

Public Document Pack

Council

Cnl/1

Monday, 24 February 2025

COUNCIL

24 February 2025

6.00-10.30 pm

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

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

25/1/CNL Minutes

The minutes of the meetings on 10 October 2024 and 28 November 2024 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

25/2/CNL Mayor's announcements

Apologies were received from Councillor Dryden, Councillor A Smith and Councillor Todd-Jones.

Councillor Carling gave apologies for lateness.

Recent events the Mayor had attended:

- i. The Chevin Sermon on the 19 January at the Church of Our Lady of The Assumption and the English Martyrs, led by the Mayor's Chaplain Monsignor Harkness.
- ii. Wintercomfort for the Homeless at Overstream House to see how the organisation operated.
- iii. The Holocaust Memorial candle lighting that took place in the Council Chamber of the Guildhall on 28 January.

The Mayor then gave a list of upcoming events.

- i. The Mayor's Quiz taking place on 26 February to raise funds for Street Aid & Give us a Lift.
- ii. The Mayor's Reception taking place on 21 March.

25/3/CNL Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
------	------	----------

Councillor Glasberg	25/20/CNLa	Member of South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum.
Councillor Clough	25/20/CNLa	Member of South Newnham Neighbourhood Forum.
Councillor Baigent	All	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Sheil	25/18/CNL	Unison Member and Adult Social Care Administrator.
Councillor Bird	25/18/CNL	Member of Unison.
Councillor Bird	25/8/CNL	Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) Board Member.
Councillor Holloway	25/20/CNLa	Is a Newnham Ward Councillor and in the run up to the referendum on the South Newnham Neighbourhood Plan put a note out to residents to vote against the Plan. But came to the matter of making / adopting the South Newnham Neighbourhood Plan afresh.
Councillor Thornburrow	25/18/CNL	Member of Unison.
Councillor Porrer	25/18/CNL	Member of Unison.
Councillor Blackburn-Horgan	25/18/CNL	Member of Unison
Councillor Blackburn-Horgan	All	Member of Cambridge cycling Campaign.
Councillor S Smith	25/8/CNL	Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) Board Member.
Councillor Tong	All	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Hossain	25/10/CNL	Member of Mill Road Friends Group.
Councillor Moore	25/8/CNL	Two of her children worked at the Leisure Centre.

25/4/CNL Petition - Saving Cambridge Market

The Petition Organiser spoke in support of the petition and made the following points:

- i. They made jewellery and has sold it on the market for 25 years.
- ii. Represented the Cambridge Market Traders Association which had 80 members, as well as the 2000 Friends of Cambridge Market.
- iii. The petition asked the Council to scrap its Civic Quarter proposals which proposed the removal of all 99 permanent stalls from the market and the replacement of 27 permanent stalls and 61 temporary gazebos.
- iv. The Council had said the proposal was being done to provide entertainment space in the square. Believed the need for this entertainment space had not been proven and there were other open spaces in Cambridge better suited to holding events, such as Midsummer Common and Parker's Piece.
- v. Signatures were collected by shoppers who came to the market stalls. More than 1800 signatures were collected in 8 weeks.
- vi. People who signed the petition were telling the Council that they do not support the current Civic Quarter plans. They understood how great an asset the market is and how important it is to the city of Cambridge.
- vii. Reducing the number of permanent stalls to 27 would harm the market.
- viii. Asked for a minimum of 54 permanent stalls as that is how many were needed for the businesses who currently operated on the market five days a week. Some larger businesses used two or three stalls for their products.
- ix. Reasons why gazebos would harm the current businesses on the market included:
 - a. There was no guarantee that the Council would employ enough people in the long term to keep putting gazebos up and down. If the Council ran out of money, staff cuts may be made and there would be no stalls to trade on.
 - b. The City Council would cease to exist in 2028 and they did not know whether any future unitary authority would continue to support the market project.
 - c. Had not been advised about the events that would take place on the market. Did not know when they would happen and how they would affect market trader businesses, so they couldn't make any plans. Would market traders be cleared out of the market on a regular basis? What time would market trading need to close before evening events? Could market traders survive this loss of income?
 - d. Remained concerned about the flimsy nature of the gazebos and if market traders would have a safe electrical supply.
 - e. It was not clear how the Council reached a decision to have 27 permanent stalls. The project said this figure had come from

- monitoring the uptake of stalls over a period of time. The time period was unknown and may have been affected by covid.
- f. The market had been under a cloud of uncertainty for the past 7 years. This has taken its toll on the number of new businesses coming on the market and had caused the market to shrink. Craft people who wanted to trade on the market had been put off by the Civic Quarter proposals.
 - x. Asked for at least 54 permanent stalls and a contract that bound the Council to erecting sufficient stalls for the market.

Councillors debated the issues raised for the allocated 15 minutes.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources made the following comments in response to the debate:

- i. The Council was committed to having a thriving 7-day a week market. This was the reason why it was investing in its refurbishment.
- ii. The facilities needed improving.
- iii. The road surface of the market made accessing the market difficult for those with disabilities.
- iv. The anti-social behaviour in the area needed to be addressed.
- v. Was confident a scheme which was satisfactory to all parties could be delivered but this needed to be undertaken by a step-by-step process.
- vi. The Council was listening to the concerns raised by the market traders.
- vii. Wanted to breathe fresh life into the market.

25/5/CNL Public questions time

Members of the public asked the following questions, as set out below.

Question 1:

- i. Clientelism and patronage networks extending between purportedly independent public authorities had the potential to allow public officials to escape institutional and legal restrictions and to misuse state powers for improper purposes. This could have catastrophic consequences for public confidence in the integrity of our democratic institutions.
- ii. Over the past several years, serious concerns have been raised about the improper involvement of elected officials in operational policing matters in Cambridgeshire. When the Police and Crime Commissioner was unwilling to address this issue, concerns were raised by members of the Police and Crime Panel.

- iii. Rather than addressing those concerns, the concerned panel members were simply purged from the panel using the system of patronage networks operated by local authorities and local political parties.
- iv. Does the Mayor of Cambridge have confidence that the majority political group at this council is committed to ensuring that the democratic process in Cambridgeshire is not subject to improper police interference, and if so, can the Mayor of Cambridge please explain why this council's representative on the Police and Crime Panel has been unwilling to meet with representatives of my organisation to discuss this important issue?

The Leader said the following:

- i. Encouraged the public speaker, if they had evidence to substantiate their claims to report this to the appropriate authorities in relation to the matter raised. Noted that the City Council's representative on the Police and Crime Panel had already advised how this could be done.

The speaker made the following supplementary points:

- i. Noted following publication of the list of public questions for the Council meeting, that the College of Policing released information about the operational issues which had been raised and that the Police and Crime Panel could consider this at a future public meeting.

The Leader made the following supplementary points:

- i. Would liaise with the City Council's representative on the Police and Crime Panel about the information which had been released by the College of Policing as they may not be aware of it.

Question 2:

- i. Residents who get Housing Benefit paid by Cambridge City Council were concerned that their service charges (the mandatory fee levied by the housing association or management company) were artificially high or inflated beyond a reasonable amount for services provided.
- ii. Public money was used to pay these charges when the resident is entitled to housing benefit. Does the Council know how much public money went towards service charges in 2023/24 and does the Council scrutinise service charges and ensure they are legitimate?

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources said the following:

- i. It wasn't possible to readily identify how much public money was being spent on service charges as some charges were included within eligible rent figures and others were split into relevant service charges.

- ii. The City Council made payments for eligible service charges in accordance with Regulations.
- iii. Many service charges the Council had determined as being eligible and reasonable were fully covered by the Housing Benefit subsidy from the Department of Work and Pensions, which did not impact on the Council's finances.
- iv. Eligible service charges were scrutinised by experienced Officers, both when new a setting started and when rents were annually reviewed.
- v. There were different rules for charitable landlords and temporary accommodation tenancies.

