to remind Officers of their responsibility.

Question 6

Councillor Tong to Executive Councillor for Housing and Homelessness.

In their most recent dog awareness report, the Royal Mail published that over the previous year postal workers across the UK suffered 381 injuries from dogs biting at them through letterboxes. These attacks can cause serious harm, including permanent disability. Does Cambridge City Council currently have a policy regarding internal letterbox cages, and, if not, would it consider fitting all its new homes with them in future?

The Executive Councillor said the following:

- i. Was shocked to hear of the injuries that postal workers sustained while delivering mail.

- ii. The Council were always looking at ways to improve the design and standards of its housing, managing design standards and budget responsibly to ensure value for residents.
- iii. There was no policy for internal letter box cages for current properties or new build housing due to identity theft and was not currently being considered.
- iv. Internal letter box cages would not be applicable to the new build flats which made up most of the Council's housing delivery; letter boxes were protected from dog access as were either in a secured lobby or on a wall.
- v. Had carried out many deliveries around the City when campaigning, as all Councillors, and understood this issue. The best tool was to take a wooden spoon to aid with the deliveries of Councillor's leaflets!

Question 7

Councillor Bick to Executive Councillor for Community Wealth Building and Community Safety.

What methods does the Council have at its disposal to require graffiti to be removed by owners or occupants from private buildings where it is disfiguring a neighbourhood (especially where it is in a conservation area) and acting as a magnet for further proliferation?

The Executive Councillor responded with the following:

- i. The Council could address graffiti on private buildings especially in conservation areas through the Antisocial Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014.
- ii. The available powers could be used to remove existing graffiti and to put in place actions that property occupiers or owners had to take to manage future incidents of graffiti.
- iii. A Community Protection Warning (CPW) would first be issued to the occupier or owner of the property which outlined the matter and set out the requirements appropriate to remedy the detriment being caused by the graffiti. It was important to note the CPW did not carry a right of appeal.
- iv. If the occupiers or owners failed to comply the Council would then serve a Community Protect Notice (CPN). This legally required the occupier or owner to remedy the detriment of the graffiti. The CPN did come with a right of appeal.
- v. Failure to comply with a CPN was a criminal offence and further action could be taken by the Council such as issuing a Fixed Penalty Notice or prosecute. The Council also has the right to under the removal of the

graffiti without requiring permission, specifically to areas of the building adjacent to the public highway that were open to the air and could be accessed without entering the properties curtilage.

Question 8

Councillor Martinelli to Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services.

Please could the Executive Councillor update us on the Council's commitment to No Mow May?

The Executive Councillor provided the following update:

- i. The Council recognised the importance of a healthy and biodiverse environment and supported No Mow May as part of promoting biodiversity. As stated when asked a question on this last year, it was a very worthy national campaign.
- ii. In 2022, the Council introduced the principles of No Mow May and the Plantlife Good Verge Guide into the Biodiversity Strategy to shape how public spaces were managed. Have since reduced the cutting schedule and designated more areas of long grass.
- iii. Whilst the Council supported No Mow May, there were times over the course of the month where Officers were required to maintain some mowing activity in parts of the city to ensure public spaces and County Highways verges were accessible and safe for all to use. This typically included areas around play equipment, designated amenity spaces such as picnic and event spaces or where critical traffic sight lines, footpaths or cycle ways were impacted by verge growth. Not doing so, would present a risk to residents and visitors.
- iv. To balance the commitment to biodiversity whilst ensuring that open spaces were safe and useable, cutting is kept to a minimum and only mowed where required.
- v. Through the management of the Council's parks, local nature reserves and tree stock we are supporting pollinators year-round and throughout their lifecycle. For example, by installing bee banks, bee hotels and deadwood features parks and local nature reserves as well as maintaining and planting a diverse range of flowering trees in our streets and open spaces.
- vi. Would finish by stressing again the usability point. Want to build a coalition of support behind the various things undertaken to support biodiversity, like the recent achievement of cutting herbicide use out of our regular operations. Leaving large, well-used public commons

completely unmown made them much less usable and risked damaging crucial public support.

The question from Councillor Flaubert would receive a written response as the time limit for the oral questions had been reached.

Question 9

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

Could the Executive Councillor for Open Spaces update us on the planned community clean-up days around Cambridge this year?

24/50/CNL To consider the following notices of motion, notice of which has been given by:

24/51/CNL Councillor Bick - Vision for Cambridge

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor Hauk seconded the following motion:

COUNCIL BELIEVES that ‘good growth’ in and around Cambridge is possible, if planned with care for sustainability. Evidence already gathered by local councils indicates that this should be provided for, in particular to alleviate poor housing conditions and rising costs, which are not only a source of division and inequality, but also jeopardise our vital public services and limit businesses which are directly or indirectly dependent on our unique concentration of research and innovation for advancement in the world.

WE POINT TO the records of parties which have recently led this council and South Cambridgeshire in delivering new communities meeting a wide spectrum of needs and means, and in nurturing the success of the local economy.

WE WELCOME a role for central government in addressing key factors beyond the scope of local councils, particularly in ensuring investment in water supply, transport infrastructure and social housing – the absence of which would result in unsustainable growth, which the city would not be able to support.

But WE ARE HUGELY CONCERNED by arbitrary government housing targets and unsubstantiated proposals for a development corporation and planning intervention, which cast locally elected representatives of residents as mere

outside advisors or minority participants in the shaping of the future of our own area in an accountable way.

WE RESOLVE to challenge this ‘power grab’ by central government; to seek instead a genuine partnership, and to strengthen the local democratic component of this by pursuing the creation of a unitary council which brings together most local decision-making and service provision into one new body.

And WE RECOMMIT to locally-led, evidence-based planning and to development that is above all sustainable, both socially and environmentally.

Councillor Carling proposed and Councillor Griffin seconded the following amendment to Motion 14a (deleted text ~~struckthrough~~ and additional text underlined)

Vision for Cambridge Sustainable Growth and Democratic Engagement in Cambridge

COUNCIL BELIEVES that ‘good growth’ in and around Cambridge is possible, if planned with care for sustainability. Evidence already gathered by local councils indicates that this should be provided for, in particular to alleviate poor housing conditions and rising costs, which are not only a source of division and inequality, but also jeopardise our vital public services and limit businesses which are directly or indirectly dependent on our unique concentration of research and innovation for advancement in the world.

WE POINT TO the records of parties which have recently led this council and South Cambridgeshire in delivering new communities meeting a wide spectrum of needs and means, and in nurturing the success of the local economy.

WE WELCOME a role for central government in addressing key factors beyond the scope of local councils, particularly in ensuring investment in water supply, transport infrastructure and social housing – the absence of which would result in unsustainable growth, which the city would not be able to support.

But WE ARE ~~HUGELY~~ CONCERNED by the lack of meaningful government engagement with elected representatives in Cambridge and surrounding areas about the future of our city, with details regarding the proposed development corporation still lacking and no evidence of appetite for meaningful discussion of alternative options. We note that the ruling Labour group, in partnership with the leadership of other relevant local authorities, have been clear about these concerns publicly – including through press statements – and that the Council’s political leadership is continuing to push for more information and stronger engagement (with elected representatives as well as other community voices) through all available channels. ~~arbitrary government housing targets and unsubstantiated proposals for a development corporation and planning intervention, which cast locally elected representatives of residents as mere outside advisors or minority participants in the shaping of the future of our own area in an accountable way.~~

WE RESOLVE to lobby this and any future government to engage genuinely with local representatives and seek a genuine partnership. We note that the complex local government environment around Cambridge is less than ideal for transparency and meaningful engagement and commit to continuing our exploratory work on how we might resolve this, including consideration of options around becoming a unitary authority. ~~challenge this ‘power grab’ by central government; to seek instead a genuine partnership, and to strengthen the local democratic component of this by pursuing the creation of a unitary council which brings together most local decision-making and service provision into one new body.~~

And WE RECOMMIT to locally-led, evidence-based planning and to development that is above all sustainable, both socially and environmentally

The amendment was carried by 20 votes to 13, with 1 abstention.

Resolved (by 29 votes to 4, with 1 abstention) that:

Sustainable Growth and Democratic Engagement in Cambridge

COUNCIL BELIEVES that ‘good growth’ in and around Cambridge is possible, if planned with care for sustainability. Evidence already gathered by local councils indicates that this should be provided for, in particular to alleviate poor

housing conditions and rising costs, which are not only a source of division and inequality, but also jeopardise our vital public services and limit businesses which are directly or indirectly dependent on our unique concentration of research and innovation for advancement in the world.

