

List of Public Questions 24 July 2025 Council

Question 1:

What measures will the council take to resolve persistent Anti-Social Behaviour on housing association property where the housing association refuses to bring the behaviour to an end?

Question 2:

From March 2025 Cambridge City Council has had a contract with Re-Gen Ltd, to take all our blue bin recycling to Warrenpoint in Northern Ireland for sorting. I object strongly to the length of this trip, 400 miles, and the contribution to global warming of all the diesel that the lorries burn on this trip. In this case, the ends definitely do NOT justify the means!

On 28th February 2025 Cambridge City Council stated that "The Re-Gen MRF is based in Newry, Northern Ireland, so initially this is where the blue bin recycling will be taken for sorting. However, Re-Gen says that 'within the first half of this year, it will take over a MRF on the UK mainland. This will negate the need to transport the recycling to Northern Ireland.' "

What has happened to this plan for our blue bin recycling to go to a new MRF in England? Please give me updates on progress with this plan?

Question 3:

November 2024 -To the Council, question on the important issue of HMO Motion - actions on report, Article 4, register, SPDs:

Full Council used the provision on the important HMO motion "to move to the next business" thus curtailing debate. If this had not have happened,

and Cllr Porrer NOT given the floor, we may have had more answers and action. Action for communities now requesting the need for permitted developed rights to be removed, SPDs to be approved. An Article 4 Report to be produced, with a commitment to get a Landlord Register for HMOs of 2+ units up and running NOW. All with an aim to establish balanced cohesive communities, with a mixed tenure, existing across Cambridge. This would stop areas being ravaged by HMOs, sweeping up all their small family housing, decimating mixed tenure communities.

November 2024: Council was asked and agreed to consider a Register of all Landlords of HMOs, of more than 2 units, via a report on an Article 4 directive produced by the summer of 2025. Where are the agreed actions at - NINE MONTHS LATER?

Having lived in Cambridge for decades, I and people in the communities I talk to are very disappointed in the Council's failures, in relation to HMOs. This is a pivotal part of the housing market, meant to be affordable and a stepping stone on the housing ladder. There also appears to be a lack of protection for tenants' rights in HMOs. Rents as high as £1,030 for a single roomper month, living with up to nine strangers. HMO growth is decimating housing tenure and community cohesion in Cambridge. Where is the Council's commitment and enforcement, of balanced neighbourhoods with decent standards and affordable housing for CAMBRIDGE RESIDENTS???

There are national recommendations for decent housing standards. To have no more that 10% of HMOs in a street, and no sandwiching, whereby one HMO is not within 100m, or next door to another HMO (of more than 2+ units). There is massive impact on the communities the HMOs sit

within. This is compounded when whole estates and streets are not complying with the 10%, instead have from 30-70% of HMOs across the City of Cambridge. Surely there is a commitment to good environmental practices to reduce the impacts of waste, parking stress, noise, pollution and anti-social behaviours a possible increase in crime that can be hidden in plain sight. Not to mention the excessive comings and goings of people and vehicles. (Way above those of regular tenured households) A transient population is no guarantee of stability and may not necessarily become part of the community and its cohesion. Many local residents in our community want 2 and 3 bed homes, as others seeking to work or settle. They cannot rent or buy such properties, as they are being taken out and turned into 4 -10 unit bed HMOs. No one can compete to either rent or purchase homes, such as a small family or a couple. Housing stock is being removed on mass as HMOs, and there is no accurate record or map of locations as to what is happening within our city. 8s Cambridge the city of GREED NOT NEED?

The Council needs to get a grip and control. Make HMOs to a high standard, perhaps encouraging developers to consider the provision of purpose-built HMOs, fit for purpose. This should be part of affordable standard homes delivery. Fair realistic controlled rents, thus stopping the break down and imbalance of Cambridge's communities. They could be based in specific locations where needs arise. This would show a Council commitment to spread HMOs of more than 2 units equally across roads, wards and the city.

So what is the Council doing to stop the decimation of our communities, whilst protecting the most vulnerable and those living in our society who

want decent homes. Where is your report, consideration of Article 4 and SPD's for HMOs. Where is The Register of all HMOs Landlords who own 2-10 units at vast profit? This request is for the Council to commit to the actions it agreed to NINE MONTHS AGO and report back to the public by the summer as agreed last November. Awaiting reply with some action and answers on this important issue. PROVE WE ARE A CITY OF NEED NOT GREED - Are we?

Question 4:

I am here to alert all Councillors to issues with public involvement in the Civic Quarter project, particularly in relation to the Market Square. The only 2 advertised public consultation meetings were in an obscure back room of the Guildhall, and in the Coleridge community hall. The trial demountable stalls, on which the Market Square proposals depend, only arrived for the last 2 weeks of the consultation period. There has been continual very misleading information, as one group is told one thing and another group is told something else. Feedback from the trial stalls, which were instantly revealed to be unfit for purpose, was reported to last week's Traders' meeting, along with a "Work in Progress" revised layout, but not to the Liaison Group earlier the same afternoon. I only know this because, after officers tried to exclude me from the Traders' meeting, the traders unanimously asked me to stay. Cllr Moore was quoted in that morning's Cambridge Independent saying that the number of permanent stalls would be increased to 44, but this was not disclosed to the Liaison Group. There is still no sign whatever of any viable demountable stalls, yet officers are rushing headlong towards a planning application.

And are Councillors aware that the project intends to sweep away all the existing stalls, and with them, our traditional market? Our change.org

petition "Please help us to Save Cambridge's traditional locals' market, and its traders" shows that people do not want to lose the vital services and intangible heritage of their traditional market. Our petition now has nearly 900 signatures, showing that people from near and far want to keep Cambridge's traditional market. We need our Councillors to act to prevent our traditional market from being swept away.

Question 5:

Earlier this week the Daily Telegraph drew attention to the plight of at least forty Palestinian students - including students with offers to Cambridge University - who are unable to take up offers of scholarships at UK universities because the government is insisting that they complete biometric verification in order to get a visa, despite there being no visa office in Gaza and no possibility for them to travel to neighbouring countries to fulfil the requirement.

Authorities in France, Ireland and Italy have waived the visa requirement in order to bring students from Gaza but so far neither the Foreign Office nor the Home Office have responded to requests to do so.

One of the students, nineteen-year old Malak Hani, has a full scholarship to study here in Cambridge, at Downing College. Like the other Gaza students, Malak has overcome unimaginable odds to achieve her place at Cambridge. She has the full support of Professor Graham Virgo, Master of the College, and local MPs including Andrew Pakes, MP for Peterborough, have spoken out in her favour.

As a student at Cambridge University myself I ask the council to add its voice to those calling on the government to show its concern and find a

way to let Malak and other students from Gaza take up the places they have earned at British universities.

The university, and Cambridge as a whole, will benefit from having her here during her studies, and she will be able to take advantage of the chance of an education that she has worked so hard for.

Question 6:

Following recent concerns raised in the National Media in relation to Uber and many delivery services, and following TFL's decision to revoke Ubers licence to operate on the grounds Safety Violations, Unauthorized Drivers, Impersonation of Drivers, Insurance Issues, Lack of Confidence in Future Safety", What proactive measures do the Council have in place to monitor and remove fraudulent behaviour / persons and offer safety to the public in Cambridge?

Question 7:

Tax payers alliance said that they had campaigned rigorously regarding the campaign against WFH

Was this the case during the Council Elections in May 2024 and any elections in 2025

When it would seem the PUBLIC had plenty of opportunity to discuss this subject with the Candidates and NOT vote for any who wanted to maintain this WFH regime.

Question 8:

I am a second-generation market trader who grew up on the market square. In June of this year in response to the proposed development

plans for the market I conducted a survey of market traders to get their thoughts on the type of stall they wished to trade from in the future. I have 59 responses which is half of all traders. The breakdown of the replies were 22 % hot food traders, 52% retail, 8.5% cold food and 17% other, which is very comparable to the breakdown of all traders. Without consideration of eligibility criteria of these 57.9% would be interested in trading from permanent kiosk type structures, only 20.3% would be interested in trading from a dismountable gazebo. The most interesting results are in the fact that 83.1% of all traders if given a preference would wish stalls to stay as they are, with 15.3% preferring kiosks and just 1.6% wishing for a gazebo.

The traders have repeatedly asked for traditional market stalls, as they are now, to be provided in the redeveloped market as they provide the versatility required for all traders, they are robust, proven and weather resistant. The design team has increased the number of permanent stalls in the latest design to 44 which they are calling “market stalls” however this is incredibly misleading as they are in fact permanent structures, which we have been told will have five-year leases, be rateable with the additional costs of waste, water and electricity. Analysis of the council's business plan shows that due to the rent being paid over 365 days a year on these units the increase cost to almost all traders will be huge and this will impact more on the market retail sellers as there is only one that trades seven days a week. For example, The Bike Mans rent, if trading from a kiosk would go up 99%.

We have a petition with 1800 signatures that asks for 54 permanent stalls. We wish to ask that at least half of these stalls are of the traditional style that we have now, and not all kiosks that take away the essence of market

trading. Will the chamber recognise the unsuitability of the current proposals to fill two thirds of the market square with permanent shop type units the project team are currently proposing?