The speaker made the following supplementary points:

- i. During their campaigning work, queried how charges could be justified, particularly where there were no additional needs or requirements. This affected people who wanted to move out of larger properties into over 55 years accommodation.
- ii. Questioned how charges were approved and paid.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources said the following in response to the supplementary statement:

- i. New settings were scrutinised to ensure that service charges were in accordance with Regulations and were eligible and reasonable. Landlords were required to demonstrate this before payment could be made.
- ii. Service charges were reviewed when annual increases were notified to the council.
- iii. Providers had to provide the following:
 - a. they were applying the subscribed increase in the core rent;
 - b. the service charge looked reasonable both in percentage terms and expenses being covered;
 - c. the service charge remained eligible for housing benefit.
- iv. Was happy to speak further with the public speaker outside of the meeting.

Question 3:

- i. Was the closure of the public toilets a forgone conclusion?
- ii. Have the Council thought of the impact on disabled members of the public. The impact on disabled people not having access to public toilets is monumental. Not all shops/cafes were accommodating and there's massive anxiety and pressure to purchase goods just to use the toilet.
- iii. Please consider these before a decision is made to close vital amenities which could potentially deter disabled people from coming into the city.

The Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services responded with the following:

- i. Recognised the need for accessible facilities and remained committed to ensuring that disabled individuals were not disproportionately affected.
- ii. Closures were proposed where there was consistent low use of the facilities. This ensured that high demand facilities remained open and well maintained.
- iii. A recent £1.1 million capital investment had improved accessibility and modernised high use sites.
- iv. Under the proposals the Council would have 10 Council operated public toilets sites, with changing places facilities at the Clay Farm Centre and the Meadows Community Centre.
- v. Noted other toilet facilities within the city centre.
- vi. Cambridge had better public toilet provision compared with other comparable cities including Norwich and Oxford.
- vii. Data from 'toiletmap.org.uk' indicated that the city had 52 public toilets, with 12 designated as accessible for disabled users.
- viii. Welcomed feedback as decisions were made regarding public amenities.

The speaker made the following supplementary points:

- i. Noted that a consultation had taken place but asked why the Council had disregarded its own survey which said that 61% of the respondents opposed the closure of public toilets.
- ii. As part of the consultation, residents were asked to rank which public toilets were used the most.
- iii. Residents were not given the choice regarding which toilets should remain open.
- iv. Noted reference to other public toilets in the city but commented that the toilets in the Grafton Centre were due to close for refurbishment.
- v. Noted that not all toilets had accessible parameters so they could be used by disabled people.

The Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services responded to the supplementary points:

- i. Noted 42.9% of respondents to the consultation opposed the closure of under-used toilets.
- ii. Noted investment by the council in toilet facilities including: £540,000 for Silver Street toilets, £492,000 for upgrades at Coleridge Recreation Ground, Chesterton Recreation Ground, Jesus Green, Christ Pieces and Cherry Hinton Hall. £100,000 was dedicated for installing changing places facilities at Christ Pieces and Cherry Hinton Hall.

- iii. Priority was to ensure high-quality, well used toilets remained open and accessible, while aligning with public feedback in accordance with responsible budget management.

Question 4:

- i. Operational Staff working in Streets and Open Spaces already have to regularly clear up human faeces and wash down urine from the market square, nearby alley-ways and other areas to keep the city healthy and safe for residents.
- ii. Unison would like to know how the reduction of approximately 13% fewer staff working in the operational teams of Streets and Open Spaces, which is represented in this budget proposal, would be able to cope with the results of removal of the 3 public toilets at Gonville Place, Quayside and Midsummer Common, because Unison predict that this decision will lead to further use of our streets and open spaces as toilets?

The Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services responded:

- i. There was no evidence that removing three under used toilets would result in the misuse of public spaces.
- ii. Public toilets needed to be well placed and in good condition for people to feel able to use them.
- iii. The Council had invested £1.1 million in public toilet infrastructure recently.
- iv. The Council managed more public toilets than other councils of a similar size.
- v. The Council was exploring opportunities to see whether toilet facilities could be passed on to other organisations to run.
- vi. The Civic Quarter project would consider if toilets could be made more accessible in the Guildhall.
- vii. The rapid response function in the city centre would continue, this was supported by Cambridge Bid funding to maintain public health and cleanliness.
- viii. People with street-based lifestyles had access to toilets and showers at Winter Comfort and The Haven.
- ix. 68% of respondents to the Budget Setting Report consultation supported a reduction in the frequency of mowing and leaf collection in some areas to save on maintenance costs and promote biodiversity.

The speaker made the following supplementary points:

- i. Operational staff who maintained open spaces began work at 6am and travelled throughout the city. They weren't the only people who started

work early other examples included bus drivers, delivery drivers and taxi drivers who all needed access to toilet facilities.

- ii. If staff were working at Parkers Piece or Midsummer Common either walking or driving to toilet facilities could easily take 20 minutes out of their work schedule.
- iii. During the refurbishment of Jesus Green toilets, even fewer options would be available for those working in the city's parks.
- iv. The Equalities Impact Assessment did not consider the needs of the Council staff or other people who shared these characteristics.
- v. Was disappointed that frontline staff were being treated differently to those who were office based and were making decisions to reduce staffing.
- vi. Was aware that the Council needed to agree a balanced budget but believed there was more than one way of doing that. Could not believe that the Council couldn't afford to keep toilets open. Asked the Council to reconsider its position on toilet closures.

The Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services responded:

- i. A lot of thought had gone into the proposal.
- ii. The city had a network of around 50 publicly accessible toilets, the majority of which were free to use.
- iii. Had historically spent more per capita on public toilets than any other District Council in England.
- iv. Toilet use would be kept under review as part of the cleaning and maintenance program.
- v. The data driven approach ensured that resources were directed to where they were most needed.
- vi. Maintenance and Rapid Response Teams remained in place to address challenges where they emerged.
- vii. Did not expect any impact on operational staff. Toilets in Mandela House were available instead of the toilets at Gonville Place. Toilets were available at Jesus Green instead of Midsummer Common.

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used their discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the published agenda.

25/6/CNL To consider Budget Recommendations of the Executive for adoption

25/7/CNL HRA Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2025/26

The Executive presented its Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget Setting Report (BSR) as set out in the Council Agenda.

The Liberal Democrat Group presented their Group's HRA BSR proposals as set out in the Information Pack circulated around the Chamber and published on the City Council's website.

The Green Group spoke to their budget commentary as published in the Information Pack and circulated around the Chamber and published on the City Council's website.

A vote on the Liberal Democrat Group's HRA BSR proposals was lost by 11 votes to 24 votes with 4 abstentions.

Resolved to agree the Executive's HRA BSR proposals by 23 votes to 2 with 14 abstentions to:

- i. Approve that council dwellings rents for all social rented and social shared ownership properties be increased in line with government guidelines, with an increase of 2.7%, being inflation as measured by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) at September 2024 of 1.7%, plus 1%. Rent increases will take effect from 1 April 2025. This equates to an average rent increase of £3.37 per week.
- ii. Approve that affordable housing rents, inclusive of service charge, are also increased by 2.7% in line with the increase for social rents. This equates to an average rent increase of £5.06 per week.
- iii. Approve that rents for affordable shared ownership properties are increased by RPI as at September 2024, 2.7% plus 0.5%, as allowed for in the lease requirements for these properties.
- iv. Approve that garage and parking space charges for 2025/26 are increased by inflation at 2.7%, in line with dwelling rents, and approve changes in charges for parking permits, as set out at table 10 on page 28 of the attached Housing Revenue Account Business Plan Update and Budget Setting Report 2025/26.
- v. Approve the proposed service charges for Housing Revenue Account services and facilities, as shown in Appendix D of the attached Housing Revenue Account Business Plan Update and Budget Setting Report 2025/26.
- vi. Approve the proposed leasehold administration charges for 2025/26, as detailed in Appendix D of the attached Housing Revenue Account Business Plan Update and Budget Setting Report 2025/26.

- vii. Approve that service charges continue to be recovered at full estimated cost, as detailed in Appendix D of the attached Housing Revenue Account Business Plan Update and Budget Setting Report 2025/26, recognising that local authorities should endeavour to limit increases to inflation as measured by CPI at September 2024 (1.7%) plus 1%, wherever possible.
- viii. Approve the revenue savings, pressures and bids set out at Appendix F of the attached Housing Revenue Account Business Plan Update and Budget Setting Report 2025/26.
- ix. Approve the resulting Housing Revenue Account revenue budget as summarised at table 5 on page 20 of the attached Housing Revenue Account Business Plan Update and Budget Setting Report 2025/26.
- x. Approve the capital bid set out at Appendix F of the attached Housing Revenue Account Business Plan Update and Budget Setting Report 2025/26.
- xi. Approve the updated Housing Capital Investment Plan as shown at Appendix E of the attached Housing Revenue Account Business Plan Update and Budget Setting Report 2025/26.
- xii. Approve the proposed approach to financing the Housing Capital Investment Plan as set out at table 11 on page 31 of the attached Housing Revenue Account Business Plan Update and Budget Setting Report 2025/26.
- xiii. Approved the revised need to borrow over the life of the Business Plan, to sustain the proposed level of capital investment, which includes delivery of the 10 Year New Homes Programme.
- xiv. Recognise that the constitution delegates Treasury Management to the Chief Finance Officer (Part 3, para 5.11), with Part 4F, C16 stating; 'All executive decisions on borrowing, investment or financing shall be delegated to the Chief Finance Officer, who is required to act in accordance with CIPFA's Code of Practice for Treasury Management in Local Authorities'.
- xv. Recognise that the decision to borrow significantly to build new homes impacts the council's ability to set-aside resource to redeem the HRA Self-Financing debt at the point at which the loan portfolio matures, resulting in a need to re-finance debt at the point of maturity.
- xvi. Approve the inclusion of a capital budget for Disabled Facilities Grant expenditure and associated grant income from 2025/26 onwards, based upon 2024/25 net grant awarded, with delegation to the Chief Finance Officer to approve an in year increase or decrease in this budget in any year, in direct relation to any increase or decrease in the capital grant funding available for this purpose, as received from Cambridgeshire County Council through the Better Care Fund.

- xvii. Approve the delegation to the Chief Finance Officer, as Section 151 Officer, to determine the most appropriate use of any additional Disabled Facilities Grant funding, for the wider benefit of the Shared Home Improvement Agency.
- xviii. Approve the delegation to the Director of Communities to review and amend the level of fees charged by the Shared Home Improvement Agency for Disabled Facilities Grants and repair assistance grants, in line with any recommendations made by the Shared Home Improvement Agency Board.
- xix. Approve the delegation to the relevant Director, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer, to draw down resource from the ear-marked revenue reserve or capital reserve for potential debt redemption or re-investment, for the purpose of open market land or property acquisition or new build housing development, should the need arise, in order to meet deadlines for the use of retained right to buy receipts or to facilitate future site redevelopment.
- xx. Approve the delegation to the Chief Finance Officer to make any necessary technical amendments to detailed budgets in respect of recharges between the General Fund and the HRA.

25/8/CNL General Fund Budget Setting Report 2025/26 to 2029/30

The Executive presented its budget recommendations as set out in the Council Agenda. [Agenda for Council on Monday, 24th February, 2025, 6.00 pm - Cambridge Council](#)

The Liberal Democrat Group presented the Liberal Democrat Group's alternative budget as set out in the Information Pack circulated around the Chamber and published on the City Council's website.

The Green Group spoke to their budget commentary as set out in the Information Pack circulated around the Chamber and published on the City Council's website.

Under the Council's budget procedure, the Liberal Democrat Group's alternative budget was deemed to have been moved and seconded as an amendment.

A vote on the Liberal Democrat Group's alternative budget amendment was lost by:

10 votes in favour: Councillors Bick, Blackburn-Horgan, Flaubert, Hauk, Hossain, Lee, Martinelli, Payne, Porrer, Young

To 22 votes against: Councillors Baigent, Bird, Carling, Davey, Divkovic, Gardiner-Smith, Gawthroe Wood, Gilderdale, Griffin, Holloway, McPherson, Moore, Nestor, Pounds, Robertson, Sheil, Smart, S Smith, Swift, Thittala, Thornburrow, Wade.

5 Abstentions: Councillors Ashton, Bennett, Clough, Howard, Tong

In accordance with the Council's budget procedure, Councillor Bick moved a separate vote on the Liberal Democrat budget proposal v) Public Toilets. The amendment sought to suspend savings proposal S5257 (Reduction in the Provision of Public Toilets) in its entirety for a six-month period. Cost of proposal: One-off cost of £60,500 in 2025/26.

The proposal was lost by:

15 votes in favour: Councillors Ashton, Bennett, Bick, Blackburn-Horgan, Clough, Flaubert, Hauk, Hossain, Howard, Lee, Martinelli, Payne, Porrer, Tong, Young

To 21 votes against: Councillors Baigent, Bird, Carling, Davey, Divkovic, Gardiner-Smith, Gawthroe Wood, Gilderdale, Griffin, Holloway, Moore, Nestor, Pounds, Robertson, Sheil, Smart, S Smith, Swift, Thittala, Thornburrow, Wade.

1 Abstention: Councillor McPherson

Unless otherwise stated, all references in the recommendations to sections, pages and appendices relate to the Council Version of the Budget Setting Report (BSR).

This can be found via: [Agenda for Council on Monday, 24th February, 2025, 6.00 pm - Cambridge Council](#)

Councillor Moore clarified a typographical error in Appendix I – Review of Charges. In the Shared Waste table of charges on p391 of the Council agenda, reference to '2nd' in relation to additional blue bins should be deleted. Charges were only to apply to additional 3rd and 4th blue bins.

Resolved by:

22 votes in favour: Councillors Baigent, Bird, Carling, Davey, Divkovic, Gardiner-Smith, Gawthrope Wood, Gilderdale, Griffin, Holloway, McPherson, Moore, Nestor, Pounds, Robertson, Sheil, Smart, S Smith, Swift, Thittala, Thornburrow, Wade.

To 13 votes against: Councillors Bennett, Bick, Blackburn-Horgan, Clough, Flaubert, Hauk, Hossain, Howard, Martinelli, Payne, Porrer, Tong, Young

1 Abstention: Councillor Ashton

To approve the Executive's budget proposals to:

- i. Approve the revenue pressures and bids shown in Appendix D(a) and the revenue savings and increased income shown in Appendix D(b).
- ii. Delegate to the Chief Finance Officer the calculation and determination of the council tax taxbase which is set out at Appendix A(a).
- iii. Approve the increase to the city council share of council tax for 2025/26 at 2.99%, and the updated council tax levels as set out on page 17 of the attached Budget Setting Report 2025/26.
- iv. Delegate authority to the Chief Finance Officer to reallocate budgets between services in relation to corporate and/or departmental restructuring, and any reallocation of support service and central costs in accordance with the CIPFA Service Reporting Code of Practice for Local Authorities (SeRCOP).
- v. Approve the capital proposals set out at Appendix E(a), the revised capital plan set out at Appendix E(c), and the revised capital funding approach set out on page 28 of the attached Budget Setting Report 2025/26.
- vi. Approve the Capital Strategy 2025/26 attached at Appendix H.
- vii. Note the impact of budget proposals upon General Fund unallocated reserves, as set out on page 34 of the attached Budget Setting Report 2025/26.
- viii. Note the key risks to the council's financial sustainability highlighted in the table on pages 30-31 of the attached Budget Setting Report 2025/26.
- ix. Approve in principle a contribution to the Civic Quarter Development Reserve equivalent to the net underspend against budget for the 2024/25 financial year (currently forecast at £4.0 million).
- x. Approve transfers to earmarked reserves totalling £6.602 million in 2025/26 as set out on pages 32-33 of the attached Budget Setting Report 2025/26.

- xi. Note the Chief Finance Officer's Section 25 Report, covering the robustness of estimates and adequacy of reserves, included at section 7 of the attached Budget Setting Report 2025/26.
- xii. Approve the Treasury Management Strategy 2025/26 attached at Appendix G, including the prudential and treasury management indicators set out at Annexe C.
- xiii. Approve a change to the maturity structure prudential indicator, such that all new borrowing will have a maturity of at least 5 years (rather than the previous 10 years), as explained at paragraph 3.8 of Appendix G.
- xiv. Reconfirm that the incomes below will be disregarded (if above the £10 statutory disregard) when calculating entitlement to housing benefit and/or council tax reduction. These schemes are often called local or modified schemes:
 - War disablement pension
 - War widow, widower or surviving civil partner pension
 - Armed Forces Independence PaymentNote that the estimated cost to the council for payments of housing benefit made under the local scheme is £1,777.50 and for council tax reduction less than £50.
- xv. Note the Equality Impact Assessment in Appendix F covering all General Fund budget proposals.
- xvi. Note the schedule of proposed fees and charges for 2025/26 in Appendix I(i) and Confidential Appendix I(ii).

Councillor Davey proposed and Councillor Bennett seconded a motion to consider and determine agenda items 7a, 7b and 7c and then to defer the remaining business to the next Council meeting taking place on the 17 March 2025.

Resolved (by 24 votes to 11 with 1 abstention) to consider and determine agenda items 7a, 7b and 7c and then to defer the remaining business to the next Council meeting taking place on the 17 March 2025.

25/9/CNL To consider the recommendations of Committees for adoption

25/10/CNL Licensing Committee - Review of Gambling Statement of Principles

Resolved (by 37 votes to 1) to:

- i. Approve the draft Statement of Gambling Principles shown in Appendix A of the Officer's report.

25/11/CNL Civic Affairs Committee - Pay Policy Changes and Draft Pay Policy Statement 2025/26

Resolved (by 36 votes to 1) to:

- i. Approve the draft Pay Policy Statement 2025/2026 attached to the Officer's report as Appendix 1.

25/12/CNL Employment Senior Officer Committee - Our Cambridge Group Redesign - Summary of Implementation and Consideration of Termination/Exit Costs

Resolved (by 38 votes to 0) to:

- i. Approve individual termination costs over £100k arising from the Group Design due to contractual severance.

25/13/CNL To deal with oral questions

Item deferred to 17 March 2025 council meeting.

25/14/CNL To consider the following notices of motion, notice of which has been given by:**25/15/CNL Councillor Porrer - Improving the Delivery of High Quality Local Development**

Item deferred to 17 March 2025 council meeting.

25/16/CNL Councillor Tong - Barriers to Cambridge Growth 2025

Item deferred to 17 March 2025 council meeting.

25/17/CNL Councillor Hossain - Opposition to a Blanket 20mph Speed Limit Zone in Cambridge

Item deferred to 17 March 2025 council meeting.

25/18/CNL Councillor Sheil - A National Care Service for England - national UNISON campaign

Item deferred to 17 March 2025 council meeting.

25/19/CNL Written questions

There were no written questions.

25/20/CNL Officer Decisions

11a To consider - Officer recommendation - South Newnham Neighbourhood Plan - Making (adopting) the Neighbourhood Plan

Resolved (by 38 votes to 1) to:

- i. Note the results of the referendum for the South Newnham Neighbourhood Plan that took place on 16 January 2025.
- ii. Make (adopt) the South Newnham Neighbourhood Plan as part of the Local Development Plan for the area as it was a successful referendum. The made version of the plan was attached as Appendix 1 to the Officer's report.

11b To note - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority-Appointment of the Council's Audit and Governance Committee reserve (substitute) member

Item deferred to 17 March 2025 council meeting.

11c To note - Appointment of Cambridge City Council Representatives to the Conservators of the River Cam

Item deferred to 17 March 2025 council meeting.

11d To note - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority-Appointment of 1 x member to the CPCA's Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Item deferred to 17 March 2025 council meeting.

The meeting ended at 10.30pm.

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank