CABINET

20 October 2026
5.00 - 9.10 pm

Present: Councillors Thornburrow (Chair), Moore (Vice-Chair), Smart (Cabinet Member), Todd-Jones (Cabinet Member), Bird (Cabinet Member), Gawthrope Wood (Cabinet Member) and Nestor (Cabinet Member)

Other Councillors present:
Councillors Bick, Dalzell, Davison, Porrer and Young

Also present (virtually) Councillors Gawthrope Wood (Cabinet Member), Flaubert and Nicmanis

Officers Present:
Chief Executive: Robert Pollock
Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development: Stephen Kelly
Director of Economy & Place: Lynne Miles
Communities Director: Sam Scharf
Assistant Director Development: Ben Binns
Assistant Director Public Realm & Environment: Alistair Wilson
Head of Strategy and Policy: David Kidston
Planning Policy Manager: Jonathan Dixon
Environmental Health Manager and Public Safety Lead: Yvonne O'Donnell
Recreational Development Manager Health: Ian Ross
Planning Policy and Strategy Team Leader: Lauren Wilkinson
Deputy Democratic Services Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

26/61/Cab Apologies

No apologies from the Cabinet were received.

Apologies were received from Councillor Glasberg, Chair of the Services, Climate and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

26/62/Cab Public Questions

Question 1: Hurst Park Estate Residents' Association (John Beasley)
Arbury Court Redevelopment

Background:
The documentation accompanying the agenda of the 6 October scrutiny committee meeting did not include, or refer to, the latest design plans, nor was there a clear justification for the proposed building height and accommodation density in relation to the immediate locality. In addition, members noted a lack of financial information, and an outdated equality assessment.

Consequently, members were asked to scrutinise the Arbury Court redevelopment proposals in the absence of material information, and yet officers present indicated that the scheme was unlikely to be the subject of further formal scrutiny prior to the submission of the planning application.

Question:
Does Cabinet agree that full scrutiny of a complete and final programme plan — including the latest design proposals, a complete financial plan, and all agreed inputs from the Community Panel — is essential before seeking planning permission, and that the Arbury Court redevelopment scheme should therefore return for a further holistic scrutiny session prior to submission?

The Cabinet Member for Housing responded:
The Cabinet report referred to an extension to the red line boundary of Kingsway as part of the North Cambridge proposals. Members were not being asked to scrutinise the redevelopment proposals for Arbury Court and there were no approvals in relation to Arbury Court.

Proposals for North Cambridge in relation to Arbury Court had been approved by Members at Cabinet on 21st October 2025.

Members have debated and approved proposals on North Cambridge at Housing Scrutiny Committee (HSC) on 18 June 2024, 17 September 2024 and 11 March 2025.

Members also voted in favour of the Council House Building budget at Full Council on 26th February 2026.

Finally, Planning Committee Members would scrutinise proposals for Arbury and Kingsway when they had been submitted. Proposals would include a Statement of Community Involvement which would include feedback from the Community Panel as well as from the various consultations that have taken place.

Whether the relevant scrutiny committee intended to include Arbury Court in its work programme was a matter for that Committee, its Chair and Vice Chair.

Supplementary Question:
The Performance, Assets and Strategy Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the Housing Development Programme on 0ctober 6 2026.

The discussion appeared to focus primarily on housing outputs rather than the potential impact of individual projects on local communities.

Given the absence of some key information, the scrutiny of the latest Arbury Court proposals appeared limited.

During the Scrutiny meeting an Officer indicated that, although unlikely, further scrutiny of the programme could still be undertaken if considered necessary.

In view of the significance of the Arbury Court project, particularly its unprecedented scale, density and complexity, will the Cabinet consider requesting a further scrutiny session, or recommend that the matter be debated by Full Council, before any final decision is taken on the Arbury Court development?

The Cabinet Member for Housing responded:
The Council was undertaking extensive consultations on the project, with a major public consultation due to launch at the end of October. All residents in the area would have the opportunity to participate and provide their views.

Worked hard to keep the community informed throughout the process, which included the very successful Community Panel and regular engagement with local traders through bi-monthly meetings.

It was important to keep residents, businesses and other stakeholders updated as much as possible as the proposals develop.

Importantly, no final decision has yet been made. Once further information is available and the latest plans had been developed, the community would be invited to review the proposals and provide feedback before any decisions are taken.

The Assistant Director, Development, said the following:

The Community Panel's feedback would be published as part of a consultation statement. This would bring together the full range of information gathered through the engagement process, including the views of residents, stakeholders and the wider community, alongside the results of the public consultation.

Remained committed to further engagement and would be bringing the project back for consideration in January and again in late February. There would also be a number of further approvals and discussions through the Council's decision-making process.

In addition, should the proposals progress to the planning application stage, there would be further opportunities for scrutiny and public comment.

Officers had consistently been clear that this was an evolving process, and no final decisions had yet been taken. The Council was committed to ensuring that members, residents and stakeholders had opportunities to consider and comment on the proposals as they developed.

Question 2: (Andrew Milbourn)
In March, the council convened an Extraordinary Full Council meeting specifically to oppose the loss of democratic control over planning. Its conclusion was that development arrangements must not come at the expense of local democratic oversight and that residents could otherwise lose their voice. The Council's subsequent public statement called it "completely *unjustified"* to transfer major decisions from elected councillors to an unelected body. Council Leader Katie Thornburrow warned *that, "a top down model risks a severe democratic deficit".*

However, with Arbury Court the Cabinet has granted exceptionally broad discretion over Arbury Court's housing numbers, mix, tenure, development route and land arrangements to an appointed officer. There are no requirements for the developed proposal to return to Full Council before submission for planning permission. It is only through Full Council that the democratic voices of residents from affected wards could be heard.

Central Government could, quite reasonably, argue that the Development Corporation is operating on the same delegated basis as the Council. Therefore, the Council has no case for managing the development as they are not operating in a more democratic manner. The number of dwellings is only just below the threshold anyway.

How are the Council’s democratic principles consistent with Cabinet granting such exceptionally broad discretion to an appointed officer?

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport said the following:
As referenced an Extraordinary Council meeting was held in March to consider the potential role of a centrally led Urban Development Corporation in Cambridge and the implications this could have for planning powers, development schemes and the determination of planning applications.

At that meeting, Members made clear their support for the current planning service, recognising it as an award-winning service and emphasised the importance of maintaining the existing democratic planning process, whereby planning applications were considered by elected councillors through the Planning Committee.

When referring to the democratic process, the intention was to highlight that council-led development proposals, including those delivered through the Cambridge Investment Partnership, would continue to be considered by the Shared Planning Service and determined by the Planning Committee in the usual way.

Any housing development, redevelopment scheme or other council-supported scheme, including the Arbury Court project, would be processed through the Shared Planning Service and considered by the Planning Committee. Decisions would be made by elected councillors through the established planning process.

Supplementary Question:
Despite the reassurance from the Leader, did not fully understand why there could not be a debate at Full Council on a project (Arbury Court) of this significance.

Understood the project represented around 90% of the Council's annual housing development programme expenditure and was therefore of greater financial and strategic importance than many matters that are debated at Council meetings.

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport said the following:

Members of the Planning Committee had to be careful not to express views that could be perceived as predetermining a planning application before consideration was given at Planning Committee.

While Councillors may discuss housing policy and development proposals in general terms, they had to avoid becoming involved in detailed debate on a specific proposal before a planning application was determined. This was to ensure that, when an application was presented at Planning Committee, Members were able to consider the case with an open mind, taking account of the Officer's report, the supporting evidence, and the views of those speaking both for and against the application.

The suggestion of a Full Council debate on the Arbury Court project was acknowledged as an interesting proposal but it would represent a departure from the Council's usual approach.

Question 3: Arbury Road East Residents Association (Professor Ian Cooper)

Update on Homes England Strategic Partnership, Development Portfolio Approach Arbury Court & Kingsway Redevelopments & Davy Road Redevelopments
Project: Arbury Court Redevelopment,

Issue addressed: Lack of Full City Council debate

Background
The full City Council had previously held substantive debates about the principles underlying major council-led developments, including Mill Road Depot, Meadows and Buchan Street, and the ATS/Murketts site on Histon Road. Those debates allowed Councillors to address affordable housing, scale of development, open space, community facilities and the treatment of existing communities.

In July 25, the Full Council was scheduled to debate the Arbury Court redevelopment but ran out of time to debate it. The scheme proposed for the redevelopment of Arbury Court has exceptional density, heights of up to 7 storeys, setting precedents which could apply across suburban and residential areas in the city.

It would also require new heavy good vehicle rerouting down Alex Wood Road, significant loss of public parking, and community impacts before, during and after construction.

Question:
Why were the proposals for redeveloping Arbury Court not being treated in the same way as the City's other developments and being subjected to a full council debate?

The Cabinet Member for Housing said the following:
Members of the Cabinet approve (or not) budgets and outline proposals for City Council developments. Proposals were submitted to Planning which are then scrutinised by Members sitting on that Committee.

Development Proposals were not generally debated at Full Council as a matter of principle or procedure, only if a member had brought a motion about a development.

The public would be able to see latest proposals from October 28th.

Officers were working hard with the Highways Authority to find a solution to avoid heavy goods vehicle travelling down Alex Wood Road. It was important to get the parking right and would work with the community to find a solution that worked.

Supplementary Question:
The Residents' Association strongly supported the Council's policy of delivering more social housing. However, it had serious concerns about the unprecedented height and density proposed for the redevelopment of Arbury Court. This would result in negative impacts on the quality of life of those who live there and in adjoining areas, causing unnecessary objections to the application.

Would ask the Council commit to a full Council debate on the redevelopment to reduce the chances of this happening**.**

The Cabinet Member for Housing responded:
This type of matter would not normally be debated at Full Council, although this recommendation may be considered.

At this stage, no final decision had been made regarding the height of the proposed buildings or the number of storeys. Those details were still being developed and would be informed by the consultation process.

A further phase of public consultation would commence shortly and once concluded, the feedback would be used to inform the next stage of the proposals. At that point, the Council would be in a much better position to provide a comprehensive update, including more detailed information about the scale and design of the development. The proposals were also likely to be subject to further scrutiny as they progress through the Council's decision-making process.

Aked for patience while the consultation was completed and the results analysed. Once that work had been undertaken, the proposals could be set out in greater detail.

It was important to note that it could not be guaranteed that the Council would secure all of the elements that it ultimately sought, as any future proposals would be subject to the appropriate approval and planning processes.

26/63/Cab Draft Greater Cambridge Non-Immediate Article 4 Direction for HMOs

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport and Director of Planning introduced the report.

The report sought agreement to prepare a Non-Immediate Article 4 Direction to remove permitted development rights to change dwellings (planning use class C3) into small HMOs (planning use class C4) without planning permission, to cover the urban area of Cambridge. This would mean that the impact of proposals for small HMOs (up to 6 unrelated persons) as well as large HMOs could be considered through the planning process.

The Article 4 Direction would be subject to public consultation, and responses reported to Cabinet to consider whether the Direction should be confirmed. As a Non-Immediate Article 4 Direction it would come into force a year after it had been confirmed.

In response to questions from the Cabinet and Members present, the Leader and Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development said the following:

i. Thanked Councillors Blackburn-Horgan and Gardiner Smith for repeatedly raising the issue and for highlighting experiences arising from their respective wards, Queen Edith's and Romsey.
ii. Noted the comment that there was a housing crisis in Cambridge and while concerns had been raised, it was recognised that HMOs provided an important and valued form of accommodation for some residents.
iii. Noted the comment regarding the Equalities Impact Assessment and that the section on disability appeared incomplete and should be fully developed.
iv. Noted concerns regarding the loss of family-sized homes and housing affordability, including the impact of high rents on lower and middle-income residents and the concerns that a lack of affordable housing could affect the city's ability to retain families and future talent.
v. Noted the comment that it was important to adopt an evidence-led approach to policy development and overly restricting a form of accommodation that was in high demand could contribute to housing affordability pressures and make it harder for future generations to live in the city. Broader planning policies should be used to address housing needs and ensure an appropriate range of accommodation was available.
vi. Welcomed the thanks to Officers for the comprehensive evidence base and supported the city-wide approach and joint working with South Cambridgeshire to avoid displacement of issues.
vii. Noted the comments that efforts should focus on ensuring HMOs were well managed, using existing licensing and enforcement powers where necessary.
viii. Noted that while some Local Authorities had introduced immediate Article 4 Directions, they generally faced lower risks of compensation claims than Cambridge due to less pressurised housing markets.
ix. Previous scrutiny discussion had emphasised that the quality of rented accommodation, particularly for young and vulnerable residents, was the key issue rather than HMOs themselves, which was part of the focus on improving planning policies.
x. Proposed landlord registration requirements under the Renters' Rights legislation would make it easier to identify and address issues in smaller HMOs.
xi. Noted the comment that HMO's should not support the Council's housing needs.
xii. The Local Plan sought to meet a wide range of housing needs, including HMOs, co-living accommodation, housing for older people, and Gypsy and Traveller provision, reflecting the Council's wider housing strategy and affordability ambitions.

xiii. Managing the impacts of HMOs required a combination of planning, licensing and enforcement measures, rather than planning policy alone.

xiv. The Equalities Impact Assessment, officers acknowledged that reducing the loss of family homes was a key objective of the proposed approach and that the policy sought to balance the need for HMO accommodation with the retention of family housing.

xv. There were a couple of local authorities who had introduced immediate Article 4 Directions for HMOs, but these were generally in areas with lower risks of compensation than Cambridge. Cambridge's high housing demand and property values increased the potential financial exposure associated with an immediate direction.

xvi. There had appeared to be some confusion at Scrutiny regarding how long the process would take to introduce Article 4. The proposed process would involve making the Article 4 Direction and then commencing the statutory 12-month notice period.

xvii. Public consultation could take place during that 12-month period, typically for around six weeks, with the Council expected to confirm its position well before the Direction came into force. Therefore the 12-month period would begin when notice of the Direction was served, at the start of the of the consultation process.

The Chair of the Performance, Assets and Strategy Overview and Scrutiny Committee reported the Committee supported the non-immediate introduction of an Article 4 Direction across the urban area of Cambridge. Discussion took place regarding whether implementation should be immediate or delayed by 12 months. Officers advised that a delayed approach could expose the Council to substantial compensation liabilities.

The Cabinet **unanimously resolved** to:

i. Agree to the ~~preparation~~ implementation of a Non-Immediate Article 4 Direction to remove permitted development rights to change dwellings (planning use class C3) into small houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) (planning use class C4), to cover the area shown on the maps in Appendix 1;

ii. Delegate preparation of the above and the carrying out of a public consultation to the Director of Planning; and

iii. Note that Cabinet approval will be required to confirm the Direction following the publication and consultation.

26/64/Cab Update on the Housing Development Programme

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Assistant Director, Development introduced the report.

The report provided an update on the Strategic Partnership, two redevelopment projects and the Council's Portfolio approach to development.

In response to questions from the Cabinet and other Members present the Cabinet Member for Housing, the Leader, the Cabinet Member for Communities and the Assistant Director, Development said the following:

i. Funding allocated by Homes England was available for the Council to draw down, subject to meeting the relevant funding conditions and requirements. The funding was linked to the delivery of council housing and the terms agreed through the funding arrangement.
ii. There were opportunities to utilise the available funding for eligible housing schemes and that further consideration would be given to how future allocations could best support the delivery of additional council homes.
iii. Noted that Members welcomed the Homes England funding award and recognised it as an endorsement of the Council's new council housing programme. Particular praise was given to Officers and project teams involved in the programme.
iv. Emphasised the importance of retaining the role and value of the Council's Planning Service and Planning Committee.
v. The co-design events were informative and constructive.
vi. Significant work had already been undertaken to develop the North Cambridge Design Code, involving extensive consultation and engagement with residents and local stakeholders over an extended period.
vii. The Design Code was a document which would help guide future development in the area. Similar design codes could be developed for other parts of the city through comparable consultation processes.
viii. There were further public engagement opportunities for Arbury Court redevelopment including a second public consultation later in the month followed by third consultation stage. Residents, Ward Councillors and other stakeholders could continue to have opportunities to influence the proposals.
ix. Budgets would be subject to scrutiny and approval through the Council's established decision-making processes.
x. The Sustainable Housing Design Guide set the standards for the delivery of new council homes.

xi. It would be ideal for all new developments to consist of council homes but this this was not financially viable.

xii. Mixed tenure developments delivered income which was reinvested into the Council's housing programme and used to support the delivery of additional council homes, including projects such as the Small Sites Programme.

xiii. There were some schemes where the overall number of homes delivered was lower than the number being replaced. However, this could result in a greater number of bedrooms being provided and therefore accommodate more residents overall.

xiv. New council homes were built to higher design, accessibility and space standards, including lifetime homes principles and enhanced accessibility requirements, resulting in better quality accommodation for residents.

xv. There would be 3,4 and 5 bedroom houses built on Ekin Road.

xvi. It was important to listen to and work with residents and all external partners. The community panel regarding the development at Arbury Court was an integral part in developing the design of the park and open spaces.

xvii. Schemes could evolve through the planning and design process. The original design for the redevelopment of the Meadows Community Centre and housing scheme had been scrapped and a new scheme developed. The revised proposal subsequently received full planning permission, delivered significant improvements to the external environment, and had since won awards for community housing.

xviii. Noted the comment that development was not just a housing matter and that Arbury Court was an important community asset and the impact that the development would have.

xix. Extensive engagement had been undertaken and would continue with residents, traders and the wider community in relation to Arbury Court. Officers were working hard to ensure effective communication and minimise misinformation. Lessons had been learned from the Ekin Road development.

xx. From the outset the Council had recognised the importance of the local centre (Arbury Court) and community engagement had helped shape the emerging proposals. While concerns remained regarding the scale and density of development, a range of factors, including community facilities and wider local benefits, continued to be considered.

The Chair of the Performance, Assets and Strategy Scrutiny Committee advised that the recommendations made by the Committee had been reflected in the Cabinet report and stated that the Committee had been broadly supportive of the proposals. The scrutiny discussion had been informative and

that the matters raised during the Committee's consideration had been dealt with appropriately.

The Cabinet **resolved** to note:

i. That the Council was one of only three councils outside London that were successful in securing a Strategic Partnership with Homes England winning £96m. Winning the bid also unlocks £584m funding previously committed by the council to deliver 1,400 council homes with at least 60% of these at social rent. This programme represents the biggest investment in social housing in a generation and will significantly increase availability of social housing in Cambridge.
ii. Once the Strategic Partnership contract is signed the most immediate use of that funding will be allocated to fund 11 of the 45 council homes (11 at social rent) at Fanshawe, 72 council homes (44 at social rent) at Hanover & Princess and 44 council homes (all social rent) at Ekin Road.
iii. The council's Portfolio Approach to Housing Delivery is currently delivering 56% affordable (Council) homes across its sites once Homes England funding is taken into account.

That Cabinet approves the following recommendations in addition to the *25/42/Cab Cabinet Report on 21/10/2025 - Cabinet (Item 42) Cambridge North Framework for Change:*

The Cabinet **unanimously resolved** to:

i. Approve the expansion of the Kingsway, Brackley Close, Rutland Close and Verulam Way redevelopment, to include additional Council properties at 2-48 (evens) Brackley Close and 2-48 (evens) Rutland Close.
ii. Approve the increase of Arbury Court and Kingsway redevelopment project budget from to £81,200,000 to £103,200,000 to account for the increase in site boundary, and a projected increase in affordable (council) homes delivered, compared with the existing project boundary, approved in October 2025. This increase in budget to £103,200,000 to cover all site assembly, construction costs, professional fees and further associated fees with the total budget to be drawn down from the sum already approved for investment in new homes and not yet allocated. This will increase the Affordable Homes Agreement to purchase 245 homes from the council's development partnership with Hill - Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP).
iii. With Homes England Strategic Partnership funding secured by the council, approves, with effect from October 26th,2026, that:

a) Council tenants will be offered emergency banding status, with leaseholders and freeholders able to sell their properties in accordance with the council's regeneration policy.
b) the issue of Home Loss and Disturbance payments to qualifying Council occupiers and Home Loss, Basic Loss and Disturbance payments to qualifying owners at the addresses at Arbury Court, Kingsway, Brackley Close, Verulam Way and Rutland Close as approved in Cabinet Report on 21/10/2025 - Cabinet (Item 42) Cambridge North Framework for Change, and the additional addresses detailed in this report.

iv. Approve to add the above addresses in I to the existing approvals in the cabinet report II to V and VII to XIII in section 2.1 of the *Cabinet Report on 21/10/2025 - Cabinet (Item 42) Cambridge North Framework for Change* https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/s70770/Item%206.%20North%20Cambridge%20Cabinet%20Report.pdf . These are approvals on variations to the scheme, to be developed through Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) or through an alternative procurement route, land transfer, CPO and Demolition Notices:

v. Authorise the Assistant Director, Development in consultation with the Cabinet Member for housing to approve variations to the scheme including the number of units and mix of property types, sizes and tenure.

vi. Delegate authority be given to the Cabinet Member for Housing in conjunction with the Assistant Director, Development to enable the sites at Arbury Court, Kingsway, parts of Brackley Close, Rutland Close and Verulam Way to be developed through Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) or through an alternative procurement route subject to a value for money assessment to be carried out on behalf of the Council.

vii. Authorise, subject to III, the Assistant Director in consultation with the Cabinet member for Housing to approve the transfer of the land for Arbury Court, Kingsway, parts of Brackley Close, Rutland Close and Verulam Way shown edged red on the attached plan in Appendix 3 and 5 to a third party for redevelopment. The transfer will be at a value provided by a further independent valuation.

viii. Authorise, subject to III, the Assistant Director of Development in consultation with the Cabinet member for Housing to approve an Affordable Housing Agreement with a third party for the purchase of 206 affordable homes. This agreement will be at a value provided by an independent valuer.

ix. Delegate authority to the Assistant Director of Development to make a Compulsory Purchase Order in respect of any leasehold interests at

Kingsway, Brackley Close and Arbury Court and any of the 5 freehold households on Rutland Close and Verulam Way identified for possible redevelopment that cannot be acquired by private treaty within a reasonable timescale and at a reasonable cost subject to the Director of Place being satisfied that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the use of compulsory purchase powers, and that all legal and policy requirements for the making and confirmation of a CPO have been met.

x. Delegate authority to the Assistant Director, Development to serve initial Demolition Notices under the Housing Act 1985.

xi. Delegate Authority to the Assistant Director of Housing and Homelessness to approve a local lettings plan for the proposed developments.

xii. Approves the increase of Davy Road redevelopment project budget from £17,840,740.95 to £20,300,000 to account for an increase in the number of council homes that will be delivered. This total budget is for the purchase of affordable homes to cover all site assembly, construction costs, professional fees and further associated fees. Budget to be drawn down from the sum already approved for investment in new homes and not yet allocated.

xiii. Approves this update report – Appendix 1 of the Officer's report - on the Council's Portfolio approach for the Ten-Year New Homes Programme

26/65/Cab Cost of Living Update

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport and the Head of Strategy and Policy, introduced the report.

The report provided an update for Cabinet on the cost of living support available to Cambridge residents this autumn and winter.

In response to questions from the Cabinet and those Councillors present, the Head of Strategy and Policy and Director of Communities said the following:

i. An all-Member briefing on the cost of living would be held on November 2, providing Councillors with an opportunity to receive further information and ask questions. Given the breadth of work involved, a number of Officers from different teams would be attending the session.

ii. Would encourage Members to attend the briefing to gain a more detailed understanding of the Council's response and the work being undertaken, enabling them to signpost residents more effectively.

iii. The Council maintained a dedicated Cost of Living webpage; this held a significant amount of information which signposted residents to support

available directly from the Council as well as assistance provided by a range of voluntary and community sector organisations across the city.

iv. Residents seeking information or support were encouraged to consult this webpage as the primary source of guidance.

v. An aspect that was not always fully recognised was that many residents and tenants already came into contact with the Council through the wide range of services provided. For example, housing services, tenancy support, and housing advice often identified residents who may be experiencing financial hardship or other challenges.

vi. The Council's response was not solely reliant on external referrals or specialist support services. Information and assistance could also be provided through existing Council services, which played a significant role in identifying needs and connecting residents with the appropriate support at an early stage.

vii. Noted the comment that it was positive to see that the Council had measures in place to support on the cost of living.

viii. The programme was being delivered jointly by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, with a shared project team comprising dedicated Officers from each authority and a Manager overseeing both posts.

ix. Both councils used the LIFT (Low Income Family Tracker) system and were seeking to build on the experience of South Cambridgeshire in measuring and evaluating outcomes. The system enabled access to relevant Department for Work and Pensions data, allowing Officers to monitor the effectiveness of campaigns aimed at increasing take-up of benefits such as Pension Credit.

x. The approach helped the councils assess both the level of benefit uptake achieved and the resulting financial gains for residents. The data was also used to identify residents who may be experiencing utility debt or financial hardship, enabling targeted support through debt relief initiatives, income maximisation advice, and other cost-of-living interventions.

xi. Acknowledged that the broader objective was to ensure that the Council's cost-of-living response was evidence-led.

xii. Emphasised the importance of using available data to target support towards those most in need and to ensure that resources were directed towards the interventions that were proven to have the greatest impact for residents.

The Cabinet **unanimously resolved** to:

i. Note the cost of living interventions announced by Government and the cost of living support already planned by the Council for autumn and winter 2026/27.

26/66/Cab Public Spaces Protection Order for anti-social behaviour driving

The Cabinet Member for Communities introduced the report.

The report referred to the work undertaken in response to the commitment to explore the introduction of a citywide Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) to address anti-social driving in Cambridge.

The report was required as Officers had completed an initial review of available evidence and discussions with key partners and were seeking Cabinet direction regarding next steps.

In response to Members' questions and statements and questions from those present, the Environmental Health Manager and Director of Communities said the following:

i. Officers would continue to work with the Communities team to develop an online reporting mechanism so that concerns could be submitted through a single, central system.
ii. Officers were also working with the police, County Council colleagues and other external partners to determine how best to bring the information together. The aim was to make it easier to record, monitor and analyse reports relating to anti-social driving and road-related antisocial behaviour across the city.
iii. The work was still in development, but the objective was to create a clear and accessible reporting process that would help gather evidence, identify patterns and better understand the scale of residents' concerns.
iv. The proposals remained a work in progress; Officers would now develop the next steps and bring forward a more detailed approach.
v. Reports received from the Police on anti-social driving included a range of different issues, such as dangerous parking, parking on pavements, dangerous driving, vehicle noise, and other vehicle-related nuisance complaints.
vi. The challenge was that not all of these issues fell within the scope of the proposed PSPO, therefore it was important to distinguish between the different types of incidents being reported.

vii. Officers were working with the police to refine the data and improve how reports were categorised. The aim was to filter out matters such as parking offences and general noise complaints so those incidents that specifically relate to anti-social driving could be identified.

viii. Currently much of the information was recorded under a single heading, making it difficult to assess the true scale of anti-social driving in the city. Developing a more detailed breakdown of the data would help build a stronger evidence base and ensure that any future action was targeted appropriately and proportionately.

ix. Noted the comments that it was important to call for evidence and when was the right point to start the three month window of evidence; summer months could see a higher proportion of anti-social driving.

x. Noted comments questioning whether it was realistic to expect members of the public to record vehicle registration numbers and other identifying details when reporting incidents. Members queried whether expectations should be adjusted and whether alternative methods could be developed to capture relevant evidence and information.

xi. Welcomed suggestions to engage with students, either directly or through the Universities' Welfare Officers, recognising that student accommodation was often located within the city centre where incidents of anti-social driving occurred.

xii. Responded to Cllr Tong's written statement by advising that it was not considered possible for Cabinet Members to support Option 2, which proposed immediate implementation, given the need for further evidence gathering, consultation and consideration before any decision could be taken.

The Cabinet **unanimously resolved** to:

i. Note the work undertaken to date and the evidence currently available regarding anti-social driving within Cambridge.

ii. Approve Option 3 as outlined in the Officer’s report as the Council's preferred approach, namely a time-limited Call for Evidence to establish whether sufficient evidence exists to justify further investigation of a potential Public Space Protection Order (PSPO), with Officers reporting the outcome to Cabinet.

iii. Note that any future proposal to introduce a PSPO would require further evidence gathering, statutory consultation, legal review, completion of an Equality Impact Assessment and a further Cabinet decision.

26/67/Cab Leisure Contract Outcomes

The Cabinet Member for Communities introduced the report.

The report referred to the outcome of the procurement for the Council's leisure facilities and the proposed inclusion of Trumpington Academy's sports facilities. It described the planned investment, wider access and health programmes, carbon reduction measures and expected financial return.

In response to questions from Cabinet Members and those Councillors present, the Cabinet Member for Communities, the Recreational Development Manager and the Director for Communities said the following:

i. The free residents' cards would be open to all residents of Cambridge, with regards to the concessions there would be different kinds of discounts, from 10%, to 50%.
ii. Further work could be undertaken through outreach programmes and the public health teams to better understand the needs of disabled residents. Direct engagement and tailoring support programmes based on feedback and lived experience was a possibility.
iii. Noted the comment that the commitment to local employment and social value initiatives, including apprenticeships, volunteering opportunities and work placements was welcomed. These would continue to be monitored and existing programmes would be expanded and supported by agreed performance measures, targets and monitoring arrangements.
iv. Prices would continue to be reported to the Committee annually, typically in February, with increases generally in the range of 2.5% to 3.5%. While some prices may be rounded for practical reasons, the Council would retain control over headline pricing, concessions and pricing structures.
v. Certain services, such as swimming lessons and memberships, would be subject to market-based pricing, enabling flexibility while maintaining oversight of key access and affordability policies.
vi. The Council already operated an agency model for VAT recovery within its leisure contract arrangements. Under this model, GLL acted as the Council's agent and collected income on the Council's behalf, enabling the Council to recover VAT that would otherwise be non-recoverable.
vii. Charitable trusts could incur a financial cost in relation to VAT arrangements, and the agency model helped mitigate this and deliver savings. The use of agency models had become increasingly common across leisure contracts nationally.
viii. Whether the VAT arrangement could change in future, was dependent on any future decisions or guidance from HMRC.

ix. Would not hit the Council's target of being net zero by 2030. However, by having that target a lot of work had been undertaken to reduce the Council's carbon emissions across all portfolios.

x. Future projects would include further solar photovoltaic generation and air source heat pumps at Cherry Hinton Village Centre and Kings Hedges; combined solar photovoltaic and solar thermal equipment at Abbey; and energy controls and lighting improvements at Parkside. Water and energy efficiency measures would be incorporated into refurbishments. Parkside's inclusion in the District Heat Network. There were opportunities to improve water recycling and reuse at swimming pools and splash pads.

xi. Noted the comment that the splash parks at Kings Hedges and Abbey needed to be improved and to use recycled water as had been done at Coleridge.

xii. At Trumpington Academy, the aim was to extend opportunities for pupils, staff and residents outside school hours, at weekends and during holidays.

xiii. Future development of Jesus Green Lido remained a key priority and should remain true to the original 1923 vision while ensuring the facility continues to evolve to meet current and future needs.

xiv. A cross-party approach would be taken to help shape the long-term future of the Lido while working with external partners.

xv. The Lido was operating close to a cost-neutral position. While income was expected to be lower during the initial period of the new contract due to capital investment, the introduction of improved and additional facilities was expected to increase usage and generate additional income in future years.

xvi. Proposals for new facilities at the Lido would include the provision of Changing Places and other accessible changing facilities to improve accessibility for disabled users. A temporary Changing Places facility had recently been completed and was now open for use.

In response to questions regarding social prescribing, officers confirmed that work was being undertaken with Public Health colleagues to develop and evaluate programmes. The focus would be on expanding activities beyond traditional leisure centre-based provision and delivering more community-led opportunities within neighbourhoods.

Members were advised that plans for the redevelopment continued to include consideration of public toilet provision within the site.

The Cabinet **unanimously resolved** to:

i. Note the award of the new leisure management contract to GLL (Greenwich Leisure Limited), initially for 10 years from November 2026, with an option to extend for five years to October 2041, and the outcomes secured through the procurement;
ii. Confirm the delegations needed to deliver site-specific Section 106 capital projects and draw down the relevant allocations for investment in Council leisure facilities;
iii. Confirm the delegations needed to bring eligible new or existing sports facilities within the contract during its term; and
iv. Confirm the delegations needed to enter into Community Use Agreements with Trumpington Academy and any other academies joining the contract, to enable the Council and GLL to manage their sports facilities through the agency model, subject to the necessary approvals.

26/68/Cab Disposal of 3-5 Coldham's Lane Cambridge

The Cabinet **unanimously resolved** to exclude members of the public and press from the meeting on the grounds that, if they were present, there would be disclosure to them of information defined as exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport introduced the report.

The report sought approval to dispose of the Council’s freehold interest in 3–5 Coldham’s Lane, currently held subject to a long lease to Railway Pension Nominees Limited (Railpen).

No questions or comments were made on this item.

The Cabinet **unanimously approved** to

i. Disposal of the Council’s freehold interest in 3-5 Coldham Lane, Cambridge to Railway Pension Nominees Limited (Railpen).
ii. Delegate authority to the Director of Economy & Place or Chief Property Surveyor to finalise the terms of disposal.

The meeting ended at 9.10 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank