

COUNCIL

9 October 2025

6.00 - 9.30 pm

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

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

25/78/CNL Minutes of the meeting held on 24 July 2025

A question was asked about the minute 25/67/CNL public questions time, Question 8, which it was stated that Market Traders had collected 1800 signatures which asked for 54 permanent stalls. Had this petition been received?

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Environment confirmed that no petition had been received since the last Council meeting.

Post Meeting Note: Democratic Services confirm that no petition has been received through the Council's petition scheme on this matter.

The minutes of 24 July 2025 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

25/79/CNL Mayor's announcements

Apologies were received from Councillors Gardiner-Smith and Divkovic.

The Mayor then expressed appreciation to the City Council's City Cultural Events and Active Lifestyles team for delivering a successful summer programme, which included events attended by both the Mayor and Deputy Mayor.

It was noted that the Mayor's diary had been particularly busy, encompassing a diverse range of charity and community engagements, including:

1. A football tournament for newly arrived Hongkongers, organised by the Cambridge Chinese Federation.
2. Hosting the Mayor of Heidelberg, Eckart Würzner, at the Guildhall.

3. A meeting with HRH The Duke of Edinburgh and the Lord Lieutenant at Murray Edwards College, which included a tour of the college's art collection.
4. Leading the civic procession alongside the Deputy Lieutenant to Great St. Mary's Church for the Chevin Sermon and Harvest Festival.

Members were also informed of an upcoming event hosted by the Cambridge Africa Network at Storey's Field on 25th October to mark Black History Month.

Finally, Members were encouraged to view the art display from the Trials of Democracy event/performance, currently exhibited outside the chamber. Originally held at the Guildhall's former tourist office, the display captured public feedback and expectations around the seven Nolan Principles, which underpinned the Council's Code of Conduct.

25/80/CNL Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Item	Reason
Bird	25/91/CNL 25/86/CNL	Personal: Member of Unison. Personal: Board Member of Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP)
Davey	25/91/CNL	Personal: Member of National Association of Probation Officers
Lokhmotova	25/85/CNL 25/93/CNL	Prejudicial: Part of the design team. Did not take part of the discussion or vote.
A Smith	25/86/CNL	Personal: Board member of CIP
S Smith	25/86/CNL	Personal: Board member of CIP
Sheil	25/91/CNL	Personal: Member of Unison
Todd-Jones	25/91/CNL	Personal: Member of Unison
Thornburrow	25/86/CNL	Personal: Board member of CIP
Todd-Jones	25/91/CNL	Personal: Member of Unison
Tong	25/85/CNL 25/93/CNL	Personal: Personal relationship with a member of the design team. Did not take part of the discussion or vote.

25/81/CNL Public questions time

Question 1:

On the subject of the City Council's blue bin contract with Re-Gen of Newry in Northern Ireland. At the council meeting on 24th July you said that you didn't have any information on whether Re-Gen was proceeding with its plan to open an MRF (Materials Recovery Facility) in the Midlands in England.

This new MRF would avoid the long 400-mile trip that all our blue bin recycling currently takes to Northern Ireland, and the contribution to global warming that these frequent trips entail.

You said you would be happy to investigate and report back to us at this meeting how Re-Gen are progressing with this. What news do you have?

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Environment said the following:

- i. The Council acknowledged that it remained Re-Gen's intention to acquire a UK mainland Materials Recovery Facility (MRF), which would represent positive progress.
- ii. Contracts of this nature were inherently complex and as such, timelines may be subject to change. Officers would ensure all stakeholders, were kept informed as further updates become available.
- iii. Would like to reiterate, as previously stated in this chamber, that the contract was signed based on the MRF located in Newry, Northern Ireland.
- iv. Now that the contract had been in place for several months, could confirm the plant was currently achieving a high sorting efficiency of 96%, representing an approximate 16% improvement compared to the previous contract.
- v. This meant that virtually all materials placed in blue bins by Cambridge residents were now being successfully recycled which was excellent news for the city's sustainability efforts.

Supplementary:

Since 2019, Cambridge City Council announced their aim of becoming a net zero council by 2030. But every week since March, Re-Gen lorries had been emitting 56 tons of climate damaging CO2 as they carried resident's recycling 400 miles to Nuri in Northern Ireland, where I have visited and seen it.

These emissions were the Council's responsibility and contract, and it is residents' recycling. In the light of this, why should Cambridge residents believe this Council did care about fighting climate change?

Actions speak a lot louder than words.

Had the Council taken the easy option and made no efforts to find a more sustainable solution using a much more local MRF site because the Council didn't care?

The Cabinet Member responded:

- i. The Council had not taken the easy option; securing this contract had required significant time and effort from officers.
- ii. The original tender was issued two years ago under RECAP (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough), ahead of the previous contract's expiry. Unfortunately, no company was able to deliver services across all councils as had occurred previously.
- iii. The contract was subsequently divided into lots and re-tendered. However, no applications met the required criteria and it was not possible for the Council to proceed due to the lack of suitable bids.
- iv. Acknowledged concerns regarding emissions and confirmed these were being monitored and reported.
- v. Work had been undertaken to reduce emissions from the Waste Service, including the introduction of electric bin lorries and the successful rollout of hydrogenated vegetable oil (HVO) as an alternative fuel. The trial was so successful that officers had worked with Re-Gen to use this in their own fleet.
- vi. The recycling plant itself was modern and energy efficient. Its processes were significantly more efficient than those used previously.
- vii. Transportation to the MRF was just one aspect; the management and operation of the facility were equally important.
- viii. Once sorted, recyclable materials may be transported globally. Fortunately, most of Cambridge's waste continued to be recycled within the UK and Western Europe.
- ix. This recycling was part of a vast global network. Once materials were recycled and turned into new products, they could travel internationally again. Transport to the MRF was therefore just one small part of this wider system.

Question 2:

Cambridge City Council has rightly earned a reputation for its work to promote inclusion and advance the equality of all people regardless of background, race, disability, or disadvantage. This is a legacy of which all members and officers of this council can be proud.

How would the Leader of the Council ensure that rights of individuals with protected characteristics are safeguarded during the upcoming period of local government reorganisation?

The Leader of the Council said the following in response:

- i. The Council remained proud of its ongoing commitment to promoting equity and inclusion for everyone in our city.
- ii. This commitment was reflected in several key policy priorities, including:
 - Meeting the needs of diverse communities in a growing city,
 - Providing accessible and inclusive council services,
- iii. Enabling all residents to participate fully in a safe, welcoming, and inclusive city.
- iv. Equality, diversity, inclusion, and belonging were central to all the Council's work whether with residents, partners, or the wider communities we serve.
- v. As plans for potential unitary councils become clearer—possibly next year—these values would continue to underpin how services are designed and delivered, and how the Council prepares for the transition.
- v. Once the government determines the boundaries for the new unitary councils in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, the Council would work collaboratively with partner authorities to establish the new unitary.
- vi. As part of this process, we would focus on designing inclusive governance and decision-making frameworks. These would support the development of services that meet the needs of all communities and foster an equitable and inclusive culture within the new council's workforce.
- vii. Throughout the reorganisation, we would ensure meaningful engagement with individuals who may be at risk of discrimination based on protected characteristics. This included the engagement already undertaken as part of the Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) proposal, as well as deeper consultation with residents during the design phase of the new council. We would work through existing council teams and local community groups to reach a diverse range of people.

Supplementary:

In light of the planned local government reorganization, would the Council support the formation of the city council's participation in a joint equality panel

with South Cambridge and Cambridge County Councils, to share best practices, co-develop shared priorities on equality and inclusion, and improve the equality impact assessments as local government reorganization approaches?

And would you support the equality panel considering participation in such a scheme at the panel's next meeting?

The Leader responded:

- i. The Council did have their own what was equality panel is now going to be an equity panel which for now was a successful way of working.
- ii. As the Council moved towards a new unitary council, the Council would develop new processes as a part of that.
- iii. To develop a new structure now not knowing what the structure of our new unitary council might be that probably wouldn't be the best approach at this time.
- iv. the current Equality Panel was an appropriate place for Council to be able to discuss the kinds of issues that had been raised.

Question 3:

Here is an evidence-based example of how funds could be raised by the Council by charging coach companies to bring tourists into Cambridge:

The city of Siena in Italy has operated an efficient system for the management of tourist coaches for over 10 years. It has a calibrated scale of charges to suit every kind of visit. There are two categories: a) day visits and b) parties staying in hotels. Clearly the system is designed to favour coach groups staying overnight, who would therefore contribute to the local economy.

Day visits: Coach companies in the Siena model are charged €160 for one dropoff and one pick-up in a day at one of 4 designated points just outside the walls of the city. These provide a total of 22 coach spaces. In between times, coaches park at the designated coach park lower down the hill, where there are 70 spaces. Bus companies can opt to buy 100 permits for €10,000.

Coach parties staying in hotels in Siena: Coach companies are charged a discounted rate for drop-off/pick-up of €75, payable through the hotel.

Besides this, as explained, there is a whole range of prices to reflect preferences. Website: <https://sigericospa.it/en/tourist-bus-rates/>

Estimated revenue from 50day visits: $50 \times \text{€}160$ (£140) = €8000 i.e. £7000. Assume 20 day visits every day of the year: $20 \times 365 \times \text{€}160$ =

£1,022,000 yearly, funds which could - if applied in Cambridge - go some way to subsidise our own existing bus services.

Question: Does the Council have statistics of the daily average number of coach drop-offs along the Backs? Given that the Council is seeking ways of boosting its finances, would it not make sense for it to adopt a similar system of charging tourist coaches for visiting Cambridge?

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport said the following:
Sienna has dealt with these issues. It's another reason to visit that wonderful inspiring city.

- i. The suggestions align with the Council's broader ambitions to manage congestion, enhance air quality and support sustainable travel.
- ii. The management of the high public highway including roads, laybys and on street drop off and pickup points is the statute responsibility of the Cambridgeshire County Council as the local highway authority.
- iii. The Council had no direct powers to introduce or enforce charges for coach movements or stopping on the public highway.
- iv. The Council did not collect data on the numbers or frequency of coach drop offs along the back as this activity takes place on the public highway and falls within the remit of the County Council.
- v. The Council would be happy to support the County Council and Combined Authority to explore options for improved coach management in and around the city.
- vi. This could include reviewing the location and suitability of the coach drop off points, exploring opportunities for designated coach parking and considering potential char charging mechanisms where legally permissible and engaging with local businesses and the tourist section.
- vii. Any formal scheme would require the County Council agreement, consultation with operators in compliance with the UK legislation for highways.
- viii. While the Council were supportive of exploring the measures that encouraged sustainable and well-managed tourism, any decision would be with the County Council; would raise these suggestions with them whenever the opportunity arose.

Supplementary:

Would this be part of the discussion when the Unitary Council was formed?

The Cabinet Member replied:

- i. When the Unitary Council was formed it would become responsible for highways and all transport issues within one council.

- ii. Hoped that it might be something the Council could discuss sooner because the Council were putting in a greater Cambridge Transport Strategy within the next 12 months.
- iii. The Transport Strategy would look the park and rides, which would become known as transport hubs. This would be an opportunity to improve the facilities for coaches where they could stop at the transport hubs and for buses and other perhaps the travelling community. The Council were keen to make a lot more of these transport hubs.
- iv. Certainly, when the Council became part of a Unitary transport and highways would come under one council.

Question 4:

The Labour Council's first priority must be to resolve our city's inequality problem and this has to start with housing the unhoused. In March 2021, the number of home seekers in Cambridge was 1119^[1]. In March this year, it was 1768^[2], an increase of 63%. Cambridge City Council's Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy, 2021 – 2026, states "our council house building programme is part of the solution. But it is not just about building. It is also about ensuring that the right support is available – to help people to remain in their homes or to find alternative accommodation where necessary" (p.1).

What is the Labour Council going to do to support the vulnerable 1768 households/individuals who are being failed?

^[1]

<file:///home/saralina/Documents/Green/Motions%20and%20Public%20Questions/housing-key-facts-housing-register-applications-and-lettings.pdf>, page 7

^[2]

<file:///home/saralina/Documents/Green/Motions%20and%20Public%20Questions/housing-key-facts-housing-register-applications-and-lettings.pdf>, page 7

The Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Safety, Wellbeing and Tackling Homelessness responded:

- i. To clarify, the figures referenced in the question did not relate to homeless individuals or rough sleepers supported through the Council's Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy. Instead, they referred to the Housing Needs Register.
- ii. The individuals on the register were not "unhoused"; they were currently living in various types of accommodation and seeking to move into social housing. This included existing social housing tenants looking to transfer.
- iii. Applicants needed to demonstrate a housing need, such as overcrowding which determined their priority level, as set out in the Council's Lettings Policy. A rigorous and fair assessment process was used to establish the level of need.

- iv. As of this week, the number of applicants on the Housing Needs Register had decreased by nearly 400. New demand had been more than offset by allocations of social housing.
- v. The Council's housebuilding programme, unprecedented for a local authority of its size, had played a significant role in this reduction.
- vi. The Council went above and beyond its statutory duties to support vulnerable households. This included early intervention measures such as home visits and personalised housing plans.
- vii. Officers had supported thousands of residents in understanding their housing options and worked closely with local partners, including employment and debt advice services, health providers, and community organisations, to address issues such as financial hardship, mental health challenges, and domestic abuse.
- vi. The Tenancy Sustainment Service helped City Council tenants maintain their tenancies. Support included advice on maximising income, reducing debt or arrears, assistance with Universal Credit claims, and help with setting up new tenancies.
- viii. Officers also supported tenants in the private rented sector who are at risk of losing their homes. The Council's homelessness prevention service included Town Hall Lettings, intermediate housing options for applicants who were unable to access private rented accommodation.

Supplementary:

Twenty-two social homes (at social rent) were demolished on Fanshawe Road, which is where I live this year.

Of the eighty-four homes currently being built in their place,

- Thirty-nine would be at market sale,
- Eleven at 80% of market rent
- thirty-four at 60% of market rent,
- zero at social rent, which is 40% of market rent.

Thirty-two social homes (at social rent) are planned to be demolished at Davy Road. Of the ninety homes planned for Davy Road

- Forty-five would be at market sale.
- Eleven at 80% of market rent.
- Twenty-nine at 60% of market rent,
- Five at social rent.

This generated a loss of fifty-four social rents in our neighbourhood. Given the urgent need for social homes at social rents, why does the Council think it's

acceptable to knock them down and replace them with market homes or homes at a higher rent?

The Cabinet Member for Housing replied:

- i. The Council had built over a thousand homes and acknowledged that money did get tight to deliver these homes.
- ii. The Council were currently on target to deliver four hundred and twenty-four homes, two hundred and sixty-seven being council homes.
- iii. The Council were about to submit planning for another four hundred homes with half being council homes.
- iv. The Council remained committed to supporting residents and has successfully rehomed over 300 families from outdated, poor-quality housing. Some of these families had moved into the newly built, high-quality, and sustainable Council homes as part of the Council's broader housing programme.
- v. Regarding the developments at Fanshawe and Davy Road, the Council recognised the concern around the reduction in social rent homes. However, due to limited government funding, it was necessary to include a proportion of homes for market sale to generate income that could be reinvested into building more council homes.
- vi. There might not be so many social rents at Fanshawe Road and Davey Road, but there would be social rent homes built elsewhere in the city.
- vii. Residents would have the choice to come back to Fanshawe Road and Davey Road if they wanted.

Question 5:

Residents would like to know how Gonville & Caius Project Agora (Greek for Market Place) plans for Rose Crescent and Cambridge Market Square fit in with the Council's plans for a new Civic Quarter for the city centre. Residents note that the Gardenia, "Gardies" Cambridge's legendary Kebab shop has now closed for good. They point out that the College owns the building concerned on Rose Crescent.

The website of Mica, the architects for Project Agora and the Future Cities Forum <https://www.futurecitiesforum.london/single-post/mica-appointed-to-masterplan-project-agora-in-cambridge> state that there has been extensive consultation about Project Agora. Future Cities Forum reports 'This redevelopment will ensure seamless integration with the College's existing central Cambridge sites, and reinforce Caius' presence within the city centre, while maintaining the retail and commercial presence that makes Rose Crescent and Market Square one of the most charming areas of Cambridge.

The first “listening” phase has included an extensive consultation exercise with the fellowship, staff, students and alumni of Gonville & Caius College.’

Mica says on its website ‘Many Fellows, staff, students and alumni have contributed valuable thoughts on how the College might best take advantage of this exciting opportunity to create a vibrant, modern and “inclusive” space that enhances the student experience and supports the College’s academic and social functions’. But there is no mention of consulting Cambridge residents. How does Project Agora fit in with the council’s plans for the redevelopment of Cambridge Market Square as an event centre and the market traders and their customers?

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Environment said the following:

- i. The Civic Quarter Team held regular meetings with stakeholders, including Gonville and Caius College to update them on the changing civic quarter designs and to share any coordination issues such as road closures.
- ii. Gonville and Caius College had attended many of the Council’s civic quarter liaison group meetings as had the public speaker.
- iii. Gonville & Caius College had undertaken internal consultation with its Fellows, staff, students, and alumni regarding its proposed redevelopment plans. However, the Council has not yet been formally consulted or received details of the proposals. As the College was the freeholder of many buildings around the Market Square, the Council looked forward to reviewing the plans in due course.
- iv. Th Civic Quarter Team would continue to meet with Gonville & Caius College and coordinate the projects, works, road closures, etc. where suitable.

Question 6:

There is a controversial proposal for a new piece of public art at Milton Road public library costing £20,000. It will occupy a well-used and much-loved community space. Instead of mitigating any adverse impact of the development, it is increasing the damage by depriving the community of this much loved green space.

Why was the community not consulted about the proposal until a commission had already been granted?

The Cabinet Member for Culture, Economy and Skills said the following:

- i. The project was still in the concept design stage.

- ii. The decision with respect to the location of any proposed public art had not yet been confirmed.
- iii. Initial consultation had taken place with some members of the community and further consultation would be taking place in due course.

Question 7:

What evidence is there that the new unitary authority council will use the expensively remodeled council chamber for meetings?

The Cabinet Member for Finance & Resources said the following:

- i. By this time next year, the Council would decide whether to proceed with the Civic Quarter scheme, which included redevelopment of the Guildhall and the Council Chamber. This decision would be informed by greater clarity around local government reform.
- ii. The Council would also have a better understanding of both current and future accommodation needs.
- iii. These insights would help shape the business case for adapting the Chamber to meet the Council's requirements and potentially other uses, while respecting its historic significance.
- iv. Regardless of the outcome, Cambridge remained the most accessible location for Councillors and members of the public to attend council meetings. The Chamber had been built to support such democratic functions.
- v. Any refurbishment works would need to ensure the space is compliant with the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA), increase seating capacity, and improve facilities to support effective meetings.

Supplementary:

What evidence did the Council have of requirements to remodel the Council Chamber.

Why was the Council Chamber project being included in firm plans and presumably budgeted, despite there being no confirmed requirements at this stage

The Cabinet Member replied:

- i. To date, alternative chamber had not been put forward to accommodate the new Unitary Council. Whichever councils were joined together when the decision is made by government, Cambridge would remain the centre of that new unitary council. This was the focal point and it's the historic centre of local democracy for centuries and would continue.

- ii. A refurbished chamber would be ready for the time the new Unitary Council would be established.
- iii. The County Council had made an error by relocating its headquarters out of Cambridge to a business park with poor public transport. The City Council did not want that.
- iv. The City Council wanted to be accountable to people in the city and the surrounding area for the decisions that were taken on their behalf.

Question 8:

Since the first proposals for the market the market traders has asked for 54 permanent pitches. Our petition received over 1800 signatures in support of this. The Civic Quarter team will argue that this is what they have moved towards. But when we created the petition, the plans for kiosks, with five year leases, had not been revealed so when the traders were asked for permanent stalls we were asking for stalls as we have them now, well designed, remaining in situ, traditional, functional, flexible and open. The civic quarter team has used our wording against us, saying it is providing what we have asked for but this is not true.

The businesses in Cambridge market are asking for very little to change from the current plans. We accept that some kiosks are necessary and desired. We accept that the council wishes to have a flexible space in front of the guildhall. We wish for some of our needs to also be met. Market traders just want some, traditional, in situ stalls. We do not believe this is too much to ask, or out of keeping with the current designs being shown. The ideal plan would be one third kiosks, one third permanent, traditional stalls, and one third gazebos.

We understand that the market needs work and this will involve a decant. Which we want to be well planned and managed, which I cannot believe will be objected to by anyone. We understand the desire for some kiosks and the reasons for them. We acknowledge the council's desire for a larger civic space outside the Guildhall and that fact that this means that some stalls will be gazebos in this space. We need a third option: which is traditional market stall. These allow the traders who trade 3-6 days a week a constant position on the market square. Which is absolutely key to a business being able to survive.

This option will also benefit the financial security of the market. The latest Market Business Plan puts the cost of the gazebos at £150,000 per year. A cost that the market will have to pay forever. With less gazebos, this huge expense is reduced. Traditional stalls also help to keep the history of the market alive, they convey the strong identity of Cambridge Market, they allow the beautiful evening light to flow over the market from Great St Mary's, and

they allow some of the longest established businesses on the market to continue to trade.

A question that needs answering is how will the event space work? The council is taking a huge amount away from the market but not offering us any ideas of what the space will be used for. We are told “small scale events” or “evening programs”. To the first I would suggest that removing over half of the stalls from the market is unnecessary to achieve such a goal. And to the second this comes with it’s own problems. One of the proposals for the new market is longer opening hours on the weekends and for businesses to trade into the evening. However how are these two things possible at the same time? Also with 55 gazebos to remove on a Friday - Sunday, and this taking approximately three hours how will this also work with evening events, unless they start after 8pm.

The civic quarter team keeps stating that details can be worked out later. But with so many questions unanswered and the traders raising so many legitimate questions how is it feasible to continue pushing ahead with these designs.

Once again we ask would the council consider installing a section of open, well designed, in situ, traditional market stalls to help support the heart of Cambridge market and preserve it for the future?

Given all of the many serious concerns outlined in detail by market traders, how can the council say the current proposals will fulfill the project brief and support a thriving seven day a week market rather than hinder it? Concerns that included: Over development of the kiosk end, creating an appearance of a shuttered and closed market on quieter days, the huge rent increases, the financial and logistical issues of 55 gazebos, the lack of a plan for how stall allocation will be managed within the gazebos, how will night time trading coexist with evening events, the lack of stalls appropriate for 3-6 day traders and a complete fear of what will happen to traders and business over the decant time period.

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Environment said the following:

- i. Thanked the public speaker for their completed survey, ongoing feedback, including some very useful suggestions for the market aspect of the civic quarter project.
- ii. To date the Project Team had met with fifty-one traders through one-to-one meetings; there had been a positive response from traders with an

- interest in forty-eight of the permanent stalls and twelve traders looking to share pitches.
- iii. The Civic Quarter Project Team had engaged with traders in regular monthly meetings, as a result, several changes had been made based on feedback, which included the layouts of the stalls, the size of them, feedback on the demountables, and the support package, decant location and business plan which are yet to be agreed
 - iv. Understood the public speaker had made representations to the design team on the third stall option and the Project Team have explained why this design doesn't work.
 - v. The Council was working to balance the creation of a civic square with the need to support a thriving market that could flexibly expand and contract throughout the week and across seasons. The aim was to ensure the market remained accessible, safe, and inclusive for all users while enhancing the overall functionality and appeal of the space.
 - vi. A key part of the proposal was the introduction of demountable market stalls, allowing the square to be opened up as a flexible public space when the market was not operating. This would create a more welcoming environment for residents and visitors and help address ongoing issues of antisocial behaviour and crime, particularly at night when fixed stalls were left empty but remained in place
 - vii. Acknowledged the comments regarding the business plan and the Council have made a commitment to continue to review the costs.
 - viii. The business plan had been updated since it was last published, the Project Team were preparing the next iterations which would be shared with all the traders when ready.
 - ix. The one-to-one meetings with traders would be continuing next year and the Council had committed to the ongoing programme of trader meetings reviewing the next steps for further feedback.

Supplementary:

Traders were going to say yes to the kiosks whether they wanted them or not because they were not going to say no to something, as did not know what the cost was going to be and how they're going to work. Because the Council kept coming back to the fact that these things still needed to be worked out, traders were not going to say no to the kiosks.

What traders wanted was a market that could be traded from. That gives with the three options, the kiosks, the stalls as they were now, and the demountables. Everyone gets what they wanted.

This would provide the Council their space in front of the Guild Hall. Traders, the stock traders, the retail traders, the traders that have been on a market for generations a space. These traders were city residents and had supply chains within the city. They were supporting city residents and were the heart of the city.

All traders wanted was a market that worked for their businesses, it was not asking for much. The traders had agreed to so many things and all that was wanted was some open stores that businesses could be run successfully from.

The Cabinet Member said:

- i. Understood the concerns raised which was why there was the option of the kiosks, the more the permanent stalls would be shared so that different traders would use them on different days.
- ii. The Project Team were working on the design of the demountables. There had been further requests to trial the demountable stalls in the winter when it was more likely to be wet and windy, but also in high summer or in a heat wave, so testing would start again next summer.
- iii. The Project Team were working on ways for the stools to be tested as they would be used in the new market because although they're demountable, they'll have fixings in the ground, and when they were tested previously, it was just using weights like if you put up a gazebo.
- iv. Acknowledged that traders wanted to be able to trade from the same location each time. This was way it was so important to have the one-to-one conversations and be open honest in these conversations.
- v. Market traders were a central part to this project. Supporting these small businesses was essential, without the traders, there would be no market. The Council was committed to ensuring that traders remained as part of the heart of the redevelopment plans and that their needs were fully considered.

25/82/CNL To deal with oral questions

Question 1:

Councillor Tim Bick to the Leader

Earlier this year the administration refused to debate their considerable cutbacks in council staffing on the basis that they would not impact the standard of services to the public. Is the Leader still happy that their justification was a good one? Has there subsequently been no reduction in standard of service to the public?

The Leader responded with:

- i. The transformation process had been very difficult for council staff.
- ii. Discussion of specific roles would have entailed public discussion of the positions of specific staff members whose jobs were potentially at risk.
- iii. The decision to begin the transformation process was not one that the Council had taken lightly. It had been a long process, and the aim had been to do it in a way that limited impact on staff as far as possible.
- iv. The February 2025 implementation paper led to a reduction of around 3.5% of the Council's total workforce. Twenty-four staff members had left the council through redundancy as part of that, and of those, eighteen had taken voluntary redundancy.
- v. Acknowledged it was difficult for every one of those individuals as well as for a far larger number of staff members who were put at risk during the process. As far as possible, the impact for most staff had been limited. Expressed gratitude to staff for bearing with the process.
- vi. The process had helped the Council to achieve significant cost savings, and it could also bring benefits in terms of efficiency from modernised processes and strengthened accountability.
- vii. The restructure had been built around improving frontline resilience and accountability rather than reducing capacity.
- viii. Since the changes were introduced, there had been no reduction in the quality or standard of services provided to the public. Customer satisfaction measures, complaint volumes, and service delivery metrics remained stable.

Question 2:**Councillor Porrer to Cabinet Member for Nature, Open Space and City Services**

Can the Cabinet Member please update the Council on the closure of public toilets on Quayside, Midsummer Common and Parker's Piece and its impact on residents and businesses.

The Cabinet Member said the following:

- i. Three toilets had been closed.
- ii. These toilets had been carefully chosen for closure to make savings in Council budgets. A review of toilet provision considered usage levels, condition, accessibility, and cost of refurbishment and ongoing maintenance and had been subject to a public consultation.
- iii. The toilets at Quayside, was a low-use facility predominantly used by punting businesses.

- iv. Midsummer Common on Victoria Avenue, also a low-use facility predominantly used by taxi drivers, and Parker's Piece, a popular event site where event organisers provided their own toilets.
- v. Savings were estimated at £121,000 a year, or about £10,000 a month. Over the past three months, the Council had saved £30,000.
- vi. Recent investments had been made in toilets at Cherry Hinton Hall, Chester Recreation Ground, Coleridge Recreation Ground, Drummer Street, Nightingale Recreation Ground and Pavilion, with Silver Street to come soon. The total investment in all those works would be about £2 million. There were also five changing places toilets.
- vii. The Council were still looking to improve provision where budgets would allow. For example, plans for improved toilet provision at Jesus Green would come forward shortly.
- viii. The Council's priority was to ensure high quality, well-used toilets open and accessible in places where they were most needed, aligning with public feedback and in accordance with responsible budget management.
- ix. Whilst reducing public toilet provision may seem initially counterintuitive, it had been a move that reflected the realities of modern urban living. By reallocating resources, addressing security concerns, and responding to changing public behaviours, the Council could make a well-considered decision that benefited the broader community.

Question 3:

Councillor Blackburn-Horgan to the Chair of Licensing Committee

How does Cambridge City Council ensure enough affordable, available wheelchair accessible (WAV) private hire vehicles to book at the time residents require? Also, that drivers offer safe entry and exit from vehicles and this in place with ramps and clamps used correctly with all types of wheelchairs, to stop any residents being put at risk?

The Chair of Licensing Committee replied:

- i. There was a legal provision under the local government miscellaneous act 1976 for council to set policy regarding the number of hackney carriage vehicles that must be wheelchair accessible.
- ii. For vehicles licensed by the City Council, all new hackney carriage vehicles must be wheelchair accessible.
- iii. Currently 50% of Cambridge City vehicles were wheelchair accessible.
- iv. Hackney carriage vehicles operating from a rank could not refuse a hire and that included disabled passengers. However, for private hire vehicles, there was no such provision and therefore the Council could not require them to be wheelchair accessible. As self-employed drivers,

a private hire driver did not have to accept bookings received through the operator.

- v. All new Cambridge City licensed drivers, both hackney carriage and private hire were required to undertake safeguarding and disability awareness training.
- vi. Members of the Licensing Committee had approved a policy that all Cambridge wheelchair accessible vehicle drivers should have training on ramp use and how to support wheelchair users.

Question 4:

Councillor Elliott Tong to the Cabinet Member for Housing/Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Environment What was the Council's latest estimate of the cost of retrofitting the average council home, the total estimated cost of retrofit and the number of council homes that still required retrofit?

The Cabinet Member responded with:

- i. The cost of retrofit would vary depending on the age, condition and type of house. The current best estimate to get a house to EPC C was £32,835 per home. This was based on a combination of quotations received and costs obtained through the Council's current external wall insulation contract.
- ii. The price included the primary energy efficiency measures together with estimated additional costs such as essential repairs.
- iii. There could be individual additional costs related to individual needs and any fees associated with meeting PAS 2035, the retrofit standards required on all grant-funded projects.
- iv. Five council homes were rated EPC E and would cost an estimated £16,600 each as they had cavity walls and cavity wall insulation was
- v. There were 1,348 homes at band D, which would cost £44.26 million. Reiterated that these were estimates and the figures could change once individual assessments had been completed.

Question 5:

Councillor Delowar Hossein to the Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Environment

Ensuring Equitable Access to Community Clean-Up and Recycling Services for All Residents in Cambridge City. Over the past six months, only 10 community clean-up events have taken place in Cambridge, with these events predominantly concentrated in specific council block areas. This limited coverage effectively leaves many residents, who are contributing council tax, without access to these essential services. Furthermore, the high cost of large

item collection disproportionately affects those who rely on walking, cycling, or public transport. Moreover, the nearest recycling centre is located in Milton, making it impractical and difficult for residents without vehicles to dispose of large or bulky items responsibly. To prevent unfair penalties and to ensure that all residents benefit from these services, will the council consider establishing designated drop-off points within each ward? This would provide residents with accessible and affordable recycling options and help maintain a cleaner, safer environment for everyone.

The Cabinet Member responded with the following:

- i. The Council recognised and valued the contribution that residents and local groups had made in helping to keep Cambridge clean and welcoming.
- ii. The Council actively supported community-led litter picks and were always pleased to work with residents and local organisations who wished to arrange their own clean-up events. Equipment such as litter pickers, bags, and high viz vests could be provided on request.
- iii. Community clean-ups were not limited to any specific area of the city.
- iv. Groups across the city were welcome to self-organise, and residents were encouraged to come together where there was an interest or a need.
- v. Information and support for setting up a clean-up event could be found on the Council's website or by contacting the community services team.
- vi. Regarding the suggestion of designated drop offs, past experience had shown that these were difficult and costly to manage. Unsupervised collection sites often attracted fly tipping and unauthorised waste disposal which could create environmental and public health issues.
- vii. Mixed recycling points had been available around the city but had to be removed because of fly tipping.

25/83/CNL Appointment of Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee

Councillor Nestor proposed, and Councillor Smart seconded, the nomination of Councillor Thornburrow as Vice Chair to the Planning Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.

On a show of hands, 22 votes in favour

Councillor Illingworth proposed, and Councillor Bennet seconded, the nomination of Councillor Flaubert as Vice Chair to the Planning Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.

On a show of hands, 18 votes in favour.

Resolved that Councillor Thornburrow be elected as Vice Chair for the remainder of the municipal year 2025/26.

The meeting broke for 15 minutes at the conclusion of this item

25/84/CNL To consider the recommendations of the Executive for adoption

25/85/CNL Cambridge Civic Quarter Project Update

Councillor Tong and Lokhmotova recused themselves from this item.

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor Porrer seconded the following amendment to the recommendations (additional text underlined and deleted text struck through).

1. A capital budget of up to £4.4m to be allocated to fund the technical design development, detailed development programme and to finalise the total direct and indirect costs of the project.

2. In addition, recommends that in the run-up to final approval in September 2026 Cabinet is requested to:

(a) Seek to improve the ongoing financial return from the **Guildhall** and **Corn Exchange** projects in relation to their capital costs, so that a better financial contribution to the protection and improvement of general council services to the public can be expected – as well as the other intrinsic benefits of the investment; and that this is achieved by rigorously reviewing the design & costings; the phasing; the proposed funding strategy (including the possibility of external grants) and the business plans for the operation of the refurbished facilities.

(b) Accept that the investment in **the public realm and Market Square** project must produce a widely experienced enhancement of the city centre for the community at large including those who work there - and not necessarily a financial return to the council; , it should however still benefit from refinement as a result of ongoing input from market traders and other stakeholders and be subject to the normal discipline of value engineering and a search for further external grant support.

The amendment was carried by 30 votes to 1 with 7 abstentions.

Resolved (30 votes to 6, 2 abstention) to agree:

1. A capital budget of up to £4.4m to be allocated to fund the technical design development, detailed development programme and to finalise the total direct and indirect costs of the project.

2. In addition, recommends that in the run-up to final approval in September 2026 Cabinet is requested to:

(a) Seek to improve the ongoing financial return from the **Guildhall** and **Corn Exchange** projects in relation to their capital costs, so that a better financial contribution to the protection and improvement of general council services to the public can be expected – as well as the other intrinsic benefits of the investment; and that this is achieved by rigorously reviewing the design & costings; the phasing; the proposed funding strategy (including the possibility of external grants) and the business plans for the operation of the refurbished facilities.

(b) Accept that the investment in **the public realm and Market Square** project must produce a widely experienced enhancement of the city centre for the community at large including those who work there - and not necessarily a financial return to the council; , it should however still benefit from refinement as a result of ongoing input from market traders and other stakeholders and be subject to the normal discipline of value engineering and a search for further external grant support.

25/86/CNL Establishment of new loan facilities for Cambridge Investment Partnership

Resolved (38 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions) to agree:

- i. A capital budget totalling £18.5 million for the provision of three new development loan facilities to Cambridge Investment Partnership LLP in respect of regeneration activities and new build development at Newbury Farm, ATS/Murketts Histon Road, and Fanshawe Road.
- ii. The setting of fixed interest rates applicable to the above loans at 3.5% per annum above the prevailing 5-year UK gilt rate (to be set no later than the date of each drawdown).
- iii. A capital budget totalling £4.677 million for the provision of equity loan facilities to Cambridge Investment Partnership LLP in respect of the

same three schemes, noting that such equity will be matched by an equal investment by Hill Investment Partnerships LLP.

- iv. The delegation of authority to the Council's Chief Finance Officer to agree the full and detailed terms of the loan with Cambridge Investment Partnership LLP, after taking appropriate professional advice and with due regard to relevant statutory requirements.

25/87/CNL Annual Treasury Management (Outturn) Report 2024/25

Resolved (40 votes to 0) to approve:

- i. The Annual Treasury Management Outturn report 2024/25, which includes the Council's actual Prudential and Treasury Indicators for 2024/25.

25/88/CNL To consider the recommendations of Committees for adoption

There were no recommendations for this meeting.

25/89/CNL To consider the following notices of motion, notice of which has been given by:

25/90/CNL Councillor Illingworth, Waste Water Plant Relocation: Rethink or our Money Back.

Councillor Illingworth proposed and Councillor Dalzell seconded the following motion:

Council **records** its huge disappointment at the government's last minute funding U-turn on the relocation (and expansion) of the Anglian Water waste water treatment plant from North East Cambridge which will:

- throw away 7 years of work by local councils and of council expenditure in planning and development;
- block the provision of at least 5,600 much-needed new homes on the most sustainable site around the city close to jobs and the provision of new amenities for the shared benefit of new and existing residents in north Cambridge;
- cause alternative development in other less suitable locations to be considered;
- make future waste water treatment capacity a new potential obstacle to all development in our area.

Council is **horrificed** that their short-sighted decision is at complete variance with the government's earlier planning approval for the relocation, its wider ambition for Cambridge's future, and the promise of a local partnership approach, and that it will prevent an attractive return to the Treasury from the growth that it would have unlocked.

Council **resolves** accordingly to:

- demand that the government urgently reconsiders its funding decision, so that the waste water plant relocation and the planned development of North East Cambridge can go ahead;
- failing which, ask for the council's money back;
- request the Head of Finance, as a precaution, to prepare a comprehensive costing of all council resources deployed since the Housing Infrastructure Grant was awarded in 2019 and premised on it – including both planning for North East Cambridge and development of the new urban quarter of Hartree;
- urges the responsible government minister to attend our Performance, Assets & Strategy Overview & Scrutiny committee at the earliest opportunity, if invited, to discuss the status and outlook for the other expected financial support to back up its ambition for Cambridge.

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

WASTE WATER PLANT RELOCATION: ~~RETHINK OR OUR MONEY BACK~~

Council **records** ~~its huge disappointment at the government's last minute funding U-turn on the relocation (and expansion) of the Anglian Water waste water treatment plant from North East Cambridge which will:~~

- ~~• throw away 7 years of work by local councils and of council expenditure in planning and development;~~
- ~~• block the provision of at least 5,600 much-needed new homes on the most sustainable site around the city close to jobs and the provision of new amenities for the shared benefit of new and existing residents in north Cambridge;~~
- ~~• cause alternative development in other less suitable locations to be considered;~~
- ~~• make future waste water treatment capacity a new potential obstacle to all development in our area.~~

Council is **horrified** that their short-sighted decision is at complete variance with the government's earlier planning approval for the relocation, its wider ambition for Cambridge's future, and the promise of a local partnership approach, and that it will prevent an attractive return to the Treasury from the growth that it would have unlocked.

Council **resolves** accordingly to:

- demand that the government urgently reconsiders its funding decision, so that the waste water plant relocation and the planned development of North East Cambridge can go ahead;
- failing which, ask for the council's money back;
- request the Head of Finance, as a precaution, to prepare a comprehensive costing of all council resources deployed since the Housing Infrastructure Grant was awarded in 2019 and premised on it – including both planning for North East Cambridge and development of the new urban quarter of Hartree;
- urges the responsible government minister to attend our Performance, Assets & Strategy Overview & Scrutiny committee at the earliest opportunity, if invited, to discuss the status and outlook for the other expected financial support to back up its ambition for Cambridge.

Council notes that:

The decision of the Planning Inspectors on the waste water plant relocation was to refuse permission. The grounds for refusal included a finding that any additional capacity could be accommodated on the existing site.

The decision of the Planning Inspectors was based on a lengthy and thorough appeal process lead by a 3 person team.

There was strong local opposition to the relocation on cost and environmental grounds from several community groups including Save Honey Hill. The existing waste water plant was the most modern in the area and had been extensively modernised in 2014 at a cost of £21 million. By contrast, smaller local plants such as Haslingfield require considerable work to bring them up to standard.

Estimated costs of the projects had risen sharply and concerns had already been expressed over the financial risks involved.

Because of the need for extensive site remediation work on the existing site, no homes were expected to receive planning permission on this site in the next Local Plan period.

The number of new homes expected to be built on the site before 2035 was estimated at 500.

The council resolves to write to Anglian Water to ask it to prepare and publish a revised plan showing how it intends to increase capacity and reduce nuisance on the existing waste water site.

The amendment was lost by 35 votes against to 5 votes in favour,

Councillor Holloway proposed and Councillor S Smith seconded the following amendment (deleted text struck through and additional text underlined):

~~WASTE WATER PLANT RELOCATION: RETHINK OR OUR MONEY BACK~~
Delivering Sustainable Development and critical waste water treatment facilities

Council **records** its huge disappointment at the decision not to fund government's last minute funding U-turn on the relocation (and expansion) of the Anglian Water waste water treatment plant from North East Cambridge which will:

- put at risk much of the preparatory work done by Government and local councils over the last 7 years ~~throw away 7 years of work by local councils and of council expenditure in planning and development;~~
- block the provision of at least 5,600 much-needed new homes on the most sustainable site around the city close to jobs and the provision of new amenities for the shared benefit of new and existing residents in north Cambridge;
- cause alternative development in other less suitable locations to be considered;
- make future waste water treatment capacity a new potential obstacle to all development in our area.

Council **notes** that:

- The cost of relocation of the waste water treatment plant had risen significantly, requiring total Government cash funding of £338m.
- Anglian Water had previously stated that there was no operational need to move the plant, and that current waste water capacity was sufficient. However, they have recently raised objections to several planning

applications in Cambridge on the grounds of a lack of waste water treatment capacity to meet the requirements of new planned growth.

- Of the approximately £13m spent by the City Council in relation to this project, approximately £11m was spent on building a new operational hub, which will provide significant benefit to council staff and Cambridge residents.

Council is **horrified** concerned that ~~their short-sighted~~ this decision is at complete variance with the government's earlier planning approval for the relocation, its wider ambition for Cambridge's future, ~~and the promise of a local partnership approach,~~ and that it will prevent an attractive return to the Treasury of circa £1bn per annum from the growth that it would have unlocked.

Council **resolves** accordingly to:

- ~~demand that the government urgently reconsiders its funding decision, so that the waste water plant relocation and the planned development of North East Cambridge can go ahead;~~
- ~~failing which, ask for the council's money back;~~
- ~~request the Head of Finance, as a precaution, to prepare a comprehensive costing of all council resources deployed since the Housing Infrastructure Grant was awarded in 2019 and premised on it— including both planning for North East Cambridge and development of the new urban quarter of Hartree;~~
- ~~urges the responsible government minister to attend our Performance, Assets & Strategy Overview & Scrutiny committee at the earliest opportunity, if invited, to discuss the status and outlook for the other expected financial support to back up its ambition for Cambridge.~~
- Request that the government reviews the investment case for Hartree in the context of the infrastructure costs of bringing forward less sustainable sites to deliver at least 5600 homes, including the cost of the new pressure to expand waste water treatment capacities.
- If investment to move the waste water plant is not secured, request Anglian Water to work with the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and the Council to prepare a plan, investment case and timetable to bring forward early works to limit as far as possible the odour from the existing waste water treatment plant, to release land for housing development at Hartree and increase its capacity to support delivery of development as proposed in the emerging Greater Cambridge Joint Local Plan.

- Request Council officers to complete a calculation of costs incurred by the Council since the Housing Infrastructure Grant was awarded in 2019 in respect of a) the North East Cambridge Action Plan and b) Hartree;
- Continue discussions with government ministers aimed at bringing forward comprehensive economic, social and environmental measures to support shared ambitions for the Greater Cambridge area to: become significantly more socially inclusive and equitable; protect and enhance the natural environment; be globally competitive in higher education, research, technology and life sciences.

The amendment was carried by 21 votes in favour to 19 votes against.

Resolved (33 votes to 6 votes with 1 abstention) that:

Delivering Sustainable Development and critical waste water treatment facilities

Council **records** its huge disappointment at the decision not to fund the relocation (and expansion) of the Anglian Water waste water treatment plant from North East Cambridge which will:

- put at risk much of the preparatory work done by Government and local councils over the last 7 years
- block the provision of at least 5,600 much-needed new homes on the most sustainable site around the city close to jobs and the provision of new amenities for the shared benefit of new and existing residents in north Cambridge;
- cause alternative development in other less suitable locations to be considered;
- make future waste water treatment capacity a new potential obstacle to all development in our area.

Council **notes** that:

- The cost of relocation of the waste water treatment plant had risen significantly, requiring total Government cash funding of £338m.
- Anglian Water had previously stated that there was no operational need to move the plant, and that current waste water capacity was sufficient. However, they have recently raised objections to several planning applications in Cambridge on the grounds of a lack of waste water treatment capacity to meet the requirements of new planned growth.
- Of the approximately £13m spent by the City Council in relation to this project, approximately £11m was spent on building a new operational

hub, which will provide significant benefit to council staff and Cambridge residents.

Council is concerned that this decision is at variance with the government's earlier planning approval for the relocation, its wider ambition for Cambridge's future, and that it will prevent an attractive return to the Treasury of circa £1bn per annum from the growth that it would have unlocked.

Council **resolves** accordingly to:

- Request that the government reviews the investment case for Hartree in the context of the infrastructure costs of bringing forward less sustainable sites to deliver at least 5600 homes, including the cost of the new pressure to expand waste water treatment capacities.
- If investment to move the waste water plant is not secured, request Anglian Water to work with the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and the Council to prepare a plan, investment case and timetable to bring forward early works to limit as far as possible the odour from the existing waste water treatment plant, to release land for housing development at Hartree and increase its capacity to support delivery of development as proposed in the emerging Greater Cambridge Joint Local Plan.
- Request Council officers to complete a calculation of costs incurred by the Council since the Housing Infrastructure Grant was awarded in 2019 in respect of a) the North East Cambridge Action Plan and b) Hartree;
- Continue discussions with government ministers aimed at bringing forward comprehensive economic, social and environmental measures to support shared ambitions for the Greater Cambridge area to: become significantly more socially inclusive and equitable; protect and enhance the natural environment; be globally competitive in higher education, research, technology and life sciences.

25/91/CNL Councillor Anna Smith, Anti-Racism Charter

This Council notes that whilst it is already undertaking many of the actions in Unison's anti-racism charter, that it has never been more important to make a clear statement of the Council's opposition to racism in all its forms, and of our clear intent to tackle racism.

This Council therefore determines to endorse and implement Unison's anti-racism charter in full.

The text of the anti-racism charter is set out below:

Our organisation pledges we will introduce the following ongoing commitments within 12 months of signing:

Our leaders will

Recognise the need and benefit in championing a racially diverse workforce.

Challenge racism internally and externally wherever it arises in relation to the organisation.

Recognise the impact of racism upon staff members' wellbeing.

Set and regularly review strategy to improve racial equality, diversity and inclusion so that the organisation reflects the communities it serves.

Our organisation will

Have a clear and visible race equality policy championed by leadership.

Have a clear and visible anti-racism programme of initiatives and actions.

Undertake equality impact assessments for all strategic-level decisions.

Undertake ethnicity pay gap recording and publicly publish results.

Undertake workforce ethnicity recording and publicly publish results.

Provide unconscious bias and anti-racism training for all staff members.

Provide a racism reporting process for notifying, investigating and recording outcomes.

Provide robust equality training for managers involved in recruiting, promotions and

investigating allegations.

Provide a wellbeing support facility for staff experiencing racism in the workplace.

Be anti-racist, not just non-racist in all we do

Our equality auditing process will review

Recruitment processes to identify and address race disparities in equality of opportunity.

Exit interview results to identify and address race disparities in retention of staff members.

Promotional processes to identify and address race disparities in equality of opportunity.

Discipline and grievance to identify and address race disparity in outcomes of comparable cases.

Policies and research under a duty or commitment to promote solidarity and tackle racism.

Our mission, values, and support to removing racial discrimination in all its forms.

Resolved (unanimous) to approve the Anti-Racism Charter Motion.

Time (9.00pm) Under Council Procedure Rules 1.9.2 as the time allotted for the meeting had concluded Members went straight to the vote on the amendment to the motion. No discussion was held as the meeting time had passed. All remaining business on the agenda went straight to the vote at this point.

25/92/CNL Councillor Glasberg, New Homes & Old Myths

Councillor Glasberg proposed and Councillor Bennett seconded the following motion:

This Council notes that:

- Cambridge data on completions of new homes, unused planning permissions and affordability ratios for rents and mortgages demonstrate that “the market” is not solving the city’s housing crisis
- its high housing costs impose severe financial and mental stresses on residents, weaken the night time economy and increase social isolation
- Cambridge’s green spaces and wildlife habitats are essential for resident wellbeing, preserving biodiversity and resilience to climate habitats
- Part 3 of the proposed Planning and Infrastructure Bill would allow developers to continue to destroy habitats and species, providing that they pay into a proposed national nature fund.

Council believes that:

Biodiversity lost in Cambridge now cannot meaningfully be replaced by potential future projects elsewhere o market housing cannot on its own address the city’s housing needs

This Council requests that:

The government maintains and increases protection for the environment and biodiversity.

in particular it urges the government not to pass part 3 of the vi proposed Planning and Infrastructure Bill currently going through the House of Lords without significant amendments to improve protection

it removes excessive restrictions on the use by councils of Right to Buy receipts so that councils have the flexibility to fund the full cost of bringing empty homes back into use, purchasing and repairing existing homes and building new 100% council housing

Accordingly, this Council proposes to write to Daniel Zeichner MP, Pippa Heyling MP and Steve Reed MP to share its concerns and make this request.

Councillor Thornburrow proposed, and Councillor Moore seconded the following amendment to the motion (additional text underlined and deleted text struck through):

(New Homes and Old Myths) Balancing Homes and Nature

~~This Council notes that:~~

- ~~• Cambridge data on completions of new homes, unused planning permissions and affordability ratios for rents and mortgages demonstrate that “the market” is not solving the city’s housing crisis—~~
- ~~• its high housing costs impose severe financial and mental stresses on residents, weaken the night time economy and increase social isolation—~~
- ~~• Cambridge’s green spaces and wildlife habitats are essential for resident wellbeing, preserving biodiversity and resilience to climate habitats—~~
- ~~• Part 3 of the proposed Planning and Infrastructure Bill would allow developers to continue to destroy habitats and species, providing that they pay into a proposed national nature fund—~~

~~Council believes that:~~

~~Biodiversity lost in Cambridge now cannot meaningfully be replaced by potential future projects elsewhere—
market housing cannot on its own address the city’s housing needs—~~

~~This Council requests that:~~

~~The government maintains and increases protection for the environment and biodiversity.—~~

~~in particular it urges the government not to pass part 3 of the proposed Planning and Infrastructure Bill currently going through the House of Lords without significant amendments to improve protection—~~

~~it removes excessive restrictions on the use by councils of Right to Buy receipts so that councils have the flexibility to fund the full cost of bringing empty homes back into use, purchasing and repairing existing homes and building new 100% council housing—~~

~~Accordingly, this Council proposes to write to Daniel Zeichner MP, Pippa Heyling MP and Steve Reed MP to share its concerns and make this request.—~~

This Council notes that:

Cambridge data on completions of new homes, unused planning permissions and affordability ratios for rents and mortgages demonstrate the need to support the approach taken in the Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy and the Council's Adopted Local Plan to identify housing needs that should be planned for, including requiring a high proportion of these to be affordable. The need to rebalance the housing market is demonstrated by research indicating that high housing costs impose severe financial and mental stresses on residents, weaken the night time economy and increase social isolation. There are significant challenges to regeneration on estates where large numbers of homes have been sold off through the right to buy, and this can make regeneration of some sites not financially viable for the council.

It further notes that:

Cambridge's green spaces and wildlife habitats are essential for the wellbeing of residents, preserving biodiversity and increasing resilience of climate habitats, as highlighted by the Tree Canopy Project Report. (see <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/media/to0h50xn/i-tree-eco-project-report.pdf>)

The Planning and Infrastructure Bill proposes a national levy that developers would be required to fund, enabling funding to be pooled towards achieving wider ecological benefits.

This Council believes that:

The best way for the Council to address issues around housing needs is to be an exemplar developer and builder and to support the Joint Housing Strategy and the model embedded in the Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan currently being prepared for members consideration, which will update the housing need and identify additional sites necessary to respond to that need

The introduction of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) has been a positive step forward in planning policy. It ensures that developers are required to leave nature in a better state than before, creating measurable improvements for wildlife and for communities.

That Shared planning has successfully implemented council policies to encourage developers to deliver BNG of 20% rather than the legal minimum of 10%.

This Council requests that:

The government follow through the commitment made in its response to the consultation on reforming the right to buy to amend the agreements made with local authorities under Section 11(6) of the Local Government Act 2003 on the use of Right to Buy receipts to simplify the rules and ensure that a greater

proportion of receipts are used to deliver new social and affordable housing, extend the existing flexibilities in spending receipts indefinitely and, permit councils to combine Right to Buy receipts with grant funding for affordable housing to accelerate delivery of replacement homes.

(see <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/reforming-the-right-to-buy/outcome/government-response-to-the-consultation-on-reforming-the-right-to-buy>)

The government maintains and increases protection for the environment and biodiversity and ensures that future planning policy works to complement and not undermine existing policy measures that protect and enhance local and site specific biodiversity,

Action:

Accordingly, this council resolves to continue to contribute to the development of government policy through responses to consultations and regular exchanges of views with local MPs.

The amendment was approved by 22 votes to 5, with 13 abstentions.

Resolved by 21 votes to 0, with 19 abstentions to:

Balancing Homes and Nature

This Council notes that:

Cambridge data on completions of new homes, unused planning permissions and affordability ratios for rents and mortgages demonstrate the need to support the approach taken in the Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy and the Council's Adopted Local Plan to identify housing needs that should be planned for, including requiring a high proportion of these to be affordable.

The need to rebalance the housing market is demonstrated by research indicating that high housing costs impose severe financial and mental stresses on residents, weaken the night time economy and increase social isolation.

There are significant challenges to regeneration on estates where large numbers of homes have been sold off through the right to buy, and this can make regeneration of some sites not financially viable for the Council.

It further notes that:

Cambridge's green spaces and wildlife habitats are essential for the wellbeing of residents, preserving biodiversity and increasing resilience of climate habitats, as highlighted by the Tree Canopy Project Report.

(see <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/media/to0h50xn/i-tree-eco-project-report.pdf>)

The Planning and Infrastructure Bill proposes a national levy that developers would be required to fund, enabling funding to be pooled towards achieving wider ecological benefits.

This Council believes that:

The best way for the Council to address issues around housing needs is to be an exemplar developer and builder and to support the Joint Housing Strategy and the model embedded in the Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan currently being prepared for members consideration, which will update the housing need and identify additional sites necessary to respond to that need

The introduction of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) has been a positive step forward in planning policy. It ensures that developers are required to leave nature in a better state than before, creating measurable improvements for wildlife and for communities.

That Shared planning has successfully implemented Council policies to encourage developers to deliver BNG of 20% rather than the legal minimum of 10%.

This Council requests that:

The government follow through the commitment made in its response to the consultation on reforming the right to buy to amend the agreements made with local authorities under Section 11(6) of the Local Government Act 2003 on the use of Right to Buy receipts to simplify the rules and ensure that a greater proportion of receipts are used to deliver new social and affordable housing, extend the existing flexibilities in spending receipts indefinitely and, permit councils to combine Right to Buy receipts with grant funding for affordable housing to accelerate delivery of replacement homes.

(see <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/reforming-the-right-to-buy/outcome/government-response-to-the-consultation-on-reforming-the-right-to-buy>)

The government maintains and increases protection for the environment and biodiversity and ensures that future planning policy works to complement and not undermine existing policy measures that protect and enhance local and site specific biodiversity,

Action:

Accordingly, this Council resolves to continue to contribute to the development of government policy through responses to consultations and regular exchanges of views with local MPs.

25/93/CNL Councillor Baigent, Civic Quarter Project - Council Chamber

Councillor Tong and Councillor Lokhmotova recused themselves from this item.

Councillor Baigent proposed the following motion:

Civic Quarter – Council Chamber

Council notes that:

The jury is still out on if the Civic Quarter Project is to have public support. Certainly at £92,000,000 it is a lot of money.

One part of that project, the Council Chamber, will be a significant cost. It is being sold as the place where the new Unitary will meet.

BUT, we do not know the size of the new Unitary. Nor do we know who will lead it, or the amount of councillors, or where it will meet.

Council resolves that:

Given all these unknowns, work on the chamber should be put on hold until there are answers to these questions.

The motion not carried by 30 votes to 8, with 1 abstention.

25/94/CNL Written questions

Council noted the responses to written questions contained within the additional information pack.

25/95/CNL Notification of Appointment - Alternate Member Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board

Unanimously noted the:

- i. Appointment of Councillor Katie Thornburrow as the alternate member of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board for Cambridge City Council.

The meeting ended at 9.30 pm

CHAIR