

Report by: Head of Policy and Projects

To: West/Central Area Committee 04 February 2010

Wards: Castle, Newnham and Market

Environmental Improvements Programme

1. DECISIONS TO BE MADE: -

- **Gough Way – Cranmer Road Path : Fencing Renewal**
Decision: Agree to implementation of the works at an estimated cost of £8,300.
- **Fitzroy/Burleigh Street Refurbishment**
Decision: Agree to consultation costs of up to £2,000.
- **Mount Pleasant Mobility Crossing**
Decision: Agree to abandon the proposals on safety grounds.

2. BUDGET and DELIVERY PROGRAMME (See over)

WEST CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE					
<i>Environmental Improvements Programme 2009-2011</i>					
Total Budget Available to 31/3/11		£368,400			
ADOPTED PROJECTS	COMPLETE	Approved Budget £	Total Spend previous years £	Forecast Spend 2009/10 £	Forecast Spend 2010/11 £
Round Church Grounds	✓	7,800	0	7,800	0
Oxford Road & Windsor Road 20MPH Zone	✓	10,500	0	4,703	0
Canterbury Street 20 MPH Zone	✓	8,500	933	4,188	0
Fitzroy/Burleigh Street Phase 3 Refurbishment		100,000	0	0	100,000
Holy Trinity War Memorial		9,000	0	9,000	0
Grantchester Road Traffic Calming		15,000	0	15,000	0
Gough Way to Cranmer Road Timber Fence Replacement		5,000	0	8,300	0
Tree Planting Midsummer Common, Jesus Green, New Sq		50,000	0	0	50,000
Riverside Conflict Reduction Scheme		61,000	0	0	61,000
Auckland St Parsonage St retaining wall	✓	22,000	19,780	0	0
Histon Rd Recreation Ground Planting (remaining spend)	✓	4,500	2,974	0	0
Eltisley Avenue/Marlowe Rd (remaining spend)	✓	1,100	875	0	0
sub-totals		294,400	24,561	48,991	211,000
Total adopted projects					259,991
Uncommitted Budget					108,409
SCHEMES UNDER DEVELOPMENT*		Estimated Cost £	Total Spend to Date £	Forecast Spend 2009/10 £	Forecast Spend 2010/11 £
Lammas Land Pavilion rebuild		20,000	0	0	20,000
Mud Lane Lighting		5,000	0	0	5,000
Wall Adjacent to Union Society Building, Park Street		15,000	0	0	15,000
sub-totals		40,000	0	0	40,000
total projects in development					40,000
Uncommitted Budget					68,409

*Projects agreed by Cttee to be investigated, but no budget committed. Costs shown are estimated and will depend on detailed design and site investigation. N.B. The estimated costs shown above are merely given as a rough guide until the projects can be designed and costed.

3.0 DELIVERY PROGRAMME

ID	Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish	% Complete	Scheme Category	Lead Cllr	Project Manager	Lead Officer
1	WEST/CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE EIP PROGRAMME 2009/11	335 days	Mon 06/04/09	Thu 29/07/10	58%				
2									
3	WEST/CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE MEETING DATES	156 days	Thu 20/08/09	Thu 08/04/10	0%				
9									
10	WEST/CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE PROJECTS	335 days	Mon 06/04/09	Thu 29/07/10	58%				
11	✓ Canterbury Street [Introduction of a 20mph speed limit]	154 days	Mon 06/04/09	Thu 05/11/09	100%	Minor		Jlsh	JV
22									
23	✓ Oxford Road [Traffic Calming]	155 days	Mon 06/04/09	Fri 06/11/09	100%	Medium	J.Hipkin	Jlsh	JV
33									
34	Lammas Land [Replacement of Pavilion]	335 days	Mon 06/04/09	Thu 29/07/10	26%	Major	J.Smith	DFN	JV
48									
49	✓ Round Church grounds [Repairs to wall & cobble surfacing]	103 days	Mon 06/04/09	Wed 26/08/09	100%	Minor	C.Rosensteil	DFN	
53									
54	Contribution toward Burleigh/Fitzroy Phase 3 refurbishment [Refurishment of street furniture/tree pits/lighting etc]	179 days	Mon 06/04/09	Thu 10/12/09	55%	Medium	T.Bick	DFN	AJ
61									
62	Manor Street/King Street [Cycle Parking Facilities]	227 days	Mon 06/04/09	Mon 01/03/10	52%	Major	T.Bick	Jlsh	PT
75									
76	Grantchester Rd [Traffic Calming]	254 days	Mon 06/04/09	Wed 07/04/10	73%	Medium	S.Reid	Jlsh	
90									
91	Gough Way to Cranmer Rd [Timber Fence Replacement]	212 days	Mon 06/04/09	Mon 08/02/10	62%	Medium	S.Reid	DFN	
103									
104	Tree Planting Open Spaces [Jesus Green, Midsummer Common & New Square]	215 days	Mon 06/04/09	Thu 11/02/10	9%	Major		DFN	

3.0 APPROVED SCHEMES – PROGRESS

3.1 Manor Street / King Street Cycle Parking

Following initial consultation with property owners, the draft proposals and draft tripartite agreement has been finalised and sent to the landowner Jesus College and building owner King Street Housing for consideration.

3.2 Lammas Land pavilion

This scheme is being led by Active Community Officers who are currently offering the project for an additional funding contribution from Section 106 monies. Officers propose to return to West/Central Area Committee once further funding has been secured.

3.3 Tree Planting on Midsummer Common, Jesus Green and New Square

Work is being undertaken to develop a consultation/workshop strategy to be organised by Active Communities in order to discuss with residents and other interested parties the current approaches to tree management and planting and then a scheme will go to public consultation. This work has been delayed due to the long-term sickness of the Principal Arboriculture Officer. A solution to the progression of this work is currently being discussed with Active Communities.

3.4 Mud Lane Lighting

Work is continuing in a bid to secure funding for the maintenance of this lighting.

3.5 Grantchester Road traffic calming features

Final Highway Authority Audits and approvals are currently being finalised for this scheme. Construction is expected to be complete by the end of March.

4.0 EXISTING SCHEMES REQUIRING DECISIONS

4.1 Gough Way – Cranmer Road Footpath : Fencing Renewal

The works comprise the renewal of the fencing between the path and the grazing land, from the footbridge to Cranmer Road.

This scheme has now been costed in accordance with the requirements of the landowner, Jesus College, and its tenant.

The estimated cost of the works is £8,300.

The Area Committee asked that the possibility of joint-funding the works with the College be investigated.

The path in question is situated on land that the City Council leases from Jesus College; the path is not a public footpath.

The terms of the lease require the City Council, at its own expense, to provide, maintain, and ultimately remove the path and fence if the former is ever closed.

In view of the terms of the lease, the College is unwilling to joint-fund the fence renewal.

Recommendation : Officers recommend that the West/Central Area Committee agree to the implementation of the fencing renewal at an estimated cost of £8,300.

Decision: Agree to implementation of the works at an estimated cost of £8,300

4.2 Fitzroy/Burleigh Street Refurbishment

Draft proposals for the refurbishment of Fitzroy/Burleigh Street are being finalised and the working party agree that public consultation can be carried out in February. It is anticipated that the consultation response can be reported back to West/Central Area Committee in April.

The draft proposals for Fitzroy/Burleigh Street include the following elements of change:

- Replacing all street furniture (seating, bollards and litter bins) with new contemporary style furniture.
- Replacing the street lighting in Fitzroy Street to match that in Burleigh Street.
- Removing all but one public phone box in order to de-clutter the streets.
- Repairing street surfaces.
- Installing tree surrounds in Fitzroy Street to avoid the existing trip hazards at the base of trees.
- De-cluttering the streets by rationalising the locations of some of the bicycle racks.

West Central Area Committee are asked for their agreement to spend up to £2,000 on consultation expenses (printing and distribution) to be deducted from the already provisionally agreed £100,000 for this project.

Recommendation : Officers recommend that the West/Central Area Committee agree to consultation costs of up to £2,000.

Decision: Agree to consultation costs of up to £2,000.

4.3 Mount Pleasant Mobility Crossing

The County Councils' Safety Auditors have recommended that this crossing should not be installed on safety grounds, despite the agreement of Highway Authority Engineers. Officers have discussed the results of this audit with County Engineers who have also now agreed with the recommendations.

Recommendation : Officers recommend that the West/Central Area Committee agree to abandon the proposals on safety grounds.

Decision: Agree to abandon the proposals on safety grounds.

5.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS

See appendices.

7. IMPLICATIONS

- a) **Equal Opportunities Implications:** These are taken into account on individual schemes.
- b) **Environmental Implications:** All of the projects seek to bring about an improvement in the local environment.
- c) **Community Safety:** This has been included as one of the assessment criteria agreed by Committee and is considered on each project.

8. INSPECTION OF PAPERS

To inspect or query the background paperwork or report, please contact,

Andrew Preston

Environmental Projects Manager

Telephone: 01223 457271

Email: andrew.preston@cambridge.gov.uk

APPENDIX 1

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA - as agreed by Executive Councillor (Environment) on 18 March 2003 with amendments agreed 22 March 2005

The essential criteria for consideration of funding of Environmental Improvement works are:

- Schemes should have a direct, lasting and noticeable improvement to the appearance of a street or area.
- Schemes should be publicly visible and accessible.
- Schemes must have the owners consent if on private land – unless there are exceptional circumstances by which Area Committee may wish to act unilaterally and with full knowledge and responsibility for the implication of such action.
- Schemes must account for future maintenance costs.

Desirable criteria – potential schemes should be able to demonstrate some level of:

- Active involvement of local people.
- Benefit for a large number of people.
- ‘Partnership’ funding.
- Potential for inclusion of employment training opportunities.
- Ease and simplicity of implementation.
- Potential for meeting key policy objectives (e.g. improving community safety or contributing to equal opportunities).

Categories of scheme ineligible for funding:

- Where a readily available alternative source of funding is available.
- Revenue projects.
- Schemes that have already received Council funding (unless it can be clearly demonstrated that this would not be ‘top up’ funding).
- Works that the City or County Council are under an immediate obligation to carry out (e.g. repair of dangerous footways)
- Play areas (as there are other more appropriate sources of funding including S106 monies)

The following categories of work were agreed as being eligible for funding by the Area Committees:

- Works in areas of predominately council owned housing
- Works to construct lay-bys where a comprehensive scheme can be carried out which not only relieves parking problems but achieves environmental improvements.