WE POINT TO the records of parties which have recently led this council and South Cambridgeshire in delivering new communities meeting a wide spectrum of needs and means, and in nurturing the success of the local economy.

WE WELCOME a role for central government in addressing key factors beyond the scope of local councils, particularly in ensuring investment in water supply, transport infrastructure and social housing – the absence of which would result in unsustainable growth, which the city would not be able to support.

But WE ARE CONCERNED by the lack of meaningful government engagement with elected representatives in Cambridge and surrounding areas about the future of our city, with details regarding the proposed development corporation still lacking and no evidence of appetite for meaningful discussion of alternative options. We note that the ruling Labour group, in partnership with the leadership of other relevant local authorities, have been clear about these concerns publicly – including through press statements – and that the Council's political leadership is continuing to push for more information and stronger engagement (with elected representatives as well as other community voices) through all available channels.

WE RESOLVE to lobby this and any future government to engage genuinely with local representatives and seek a genuine partnership. We note that the complex local government environment around Cambridge is less than ideal for transparency and meaningful engagement and commit to continuing our exploratory work on how we might resolve this, including consideration of options around becoming a unitary authority.

And WE RECOMMIT to locally-led, evidence-based planning and to development that is above all sustainable, both socially and environmentally.

24/52/CNL Councillor Moore - Climate & Ecology Bill

Under Council Procedure Rule 26, Members agreed to accept the altered motion as submitted by Councillor Moore (deleted text ~~struckthrough~~, additional text underlined).

Councillor Moore proposed and Councillor Nestor seconded the following motion:

Climate & ~~Ecology~~ Nature Bill

Humans have already caused irreversible climate change, the impacts of which are being felt in the UK, and across the world. The average global temperature has already increased by 1.2°C above pre-industrial levels and—alongside this—the natural world has reached crisis point, with 28% of plants and animals threatened with extinction. In addition, the UK is one of the most nature-depleted countries in the world as more than one in seven of our plants and animals face extinction, and more than 40% are in decline.

The Climate & ~~Ecology~~ Nature Bill (an updated version of the previous Climate & Ecology Bill and before that the CEE Bill), seeks to address the challenges that this situation poses by creating a whole-of-government approach to deliver a net zero and nature positive future.

The Bill aims to align current UK environmental policy with the need to halt and reverse nature loss by 2030, which was a goal agreed to at COP15,); and reduce greenhouse gas emissions in line with the UK's fair share of the remaining global carbon budget to give the strongest chance of limiting global heating to 1.5°C, which was the goal agreed to at COP21.

By bridging the gap between the UK Government's current delivery, and what has been agreed at international levels, Britain has a chance to be a world leader on climate and the environment; seizing the opportunities of the clean energy transition, including green jobs and skills; reduced energy bills; and boosting the UK's food and energy security.

This council notes that:

- This council declared a Climate Emergency in February 2019.
- This council declared a bio-diversity emergency in May 2019
- Cambridge is one of 119 Global Cities named Climate Action Leaders on the Carbon Disclosure Project 2023 A List. A-List cities are taking four times as many climate mitigation and adaptation measures as non-A Listers.

- Cambridge City Council is ranked second amongst all UK District councils by Climate Action Scorecards (run by Climate Emergency UK) on actions we have taken to reach net zero in 2023.
- In our Climate Change Strategy 2021-2026 we set a target for the Council to be net zero carbon in our direct emissions by 2030 and our Carbon Management Plan explains how we plan to achieve it.
- Our Change Strategy 2021-2026 also sets out a vision for Cambridge City to be net zero carbon by 2030 but we need a more ambitious policy framework and increased investment from national government in order to achieve that.

The Climate & Nature Bill would require the UK Government to develop and achieve a new environmental strategy, which would include:

1. Delivering a joined-up environmental plan, as the crises in climate and nature are deeply intertwined, and require a plan that considers both together;
2. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions in line with 1.5°C to ensure emissions are reduced in line with the best chance of meeting the UK's Paris Agreement obligations;
3. Not only halting, but also reversing the decline in nature, setting nature measurably on the path to recovery by 2030;
4. Taking responsibility for our overseas footprint, both emissions and ecological;
5. Prioritising nature in decision-making, and ending fossil fuel production and imports as rapidly as possible;
6. Providing for re-training for those people currently working in fossil fuel industries; and
7. Giving the British people a say in finding a fair way forward via a temporary, independent and representative Climate & Nature Assembly, as part of creating consensus and ensuring that no one and no community is left behind.

This council therefore resolves to:

1. Support the Climate and ~~Ecology~~ Nature Bill;
2. Inform local residents and the local press of this decision;

3. Write to our MPs Daniel Zeichner & Anthony Browne to inform them ~~him~~ that this motion has been passed, and urge them both ~~him~~ to sign up to support the CE Bill.

4. Write to Zero Hour, the organisers of the cross-party campaign for the CE Bill, expressing Cambridge City Council's support.

5. Write to Sir Keir Starmer MP expressing Cambridge City Council's support for the bill and requesting that it be upgraded from a private members' bill to a government bill should there be a Labour government after the next general election.

Councillor Glasberg advised that her amendment to the motion had been withdrawn.

Resolved (unanimously):

Climate & Nature Bill

Humans have already caused irreversible climate change, the impacts of which are being felt in the UK, and across the world. The average global temperature has already increased by 1.2°C above pre-industrial levels and—alongside this—the natural world has reached crisis point, with 28% of plants and animals threatened with extinction. In addition, the UK is one of the most nature-depleted countries in the world as more than one in seven of our plants and animals face extinction, and more than 40% are in decline.

The Climate & Ecology Nature Bill (an updated version of the previous Climate & Ecology Bill and before that the CEE Bill), seeks to address the challenges that this situation poses by creating a whole-of-government approach to deliver a net zero and nature positive future.

The Bill aims to align current UK environmental policy with the need to halt and reverse nature loss by 2030, which was a goal agreed to at COP15,); and reduce greenhouse gas emissions in line with the UK's fair share of the remaining global carbon budget to give the strongest chance of limiting global heating to 1.5°C, which was the goal agreed to at COP21.

By bridging the gap between the UK Government's current delivery, and what has been agreed at international levels, Britain has a chance to be a world leader on climate and the environment; seizing the opportunities of the clean energy transition, including green jobs and skills; reduced energy bills; and boosting the UK's food and energy security.

This council notes that:

- This council declared a Climate Emergency in February 2019.
- This council declared a bio-diversity emergency in May 2019
- Cambridge is one of 119 Global Cities named Climate Action Leaders on the Carbon Disclosure Project 2023 A List. A-List cities are taking four times as many climate mitigation and adaptation measures as non-A Listers.
- Cambridge City Council is ranked second amongst all UK District councils by Climate Action Scorecards (run by Climate Emergency UK) on actions we have taken to reach net zero in 2023.
- In our Climate Change Strategy 2021-2026 we set a target for the Council to be net zero carbon in our direct emissions by 2030 and our Carbon Management Plan explains how we plan to achieve it.
- Our Change Strategy 2021-2026 also sets out a vision for Cambridge City to be net zero carbon by 2030 but we need a more ambitious policy framework and increased investment from national government in order to achieve that.

The Climate & Nature E Bill would require the UK Government to develop and achieve a new environmental strategy, which would include:

1. Delivering a joined-up environmental plan, as the crises in climate and nature are deeply intertwined, and require a plan that considers both together;
2. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions in line with 1.5°C to ensure emissions are reduced in line with the best chance of meeting the UK's Paris Agreement obligations;
3. Not only halting, but also reversing the decline in nature, setting nature measurably on the path to recovery by 2030;
4. Taking responsibility for our overseas footprint, both emissions and ecological;
5. Prioritising nature in decision-making, and ending fossil fuel production and imports as rapidly as possible;
6. Providing for re-training for those people currently working in fossil fuel industries; and
7. Giving the British people a say in finding a fair way forward via a temporary, independent and representative Climate & Nature Assembly, as part of creating consensus and ensuring that no one and no community is left behind.

This council therefore resolves to:

1. Support the Climate and Ecology Nature Bill;
2. Inform local residents and the local press of this decision;
3. Write to our MPs Daniel Zeichner & Anthony Browne to inform them that this motion has been passed, and urge them both to sign up to support the CE Bill.
4. Write to Zero Hour, the organisers of the cross-party campaign for the CE Bill, expressing Cambridge City Council's support.
5. Write to Sir Keir Starmer MP expressing Cambridge City Council's support for the bill and requesting that it be upgraded from a private members' bill to a government bill should there be a Labour government after the next general election.

24/53/CNL Councillor Glasberg - Climate and Nature Bill 2024

Under Council Procedure Rule 13.3.1 this motion was withdrawn.

24/54/CNL Councillor Bennett - Disability Rights UK 2024

Under Council Procedure Rule 26, Members agreed to accept the altered motion as submitted by Councillor Bennett (deleted text ~~struck through~~, additional text underlined).

Councillor Bennett proposed and Councillor Tong seconded the following motion:

The purpose of this motion is to raise awareness ~~and support the~~ of the developing 2024 Disabled People's Manifesto and to stand with disabled residents, their carers and their families in the face of the continuing national government's attack on their lives and rights.

The 2024 Disability Rights UK Manifesto is a four point plan to create a society where everyone has equal life chances and is valued and treated equally.

The four points are:

1. Representation and Voice

Removal of barriers for disabled people to participate in political and public life.

2. Rights

The full rights set out in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (“UNCRPD”)

3. Independence

The right to live independently with choice and control over the support given.

4. Inclusion

Plans for every aspect of life to address specific needs of disabled people from the outset.

Although Cambridge City Council is not a unitary authority and social services are provided by the county council, it is very much aware of the impact of the services that it does provide on the lives of disabled residents. Housing, the planning service and the public realm are critical to the life chances of disabled people. Even basic services such as contact with the public can present extra challenges to disabled people and carers.

The council accepts that it has an important part to play in supporting the lives of its disabled residents and indeed all the residents who are affected by their own or another person’s disability.

However, no council can do this work alone. Central government support is needed.

Accordingly, Cambridge City Council resolves to:

1. ~~Sign the Manifesto as an organisation~~ Refer the manifesto to the Council’s Equalities Panel for scrutiny and debate involving staff, resident representatives and councillors, and reporting back to the Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee on their discussions;
2. Raise awareness of the Local Government Association Disability Champions Network with both council officers and councillors.
3. Write to Daniel Zeichner MP and Anthony Browne MP to inform them that this motion has been passed ~~and urge them to sign the Manifesto;~~

4. Write to Sir Keir Starmer MP asking him to confirm his party's support for the Manifesto and opposition to the current government's proposed attacks on the dignity and rights of Disabled People

Further Reading

Disability Rights UK

<https://www.disabledpeoplesmanifesto.com/manifesto>

Local Government Disability Champions Network ("LGDCN")

<https://www.local.gov.uk/our-support/equalities-hub/local-government-disability-champions-network-lgdcn>

United Nations Convention On the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

<https://social.desa.un.org/issues/disability/crpd/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities-crpd>

Resolved (unanimously) that:

The purpose of this motion is to raise awareness of the developing_2024 Disabled People's Manifesto and to stand with disabled residents, their carers and their families in the face of the continuing national government's attack on their lives and rights.

The 2024 Disability Rights UK Manifesto is a four point plan to create a society where everyone has equal life chances and is valued and treated equally.

The four points are:

1. Representation and Voice

Removal of barriers for disabled people to participate in political and public life.

2. Rights

The full rights set out in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities ("UNCRPD")

3. Independence

The right to live independently with choice and control over the support given.

4. Inclusion

Plans for every aspect of life to address specific needs of disabled people from the outset.

Although Cambridge City Council is not a unitary authority and social services are provided by the county council, it is very much aware of the impact of the services that it does provide on the lives of disabled residents. Housing, the planning service and the public realm are critical to the life chances of disabled people. Even basic services such as contact with the public can present extra challenges to disabled people and carers.

The council accepts that it has an important part to play in supporting the lives of its disabled residents and indeed all the residents who are affected by their own or another person's disability.

However, no council can do this work alone. Central government support is needed.

Accordingly, Cambridge City Council resolves to:

1. Refer the manifesto to the Council's Equalities Panel for scrutiny and debate involving staff, resident representatives and councillors, and reporting back to the Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee on their discussions.
2. Raise awareness of the Local Government Association Disability Champions Network with both council officers and councillors.
3. Write to Daniel Zeichner MP and Anthony Browne MP to inform them that this motion has been passed.
4. Write to Sir Keir Starmer MP asking him to confirm his party's opposition to the current government's proposed attacks on the dignity and rights of Disabled People.

Further Reading

Disability Rights UK

<https://www.disabledpeoplesmanifesto.com/manifesto>

Local Government Disability Champions Network (“LGDCN”)

<https://www.local.gov.uk/our-support/equalities-hub/local-government-disability-champions-network-lgdcn>

United Nations Convention On the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

<https://social.desa.un.org/issues/disability/crpd/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities-crpd>

24/55/CNL Councillor Gilderdale - Motion on Palestine-Israel

Councillor Gilderdale proposed, and Councillor Divkovic seconded the following motion:

This Council notes:

- a. The City Council’s three previous statements ([19th October](#), [15th February](#), [29th February](#)) which condemned the attack by Hamas on the 7th October and called for ‘an immediate ceasefire, the return of hostages, unfettered access for humanitarian aid, peace in the Middle East, international support for a two-State solution and the upholding of international law.’
- b. That since October 7th, according to the Gaza health ministry, the present Israeli Government has [killed over 34,000 Palestinians, with over 77,000 wounded](#) and [10,000 feared buried under the rubble](#) in Gaza.
- c. That the [UN Secretary-General](#), [Amnesty International](#), [Human Rights Watch](#) and others have said that Israel has committed grave violations of international law in its assault on Palestine. [The International Court of Justice](#) has ruled that there was a risk of irreparable harm to the Palestinian right to be protected from genocide.
- d. [UN experts including Special Rapporteurs Ben Saul, Margaret Satterthwaite and Independent Expert Cecilia Bailliet have warned](#) that ‘any transfer of weapons or ammunition to Israel that would be used in

- Gaza is likely to violate international humanitarian law and must cease immediately’.
- e. That the UK continues to sell arms to Israel which are being used in the ongoing conflict. They may be used in a way that creates further human suffering and prolong the conflict. By providing arms and military support to Israel, the [UK Government could be complicit in this catastrophe](#).
 - f. [That since 2015, the UK has licensed](#) at least [£474 million](#) worth of military exports to Israel, including components for combat aircrafts, missiles, tanks, technology, small arms and ammunition. The [UK provides approximately 15% of the components](#) in the [F-35 stealth bomber aircraft](#) currently being used in Gaza.
 - g. In 2009, under a Labour government, [the UK suspended arms licenses for naval guns due to their use against civilians in Gaza](#). In 2014, under a Conservative-led government, the UK [said it would suspend licenses](#) if hostilities resumed in Gaza.
 - h. [A cross-party group of 134 parliamentarians](#) have signed a letter to Foreign Secretary David Cameron and Business Secretary Kemi Badenoch MP, asking for them to immediately suspend export licenses for arms transfers to Israel.
 - i. On 8th May 2024, [President Biden confirmed that the US had blocked an arms shipment](#) of thousands of heavy bombs to Israel over fears that they could be used during Israel’s military operation in Rafah. Following this news, [a former UK national security adviser has criticised Rishi Sunak](#) for failing to suspend arms sales to Israel.

This Council calls on the current and any future UK Government to:

- a. Press for an immediate and permanent ceasefire in Gaza, Israel and the rest of Palestine and to make every effort to resume the peace process.
- b. Work to ensure that international humanitarian law is upheld and that civilians are protected in accordance with those laws.
- c. Work to ensure that civilians have access to humanitarian support, including unfettered access of medical supplies, food, fuel and water.
- d. To immediately revoke all licences for arms exports to Israel and suspend arms sales to Israel.

In addition, this Council will:

- a. Investigate the implications of stopping banking with Barclays - which is [known for investing over £2 billion in](#), and providing financial services to companies arming Israel worth £6.1 billion - and instead banking with an ethical bank.
- b. Continue to condemn all forms of Islamophobia and Antisemitism and work to champion a city free from hate, including in the Council's work to make Cambridge a City of Sanctuary.

Resolved (unanimously) to support the motion.

24/56/CNL Written questions

Members were asked to note the written questions and answers that had been placed in the information pack circulated around the Chamber.

The meeting ended at 5.50 pm

CHAIR