

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

REPORT OF: Director of Environment

TO: South Area Committee 16/9/2013

WARDS: Cherry Hinton, Queen Edith's, Trumpington

DEVOLVED DECISION-MAKING AND DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS: SECOND ROUND SHORT-LISTING FOR SOUTH AREA

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The four local priorities identified by the South Area Committee in the first round of devolved decision-making are moving forward:
- a. the community hub at Cherry Hinton library has been completed;
 - b. the Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground trim trail is due to be installed within 6-8 weeks;
 - c. work on the community room at Princess Court/Hanover Court is due to start in December, with completion expected in February;
 - d. consultation on the improvements to the Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground will take place shortly so that these can be delivered by spring 2014, as planned. Local residents and users of the recreation ground will be asked for views on the proposals for additional play area equipment and panna goals from this month and on the skate park proposals from November.
- 1.2 Without diverting the focus from delivering these first round projects, this report introduces the second round of devolved decision-making. It summarises the feedback from the recent consultation about local project ideas and puts the proposals in the context of the latest analysis of devolved developer contributions available for the South Area. This will help the Area Committee to identify its next set of priorities for developer contributions funding, so that these can be prepared, appraised and implemented from spring 2014, once the first round priority projects have been completed.
- 1.3 This report aims to help the Area Committee to whittle down the current list of 33 local ideas to a short-list of around eight. A follow-up report on those short-listed options will help the Area Committee to prioritise around four projects.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 To short-list the project ideas that the Area Committee would wish to consider in more detail in a follow-up report in January 2014.
- 2.2 To consider whether there are any project ideas that the Area Committee would wish to prioritise now, subject to project appraisal.
- 2.3 To consider whether any project ideas on the South Area list should be referred to another (area or scrutiny) committee for consideration;
- 2.4 To note other comments and suggestions (not eligible for developer contributions funding) made as part of the recent consultation.

3. CONTEXT

- 3.1 Background information can be found in Appendix A. This includes:
 - a. a round-up of projects in the South Area funded from developer contributions in recent years;
 - b. an overview of the first round of devolved decision-making in 2012/13 and the local and strategic projects prioritised so far; and
 - c. a summary of the process for the second round, which was considered by the Environment Scrutiny Committee last June.
- 3.2 This summer, prior to the second round, comments and updates were invited on the 33 project ideas that had been suggested by local residents and community groups last year but not prioritised in the first round. This exercise has also provided the opportunity for fresh suggestions. There were 20 responses from the South Area covering a range of project ideas (see Appendix B). An update on any comments received after the publication of this report will be given at the meeting. Other feedback is summarised in Appendix C.
- 3.3 The South Area list of project ideas is set out in Table 1. As an initial filter, proposals that are ineligible for developer contributions or would far exceed the devolved contributions available or no longer need funding are marked with a '✘'. (Last July's Developer Contributions newsletter already highlighted no devolved funding availability for public realm improvements and limited amounts for indoor sports [under £25k] and public art [under £10k]). Discounting these ideas reduces the number being considered in this report from 33 to 21.

4. AVAILABILITY OF DEVOLVED DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

- 4.1 Short-listing and priority-setting needs to be set firmly in the context of the levels of developer contributions available for devolved decision-making. The project ideas to be identified as priorities must be affordable within the unallocated funding already received in the appropriate contribution types.

Table 1: Project ideas and devolved contributions types needed

No.	Project ideas	Types	
1	Refurbish centre at Cherry Hinton Baptist Church	A	
2	Phases 2-3 of community centre for Cherry Hinton	A	
3	Upgrade kitchen at St John's Community Rooms	A	
4	Café/drop-in centre at St James' Church/QE Chapel	A	
5	Turn Brooklands Ave bunker into community facility	A	
6	Extend Trumpington Bowls Club Pavilion	A	
7	Better parking at King George V Pavilion	A	
8	Benches in parks	B	
9	Make nature reserves more accessible/interesting	B	
10	BMX track/zip wire at Lime Kiln Chalk Pits	B	
11	Trim trail for Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground	B, D	
12	Increase biodiversity at Nightingale Avenue Rec	-	✘
13	Trim trail at Accordia	B, D	
14	Footbridge over Hobson's Conduit	-	✘
15	Community orchard on Empty Common	B	
16	Swift Tower for community orchard on Foster Road	-	✘
17	Fitness circuit at Trumpington Rec	B, D	
18	Skate ramp for older children at Trumpington Rec	B	
19	Improve Trumpington Rec play area	C	
20	Junior scooter park for pre-teens at Accordia	C	
21	New or refurbished Cherry Hinton Rec pavilion	D, A	
22	Basketball court or MUGA Cherry Hinton Rec	D	
23	New pavilion at Nightingale Avenue Rec	D, A	
24	New cricket pavilion at Netherhall School	D	
25	Expand badminton courts behind Queen Edith Chapel	E	✘
26	Public art on Cherry Hinton green	F	✘
27	Benches on streets	G	✘
28	Improve public realm around Colville Road car park	G	✘
29	Supplement scheme to improve Cherry Hinton High St	G	✘
30	Information boards in Cherry Hinton village	-	✘
31	Improve Cherry Hinton Road streetscape	-	✘
32	Improve streetscapes in Newtown	G	✘
33	New information maps around Trumpington village	-	✘

Key to contribution types: A = Community Facilities; B = Informal Open Space; C = Provision for Children and Teenagers; D = Outdoor Sports Facilities; E = Indoor Sports Facilities; F = Public Art; G = Public Realm

- 4.3 Table 2, below, provides an updated analysis of the developer contributions devolved to the South Area. Whilst this shows that there is considerable funding available, when placed in the context of local aspirations for new and improved local facilities, the Area Committee is still likely to be faced with some difficult choice about its priorities.

Table 2		Devolved funding available	'Ball park' cost estimates of the costs of the remaining 21 project ideas
Contribution types			
A	Community facilities	£125k	Around £650k
B	Informal open space	£175k	Around £250k
C	Play provision	£25k	Around £75k
D	Outdoor sports	£150k	Around £450k

Figures for devolved contributions rounded down to nearest £25k. The cost estimates include assumptions where proposals are not yet known (eg, £100k for community facility conversions/refurbishments).

- 4.4 The number of short-listed options and project priorities per area committee needs to take account not only of the devolved developer contributions available but also the staffing capacity available to deliver priority projects across all four areas as well as strategic/city-wide priorities. For the second round, each area committee has been asked to set as many second priorities as it has wards, plus an additional grant-funded priority (to be delivered by a local community group). The number of short-listed options could be double this amount. Therefore, the South Area is invited to identify eight short-listed options from which it can choose four priorities.
- 4.5 Looking at the contribution types that the remaining 21 project ideas would draw on most, Table 3 suggests how many in each category the Area Committee might short-list and prioritise. 'Project idea codes' refer to the numbering in the left-hand column in Tables 1 & 4.

Table 3 Main contribution type	How many ideas?	Project idea codes between	How many might be short-listed?	How many might be prioritised?
Community facilities	7	[1]–[7]	Up to 2	Up to 1
Informal open space	8	[8]–[18]	Up to 3	Up to 2
Play provision	2	[19]–[20]	Up to 2	Up to 1
Outdoor sports	4	[21]–[24]	Up to 3	Up to 2

- a. The advice in Table 3 to short-list up to two or three ideas in particular categories does not mean that this number is expected in each case. For some contribution types (eg, community facilities), it may be difficult to identify that many options that are ready to be considered in this second round. The Area Committee is invited to short-list of around eight ideas in total.
 - b. Whilst referring to these main contribution types can be useful in helping to break the short-listing task down into more manageable 'chunks', there are some complications:
 - trim trails (project ideas [11], [13], and [17]) can use outdoor sports as well as informal open space contributions;
 - improvements to play areas (eg, [19]) can use informal open space as well as play provision contributions.
- 4.6 Officers would recommend that area committees' choice of short-listed options, and ultimately, priorities, should draw on a range of different contribution types in order to help make sure that contributions with expiry date conditions can be used on time. Further details can be found in Appendix D. Allocations already made to first round local priority projects and other on-going schemes mean that there are currently no unallocated devolved contributions with expiry dates (for contracts to be put in place) before December 2016.
- 4.7 At the same time, area committees may wish to defer using all the funding available in particular contribution types so as to leave some for future priority-setting rounds or allow more to accrue so that larger projects (which may not be ready to consider yet) can be undertaken in future. This is particularly relevant for the South Area as its list of project ideas includes a number which are still at an early stage and need more time to develop. This point is explored further in paragraph 6.5.

5. SHORT-LISTING OPTIONS

- 5.1 Table 4 provides a summary of the remaining 21 project ideas, including estimates of how much developer contributions funding they might need and when they might be delivered. This draws on the recent consultation feedback and officer notes in Appendix B. As a first step, the Area Committee is asked to go through the ideas in the table to identify which proposals it would be prepared to rule out and which ones it finds particularly interesting.
- 5.2 Once the Area Committee has done this, Section 6 highlights some further issues to consider in helping to firm up the short-list.

Table 4: Assessment of project ideas

No.	Ward	Project ideas	Provisional estimates					Delivery	Commentary
			Comm. Facility	Informal OS	Play	Outdoor Sport			
1	CH	Refurbish centre at Cherry Hinton Baptist Church	?	-	-	-	Medium term	No proposal yet. Not ready to be considered in second round	
2	CH	Phases 2-3 of community centre for Cherry Hinton	£150k-£250k	-	-	-	Medium term	Residents' assoc. taking stock of phase 1 before moving forward	
3	QE	Upgrade kitchen at St John's Community Rooms	£20k-£25k	-	-	-	Short/Medium	No proposal yet. Not ready to be considered in second round	
4	QE	Café/drop-in centre at St James' Church/QE Chapel	?	-	-	-	Medium term	No proposal yet. Not ready to be considered in second round	
5	T	Turn Brooklands Ave bunker into community facility	?	-	-	-	Medium term	No proposal yet. Needed? New facility at Kaleidoscope soon	
6	T	Extend Trumpington Bowls Club Pavilion	£35k	-	£35k	-	Short term	Bowls club & residents' assoc. support. Could be useful	
7	T	Better parking at King George V Pavilion	?	-	-	-	Short term	Not supported by residents' assoc. Need questioned	
8	Area	Benches in parks	-	£30k	-	-	Short term	Do-able. Byron's Pool benches better funded from growth site	
9	Area	Make nature reserves more accessible/interesting	-	£30k	-	-	Short term	Could do it across South's LNRs, but is it a strategic project?	
10	CH	BMX track/zip wire at Lime Kiln Chalk Pits	-	£30k	-	-	Short term	Not supported by consultation respondent nor by officers	
11	CH	Trim trail for Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground	-	£15k	-	£15k	Short term	Do-able. Could look at options to minimise impact on open space	

No.	Ward	Project ideas	Provisional estimates						Delivery	Commentary
			CF	IOS	Play	OS	IOS	OS		
13	T	Trim trail at Accordia	-	£15k	-	£15k	-	£15k	Medium	Do-able. Already officer input
15	T	Community orchard on Empty Common	-	£15k	-	-	-	-	Short term	Could fund landscaping, paths and benches.
17	T	Fitness circuit at Trumpington Rec	-	£15k	-	£15k	-	£15k	Short term	Could be done (trim trail/outdoor gym equipment)
18	T	Skate ramp for older children at Trumpington Rec	-	£65k	-	-	-	-	Short term	Could be done, similar to plans for Cherry Hinton & Nun's Way
19	T	Improve Trumpington Rec play area	-	£10k-£35k	£25k-£65k	-	-	-	Short term	Only £25k devolved play funding available. Could be R&R scheme
20	T	Junior scooter park for pre-teens at Accordia	-	-	£20k-£25k	-	-	-	Short term	Strong local support. Design proposals have been worked up
21	CH	New or refurbished Cherry Hinton Rec pavilion	-	-	-	-	£60k-£100k	-	Short term	Strong support from residents' assoc. Refurb. could be meet need. Estimates based on refurb.
22	CH	Basketball court or MUGA Cherry Hinton Rec	-	-	-	-	£75k	-	Medium term	Do-able. Could link it to pavilion refurb and review use of space
23	QE	New pavilion at Nightingale Avenue Rec	£150k-£200k	-	-	-	£150k-£200k	-	Medium term	Strong support. Growing usage justifies new pavilion + meeting space. Question need for café.
24	QE	New cricket pavilion at Netherhall School	-	-	-	-	£25k-£100k	-	Long term	No proposal yet. Good idea but is it as high priority as others?

Key: The 'delivery' column includes rough estimates about how long after April 2014 project ideas could be delivered (short-term by October '15, medium-term by April '17 and long-term beyond April 17). Timescales will be refined for short-listed options. Wards: CH = Cherry Hinton; QE = Queen Edith's; T = Trumpington; Area = within/across South Area.

6. TAKING STOCK

- 6.1 It is envisaged that, by reviewing Table 4, the Area Committee may be able to discount a number of the 21 project ideas (for example, on the grounds that they are not ready to be considered yet or are not justified by levels of need). There are now a number of other issues that each area committee is being invited to consider before short-listing, albeit that not all of them may apply to all areas.
- 6.2 One of the lessons learnt from the first round process is that some smaller, related project ideas could be packaged together in order to form larger proposals, helping areas committee to get more out of the number of short-listed options and priorities they have been invited to identify. Section 5 has already highlighted the following connections between smaller project ideas.
- Accordia: [13], [20] and, possibly, [15]
 - Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground: [11], [21] and [22]
 - Trumpington Recreation Ground: [17], [18] and [19].
- 6.3 All Area Committee are being asked to consider whether there are any project ideas which are 'ready to go' and could be prioritised now without the need for short-listing. This may be particularly useful for areas which are looking at other funding or project delivery opportunities at the same time and where there is a possibility to 'kill two birds with one stone'. It must be emphasised, however, that this is not intended to cut across the commitment to deliver the first round priority projects first before embarking on second round priorities.
- 6.4 Another question being posed to each area committee is whether it wishes to refer some project ideas currently on the Area list to the city-wide/strategic list of ideas (which could benefit residents of more than one area), or seek joint funding from another area. This has been raised in Section 5 in connection with project [9] (making local nature reserves in South Area more accessible and interesting).
- 6.5 The Area Committee could choose to short-list fewer than the suggested eight project ideas now given that a number of proposals in some categories (eg, community facilities) are not ready to be considered yet. At the heart of this is the question of whether to pursue some options now because they could be taken forward or to wait until other ideas - still being developed but possibly a higher priority – could be considered in later round of devolved decision-making. There is a balance to be struck here between taking a long-term view and making sure that developer contributions with expiry dates can be used on time.

- 6.6 Members are asked to note some of the other suggestions from South Area respondents in Appendix C, which do not relate to the use of existing devolved developer contributions in this area.
- 6.7 The Environment and Community Services Scrutiny Committees will consider short-listing options for second round strategic/city-wide project ideas at their meetings on 8 and 10 October respectively. Some consultation responses from South Area have provided updates on proposals for further grounds improvements at Cherry Hinton Hall and grant-funding for cricket nets at Netherhall School. These comments will be highlighted in the relevant scrutiny committee reports.

7. IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 **Financial implications:** The importance of ensuring that local priorities are affordable within the devolved contributions available has already been stated in Section 4 and Appendix A. Once the Area Committee has identified its local priorities, these will then undergo project appraisal (probably from spring 2014), which will include consideration of any related running or maintenance costs.
- 7.2 **Staffing implications:** The need to set priorities in the context of the available staffing capacity has also been explained in paragraph 4.4 and Appendix A. A similar point was made in the first round priority-setting report to this Area Committee in November 2012.
- 7.3 Following this current report, the next steps will be for officers to refine cost estimates and compile other available information on the short-listed options. Officers propose to report back to the Area Committee in January 2014 as there would not be enough time to produce these profiles in time for the next meeting on 4 November 2013 in view of other workloads. Given the need to ensure that officers can continue their focus on the delivery of first round projects, it is unlikely that there will be capacity available for further detailed research into proposals until after local priorities have been identified.
- 7.4 Equality and environmental impact assessments and community safety implications will be addressed for prioritised projects as part of the project appraisal process. If the compilation of profiles for the short-listed options highlights any particular issues, these will be reported in the report to the Area Committee next January.

8. CONCLUSIONS

We would like to thank all those who took the time to put forward their views in the recent Developer Contributions consultation. The introduction of devolved decision-making has involved a learning curve for everyone. The experience of implementing the first round has enabled officers to sharpen their approach and process for the second round.

9. APPENDICES

- A. Developer contributions devolved decision-making: background
- B. Overview of consultation feedback
- C. Summary of other comments from the consultation feedback
- D. Further details on developer contributions devolved to South Area

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following papers on devolved decision-making and developer contributions were used in the preparation of this report.

- Developer Contributions newsletter for South Area, July 2013
- Devolved decision-making reports to South Area Committee on 12/11/2012 and 9/5/2013
- Report to Environment Scrutiny Committee, 11/6/2013
- Report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee, 17/1/13

This and other background information can be found on the Council's Developer Contributions web page (www.cambridge.gov.uk/S106).

For the county council's Cambridgeshire Insight web pages see www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/business/research/Social+Classification.htm

The city council's Maps web page (www.cambridge.gov.uk/maps) provides links to a range of maps, including locations of community centres, sports centres and parks and playgrounds.

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report, please contact:

Author's name: Tim Wetherfield, Urban Growth Project Manager
Author's phone number: 01223 – 457313
Author's email: tim.wetherfield@cambridge.gov.uk

Developer contributions devolved decision-making: background

1. **What are developer contributions?:** When approving planning applications, the council can require property developers to pay towards the costs of new/improved local amenities to offset the impact of development. they are used to create or improve a range of community and sports facilities, parks and open spaces, play areas and public art.

The parameters for how the different contribution types can be used are set out in the council’s Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document. It is not possible to make transfers between contribution types or to fund one type of facility from an unrelated category. That said, some projects can make use of more than one contribution type. For example:

- a. Improvements to play areas can draw on ‘informal open space’ as well as ‘provision for children and teenagers’ contributions, where landscaping of the play area is involved.
- b. Sports pavilions can draw on ‘community facilities’ as well as ‘outdoor sports provision’/‘formal open space’ contributions if it provides meeting rooms that can be used by the wider community.

2. **How have developer contributions been used?:** Examples include:

Completed projects since 2007	Ward	S106 funding
Baldock Way: affordable housing	Queen Edith’s	£50k-£75k
Cherry Hinton Hall phase 1 grounds improvements	Cherry Hinton	£75k
Cherry Hinton Village Centre changing rooms	Cherry Hinton	£50k-£75k
King George V Rec. Ground Pavilion	Trumpington	£575k-£600k
Netherhall School Astroturf Pitch	Queen Edith’s	£200k
Nightingale Avenue Rec improvements (including MUGA and tennis court)	Queen Edith’s	£175k-£200k
Trumpington Rec: electronic play	Trumpington	£25k-£50k
Wulfstan Way: affordable housing	Queen Edith’s	£400k-£425k
Wulfstan Way: local centre & public art	Queen Edith’s	£50k-75k

3. **How does devolved decision-making work?:** To give local communities more say, the council has devolved to its area committees decision-making over how some developer contributions are used.

- a. It applies to the following off-site contribution types: community facilities, informal open space; provision for children and teenagers (for play area improvements); indoor sports facilities; outdoor sports facilities (formerly, formal open space); public art and public realm.
- b. The funding devolved to an area committee is based on all contributions from minor planning applications determined by the area committee or by officers under delegated powers and 50% of contributions from major applications from the area determined by the council's Planning Committee. (The other half is held in a city-wide fund for strategic projects benefiting residents of more than one area: decisions on its use remain with the relevant Executive Councillor following reports to the relevant scrutiny committees).
- c. The relevant Executive Councillor has the power to reallocate any devolved contributions getting close to 'expiry dates' to schemes that would enable the money to be used appropriately and on time.

4. What are the main ground rules for devolved decision-making?:

A project can only be taken forward where:

- a. there are enough developer contributions already available in the relevant contribution type (contributions have to be used in line with the intended purposes agreed in the related legal S106 agreements);
- b. there is sufficient officer capacity to take forward the development, appraisal, procurement and delivery of projects;
- c. it is formally agreed as a priority by the Area Committee (or Executive Councillor for strategic projects) and, consequently, included on the Council's Capital Plan. The need for projects to be formally approved before they can go forward is not new and pre-dates devolved decision-making. (Whilst officers may provide advice on the feasibility of project ideas at an earlier stage, it cannot be assumed that these ideas will be funded until decisions have been made by the appropriate committee/councillors).

The council's Constitution requires all projects above £15k to be appraised. This happens after the setting of project priorities. Appraisals for area priorities estimated to be above £75k are reported to and decided by the relevant area committee. Those under £75k are reported to the area chair and vice chair and opposition spokes for sign-off.

5. What preparations were made for devolved decision-making?:

Consultations took place in each area of the city in early autumn 2012 to assess needs for new/improved local facilities for 2012-15. All project ideas from the South Area consultation were reported to the Area Committee on 12 November 2012.

6. What happened in the first round of devolved decision-making?:

The four, agreed first round local priorities chosen by the Area Committee were:

Improvements to Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground (skate park, play area, 5-a-side goals)	£122,000
Cherry Hinton Community Centre - stage 1	£9,000
Trim Trail/outdoor fitness equipment at Nightingale Ave Rec	£30,000
Hanover Court/Princess Court community meeting space	£100,000

The strategic first round priorities (for delivery in the short-medium term), agreed by Executive Councillors last January, included the grant-funding for phase 3 of the development of the Centre at St Paul's. The first round priority projects are being taken forward alongside other on-going projects in the South Area, namely: the Southern Connections public art project and the bat and vole biodiversity project at Accordia.

7. What progress has been made on first round priority projects?

An update on progress was included in the Developer Contributions newsletter for the South Area in July 2013.

- a. Consultation on additional play area equipment and panna goals at Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground will start this month. Consultation on the skate park (including the opportunity for residents neighbouring the recreation ground to have their say) will start in November. These projects will be completed by spring 14, as previously stated.
- b. Work on the community hub at Cherry Hinton library has been completed, and the opening/launch is set to take place on 14 September.
- c. The order for the trim trail/outdoor gym equipment at Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground has been placed following approval of the project appraisal (reported elsewhere on this agenda). It is expected that this project will be completed within the next 8 weeks.
- d. The project appraisal for the community meeting space at Hanover Court and Princess Court was approved this summer. The works are due to start in December, with completion expected next February.

8. How have project ideas from last autumn been updated/refreshed?

Local people have been invited to give their comments on existing/not yet prioritised project ideas as well as putting forward new proposals. The opportunity was highlighted in the July 2013 area newsletters, which were sent to those who attended last autumn's workshops as well

as local residents' associations and other community groups. It was also publicised via the council's website and Twitter. A 23/8/13 'deadline' was set to enable feedback summaries to be included in the committee reports. All replies made before 16 September will be fed back at the Area Committee meeting.

9. How will the second round work?:

- a. Each area committee has been asked to set as many second round priorities as it has wards, plus the option of another project grant-funded from developer contributions (to be delivered by a local community group). This is in order to make sure that the overall programme of priority projects across the city is manageable and achievable.
- b. It has been envisaged that the selection of this next set of local priorities may take two reports, although there is some flexibility for the Area Committee to adapt the arrangements to fit local circumstances.
- c. A two-stage process is envisaged. Each area committee may wish to adapt this approach. Strategic project ideas will be considered in a similar way, with decisions by the relevant Executive Councillor following reports to:

	Committee dates
Environment Scrutiny (relating to open space, play areas, public art & public realm contributions)	Short-list: 08/10/13 Prioritise: 14/01/14
Community Services Scrutiny (for community facilities and outdoor/indoor sports contributions)	Short-list: 10/10/13 Prioritise: 16/01/14

10 Are there any other guidelines for the second round?:

- a. No short-term time limits are being set for the project ideas that can be considered, allowing area committees to identify projects for medium and long-term delivery. Target timescales for project delivery will be set for individual priority projects when they are appraised.
- b. Second priority projects are likely to be developed, appraised and delivered from April 2014 onwards, once first round priority projects have been completed.

Further rounds of devolved decision-making, and a refresh of the three-year assessment of needs and local ideas are envisaged in future.

For more information, please see the Developer Contributions web page at www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106.

Overview of consultation feedback

1	Refurbish family centre at Cherry Hinton Baptist Church	Cherry Hinton
----------	--	----------------------

Consultation feedback:

Cherry Hinton Baptist Church: These plans have not been developed any further. The provision of our existing services to the community is taking up all of the person-power that is currently available in our church. In the past year we have not been successful in attracting anyone to project manage development work in the church buildings. However, a recent increase in numbers of members gives us hope that in a year's time we may be in a position to proceed with refurbishing our family centre.

Cherry Hinton Residents' Association: Whole-heartedly support. This was a very modest proposal put forward by Rev. Nic Boynes and would support some excellent work being undertaken by the Baptist Church including provision of free lunches to those in need, hosting Cherry Hinton's only youth club, and hosting the local Credit Union. A very worthwhile initiative.

Provisional officer notes: Awaiting outline proposal, including information on likely costs and delivery timescales. Not ready to be considered in the second round.

2	Phases 2-3 of community centre for Cherry Hinton (new build or extension to the library)	Cherry Hinton
----------	---	----------------------

Consultation feedback:

Cherry Hinton Residents' Association: Remains on the list of desired schemes, pending a review of the success of the Phase 1 trial (first review meeting is February 2014).

MG: I think the idea of extending the public library in Cherry Hinton to include a community centre would be a good use of developer funds. This would provide a much needed public resource for the area and would, at the same time, bring more people into the library.

Provisional officer notes: Phase 1 is complete and has provided a new community room within the existing library. Phase 2 will provide a larger community facility by extending the library. Cost estimate is £150k - £200k with possible delivery in 2015. Not ready to be considered in the second round.

3	Upgrade kitchen at St John's Community Rooms	Queen Edith's
----------	---	----------------------

Consultation feedback:

Church of St. John the Evangelist: Our scheme is still on our agenda. The roughly estimated costs are in the region of £20k-£25k. We have a number of various subjects at the church all calling for expenditure and some of these are high priority. Our kitchen proposals are rising towards the top of the list, perhaps for bringing to fruition in 2014.

Provisional officer notes: Awaiting proposal. Not ready to be considered in the second round.

4	Cyber café/drop-in centre at St James' Church or Queen Edith Chapel	Queen Edith's
----------	--	----------------------

Consultation feedback: Have not heard back from St James' Church yet.

Queen Edith's Chapel: The church does not have the capacity/resources to go ahead with their project at this stage. Would like to see this as one for the future.

Provisional officer notes: Awaiting proposal. Probably not ready to be considered in the second round.

5	Adapt the old nuclear bunker off Brooklands Avenue into a community facility	Trumpington
----------	---	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

IC: The bunker conversion provides an opportunity for Cambridge University, the city council's Community Development team and residents to work together to enhance community provision for a range of parties in what would otherwise remain a dormant asset.

Provisional officer notes: Awaiting proposal. Understand that the bunker is owned by Cambridge University. There is no Community Development officer capacity to take this proposal forward, so it would need to be driven by the community. Given that there is a brand new community facility nearing completion in the vicinity at Kaleidoscope, we would want more information about the need for a further community facility at the bunker, not least given competing requests for funding community facilities elsewhere in South Area.

Consultation feedback:

Trumpington Bowls Club: If we were fortunate enough to be selected, we could extend the Pavilion by at least half again (on unused wasted area) and, with removal of some internal walls, the space could be better used. This could encourage carpet/short mat bowls to the area over the winter. This is a fast growing game, and could be of interest to Trumpington and surrounding area. We would also be offering an alternative venue available for the wider community, when not in use for bowls. We have tried for improvements/alterations over the last 3 years, funding being the stumbling block. We would be looking at approx. £50k-70k.

We have already been used in the past by the Allotment Society, and the Sewing Group. Trumpington Pavilion and the Village Hall are well used and not always available.

The club has a reasonable compliment of members and are involved with other clubs across Cambridgeshire to participate in the game, on a home and away basis. We play in four leagues with a possibility of another. We have disabled facilities and a disabled bowling chair.

With the 4000+ housing development in the immediate and surrounding areas, we foresee an increase of members to us, and also more need of alternative venues for use. Unfortunately, the size of our existing Pavilion is becoming noticeably smaller to accommodate some events. We have had to regrettably decline a request from Bowls Cambridgeshire to host an event for this reason at this time.

Trumpington Residents' Association: We support the Bowls Club in its bid for funding to extend the club. As the club has recognised, the growth in the population in the Southern Fringe in the next few years will bring in thousands of new residents who are potential users. If the facilities could be upgraded and extended this would be of considerable benefit. We understand that the club is very positive about the facilities being made available to the local community. There is the advantage that the club is alongside Trumpington Pavilion, with the opportunity for the two venues to work more closely together.

Provisional officer notes: This is a city council-owned building with a peppercorn lease. Feasibility work and some costings been carried out by Bowls Club Members. If extended, it could be used for wider community use. This would need 50:50 funding from 'community facilities' and 'outdoor sports facilities' contributions. Could be taken forward in 2014.

From a sports perspective, this proposal would be good, given the size membership of the club in relation to its small pavilion. It should also be

noted that the demand for Trumpington Bowls Club has increased as there is no longer a bowls club at Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground. Provision for bowls has not been covered in the planning obligations for the developments on the Southern Fringe of Cambridge.

7	Better parking at the King George V Pavilion on Foster Road	Trumpington
----------	--	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

Trumpington Residents' Association: As managers of the Pavilion in partnership with the Council, we appreciate that parking can be a problem at times, but in our view it is best to continue to encourage users to park on the surrounding roads and avoid obstructing the nearby junction and the building frontage. We would not support any proposal to enable parking on the green.

Provisional officer notes: Would also question the need to increase the amount of parking here. At time of development, this issue was raised and addressed. This is a local facility for local residents. The immediate area outside the building was paved to allow disabled people easier access.

8	Benches in parks (including additional seating at Byron's Pool)	Across Area
----------	--	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

Trumpington Residents' Association: We think there is a very good case for additional benches on King George V playing field and at Byron's Pool. The latter is likely to be much more heavily used once the adjacent country park has opened and more homes are occupied on the three new developments.

Friends of Cherry Hinton Hall: The proposal for benches for Cherry Hinton Hall is a long-standing request item since the establishment of the Friends in 2009. It is one that regularly comes up at our bi-monthly public meetings.

Provisional officer notes: Benches in parks and open spaces in South Area could be provided, similar to the £30k first round priority project in West/Central Area. Would advise that benches at Byron's Pool might be more appropriately funded from the informal open spaces contributions from the Southern Fringe growth sites, rather than from the off-site contributions from the non-growth sites (on which devolved developer contributions are primarily based). Please note also that not all of Byron's Pool is within the city boundary.

9	Make the nature reserves more accessible, interesting and informative	Across Area
---	--	--------------------

Consultation feedback: No comments received about this proposal.

Provisional officer notes: Could consider a £30k project for improving access points, signs, paths and interpretation boards at the local nature reserves in South Area. Elsewhere in the city, LNR-related projects have been seen as strategic ones, benefiting people from across the city, to be funded from city-wide contributions. Please note, however, that there is currently more devolved informal open space funding available in the South Area than there is in the city-wide fund.

10	BMX track/zip wire for older kids/teenagers at Lime Kiln Chalk Pits	Cherry Hinton
----	--	----------------------

Consultation feedback:

MN: The proposal to create youth recreation facilities at Limekiln Chalkpits is misconceived. These have been created as nature reserves and are already blighted by litter, including the debris from drinking bouts and unauthorised bonfires. Besides many rare and unusual plant species being present at the site, rare peregrine falcons nest annually in the west pit and would very likely be deterred by the activities proposed. I oppose this measure in the strongest terms. These facilities can easily be accommodated at Cherry Hinton Rec where there would be less environmental degradation and where safety concerns could be addressed more easily. I would add that one only needs to look at the Coldham's Common BMX trail to see what an eyesore such a facility can be.

Provisional officer notes: Would support the view that these suggested uses would not be compatible with a local nature reserve. Would advise that this idea be discounted.

11	Trim trail for Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground	Cherry Hinton
----	---	----------------------

Consultation feedback: No comments received about this proposal.

Provisional officer notes: This would be feasible and could be done for around £30k. (Trim trails are being taken forward as first round priority projects at both Nightingale Avenue Rec and at Ditton Fields in East Area). The Area Committee would need to weigh up this proposal with potential concerns about a reduction in open space, which might compromise the enjoyment of other park users. One way to overcome this might be to consider having some trim trail equipment at Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground and some further equipment outside the Village Centre.

12	Measures to increase biodiversity at Nightingale Avenue Rec. Ground	Queen Edith's
----	--	----------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.4): This would not be a developer contribution-funded project.

Consultation feedback:

MN: The general thrust of the council's approach is that building is good. There seems to be very little in the way of biodiversity and green development. Nor are there any proposals for green use of the bowling green at Nightingale Avenue Rec, which currently lies abandoned.

Provisional officer notes: Whilst the park is largely a mown-grass area, there are a few unusual species (eg, bee orchids and white hellebrine orchids) that are carefully protected. The edge of the site is also left as a natural habitat buffer. Rather than a capital scheme funded by developer contributions, there are options for putting together a new management plan for the recreation ground to enhance existing grassland and promote wider biodiversity.

Options for use of the bowling green will be worked on with the emerging local Friends group. There is not a clear proposal for this that is ready to be considered at this stage – this could be one for a future round of devolved decision-making.

13	Trim trail at Accordia	Trumpington
----	-------------------------------	--------------------

Provisional officer notes: This project idea could cost £25k. There are opportunities for linking it to the other proposal for a scooter park at Accordia for pre-teenagers.

Accordia Community and Residents' Association has previously raised concerns that it had understood from council officers that this trim trail could go ahead. Officers have since clarified that the scheme has not been formally approved, but that the proposal could be considered through developer contributions devolved decision-making.

14	Footbridge over Hobson's Conduit	Trumpington
----	---	--------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.4): Developer contributions funding no longer needed for this proposal.

Consultation feedback:

Accordia Bridge Group: We have secured funding from third parties.

Provisional officer notes: We have noted the progress made by the Accordia Bridge Group and recognise that this project does not now seek developer contributions funding. It should be noted that no permissions have yet been given for the siting of the bridge on Council owned land and that, before any permissions are considered, consultation will have to be undertaken with all stakeholders. We are mindful of the different views within the community regarding this project and a full consultation will help to inform any decision making.

15	Community orchard on Empty Common for New Town	Trumpington
-----------	---	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

A local group has been working with officers to discuss what they might need for a community garden. The list includes: shed material; raised beds; grass seed; top soil; compost; tools; push mower; publicity; bird box and other habitat booster materials; a bike trailer for compost carrying etc from far end; wheelbarrow; tree trunks cut to be flat for sitting on; taps for the wheelie bins; solar water pump from the brooks; petrol allowance; charcoal burner; website fees; paint; first aid kit; accident book; general stationery; fruit bushes; plants; seeds.

MG: For the open spaces funds, I think the community orchard is a strong contender -- if planned well, this could function to reinforce many of the city's goals on sustainability, biodiversity, and community involvement. Again, this would create a resource for generations to come.

Provisional officer notes: It would not be possible to use developer contributions for tools and plants (there may be other external sources of funding that could be used for that). However, the provision of landscaping, access and paths and benches could be eligible for devolved informal open space funding include. Possibly around £15k.

16	Swift Tower for community orchard on Foster Road (with public art)	Trumpington
-----------	---	--------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.4):
Developer contributions funding no longer needed.

Consultation feedback:

Trumpington Community Orchard: We have managed to obtain a Cambridgeshire Community Fund grant to cover the cost of installing a swift tower in the orchard, this means that this project idea is no longer required.

17	Fitness circuit at Trumpington Recreation Ground	Trumpington
18	Refurbish the skate ramp for older children at Trumpington Recreation Ground	Trumpington
19	Improve Trumpington Rec. Ground play area	Trumpington

Consultation feedback:

Trumpington Residents' Association: We have grouped these three items together and support each of them. We realise that there will be excellent play and recreation facilities in the new developments, but these will be some distance from the established village and it is important to continue to improve the facilities for all ages on the recreation ground. A fitness circuit would be a very welcome addition to encourage active lifestyles and the existing skate ramp and play area would benefit from being upgraded.

Provisional officer notes: Text

For [17]: A trim trail could be provided for around £30k, as is being done as first round priority projects at Nightingale Avenue Rec and Ditton Fields.

For [18]: Yes. Could be done. First round priority projects for skate parks at Cherry Hinton Rec and Nun's Way (North Area) have each been allocated £65k of informal open space contributions.

For [19]: There is not enough devolved 'play provision' contributions for a large play area improvement (which could cost in the region of £50k-£100k), but a smaller proposal could be considered. Existing play equipment could be considered for future repair and maintenance programme funding.

20	Junior scooter park for younger children at Accordia	Trumpington
----	---	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

Accordia Community and Residents Association: With the cooperation of City Council Officers, a group of Accordia residents (including the potential users) have developed a proposal for a safe, non-intrusive scooting park on Accordia for pre-teenage children, which meets S106 criteria and for which a location and designs have already been identified by council officials. This would:

- a. *meet a clearly-expressed community need and promotes community spirit.* The petition, drawn up by the children themselves, shows that it is what they want. Not only is scooting popular with them, it is ideal as safe and healthy active play for pre-teenage children (in line with the Council's 2009/13 Sports Strategy). It brings together children from all

the housing types across the site, and recognises the place of young people as part of the wider community.

- b. *promotes a safer environment.* Because of the absence of private gardens, children on Accordia use the roads and open spaces for recreation and play. But the residential streets are not safe. There are many car movements and much parking (uncontrolled and frequently illegal and inappropriate) which can block sight lines particularly on corners and crossing places. A dedicated scooting area would separate play from hazardous areas.
- c. *meets the central S106 criterion.* It responds directly to planning decisions which have created a new and mixed community, and which have put pressure on road use.
- d. *is clear and ready to implement.* Before the current arrangements for deciding on the use of developer contributions were established, fruitful discussion with City Council officers led to the identification of a site (on the edge of the existing large playground, where planning permission will not be needed) and the development of possible designs by specialist consultants. The expectations raised by this progress were dashed when the new process slowed the decision-making process, only to be raised again by the article in the recent "Cambridge Matters."
- e. *is cheap.* Initial indications were that the cost would be under £20k.

We therefore request the Committee agree that the project should be implemented as quickly as possible. Discussion among residents suggests that there would be strong support for it. But we assume that this would be subject to responses to a consultation exercise.

Petition from young people from Accordia: signed by 23 children

Petition to support the skate park we were consulted about.

The reason for us all getting together and signing a petition is because we were told about a small scooter/skate ramp that would be built, we waited and even helped with planning for it but sadly the progress suddenly stopped and nothing happened. We were looking forward to having somewhere to play and stay around instead of playing in the streets and so we decided to form a petition. All of the kids below who signed and more all want the skate park to be built We want and need it to go ahead because:

1. It is dangerous for us to skate and scoot on the road
2. Neighbours get angry and threaten to call police when we scoot and skate outside their houses and so we are stopped.
3. There are lots of us and we need somewhere safe to play instead of roads that have a constant flow of cars and bikes.
4. The area that the park was planned to be put in, is not being used and this is a very useful and helpful use for the area.

SW: ACRA is giving priority to the scooter track. We would not wish to distract from the Committee's attention by seeking to advance other projects during this round of consideration.

Neighbourhood Manager, Wherry Housing Association: I wholeheartedly support this proposal. The scheme would give our residents more of an opportunity for appropriate play within a designated area, would encourage community cohesion and prevent undesirable street play which has sometimes been the cause of complaint by other residents. [Wherry Housing manage approximately 100 properties on this site and we have been part of a community development initiative from the start to provide community facilities on site as part of the Section 106 agreement.]

Provisional officer notes: Designs are in place for scooter park. This could make use of the available devolved play area contributions.

The summer 2013 edition of Cambridge Matters magazine wrongly stated that the scooter park at Accordia was scheduled for installation in the coming months. This statement was incorrect. The Council has apologised to ACRA for the confusion and for the disappointment caused. A correction has been placed on the Council's website and a similar statement is will be included in the next Cambridge Matters.

If the Area Committee is minded to take forward this proposal (possibly linked to the other ideas for the trim trail at Accordia and support for a community garden at Empty Common), officers would advise that implementation would need to follow the implementation of the South Area's first round priority projects.

21	New pavilion at Cherry Hinton Rec or improve the existing one (eg changing room non-slip floor)	Cherry Hinton
----	--	----------------------

Consultation feedback:

Cherry Hinton Residents' Association: Wholeheartedly support. The existing facilities are extensively used for weekend football by scores of teams and are in a very poor/dilapidated condition. This is a real priority for Cherry Hinton Lions FC and the Residents Association.

Provisional officer notes: The pavilion certainly needs to be refurbished, but would question whether replacement with a new pavilion could be justified, particularly in the context of other proposals for the use of devolved outdoor sports facilities contributions.

- The level of use of this pavilion and the recreation ground is not changing in the same way as it could at Nightingale Avenue Rec.

- A refurbishment could make a significant difference to the pavilion inside and out. This could cost in the region of £60k-£100k and could be carried out in the short-term. The project brief could be developed once the amount of funding allocated to the project was known.
- A new, replacement pavilion could cost in the region of £250k-£400k, but this would not be affordable within the levels of devolved outdoor sports facility contributions currently available to South Area. This would need to be a long-term project.

22	Basketball court or multi-use games area at Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground	Cherry Hinton
-----------	--	----------------------

Consultation feedback: No comments received.

Provisional officer notes: Could be useful. Could cost in the region of £75k-£90k and be carried out in the medium-long term, subject to planning permission. If both this proposal and a pavilion refurbishment were taken forward, there could be an opportunity to consider reconfiguring the site, so that a MUGA could be close to the play area.

23	New pavilion at Nightingale Avenue Rec	Queen Edith's
-----------	---	----------------------

Consultation feedback:

MN: This proposal is welcome. It should include facilities for community meeting and information sharing as well as educational materials dealing with the park's unusual biodiversity. A coffee/tea shop in the pavilion would be welcome subject to obvious restrictions concerning noise, litter etc.

Queen Edith's Chapel: Would support other community facilities project in Queen Edith's, particularly Nightingale Rec Pavilion.

Cllr Birtles: I would support a renovation of the Nightingale Rec Pavilion - possibly to include a community café. We have done a random straw poll whilst visiting the Recreation Ground. I think it would be a good idea (although appreciate the practicalities would need to be gone into).

Provisional officer notes:

- a. A case can be made for a new pavilion here, given the increasing use of Nightingale Avenue Rec, not least the expected use that residents of the Bell School development could make. Has a lot of local support.
- b. The council's Capital Plan already includes a long-standing 'on hold' project (£228k) for the refurbishment of Nightingale Avenue Rec Pavilion: it is 'on hold' as it not yet funded, awaiting developer contributions from the Bell School site (subject to planning permission and development). The prospect of payment is still some way off, with the submission of a Reserved Matters application expected this autumn.

- c. There are currently not enough devolved ‘community facilities’ and ‘outdoor sports’ contributions to fund this Pavilion before the receipt of funding from Bell School. Given the proximity of Bell School to the Nightingale Avenue, it is the obvious place to spend the outdoor sports contributions when they are received (again, subject to planning approval and construction). It is questionable whether this pavilion is ready for consideration in this second priority-setting round.
- d. Given that this project has been in the planning for a considerable time, it would be helpful to review the position, not least to take stock of any changes in need and to update the proposals accordingly. It is interesting for example that the capital plan project refers to ‘refurbishment’ when the current assessment of need would suggest the provision of a new pavilion (possibly in the region of £300k-£400k).
- e. It should not be assumed that the Bell School site developer contributions would necessarily cover all the costs of a pavilion. Other devolved (and possibly, city-wide) developer contributions may need to be considered too, alongside possible funding applications to the Football Foundation and a bid for use of council reserves.
- f. The priority need is improved sports pavilion provision along with community meeting space (funded from ‘community facilities’ contributions from the Bell School site).
- g. Any calls for a community café would have to be backed up with evidence of need. The council would have no resource to run a café so it would, perhaps, need to be offered to voluntary organisation to run. Or, the pavilion could have a kitchenette for community groups to use.

24	New cricket pavilion at Netherhall School	Queen Edith’s
-----------	--	----------------------

Consultation feedback: No response on this specific proposal.

Provisional officer notes: Depending on the school’s proposals, a pavilion could cost anywhere between £25k-£100k and could be a long-term project. A grant to the school would be in return for community use agreement for public use of facilities by local groups. There is the potential for the school to seek part-funding from other agencies.

The school’s focus for developer contributions support is currently more on seeking funding for its cricket nets proposal. This is being put forward as a strategic project idea for city-wide funding, given that such a facility could be used by groups from across the city. This would also seem to be a sensible way forward given the competing calls for devolved outdoor sports facilities funding. The school is awaiting the outcome of a planning application for the cricket nets shortly. The overall strategic project idea could cost around £55k: £15k support has already been secured from the ECB. The school is requesting £20k-£25k of developer contributions funding and aims to make up the rest from other funding applications.

25	Expand badminton courts behind Queen Edith Chapel	Queen Edith's
----	--	----------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.4): Insufficient devolved contributions for indoor sports facilities.

Consultation feedback: No comments received.

Provisional officer notes: There is already an adequate local supply of badminton courts (eg, Netherhall Sports Centre and Cherry Hinton Village Centre). Would question the value and viability of further local provision. If it was provided, however, it could cost in the region of £75k.

26	Public art on Cherry Hinton green	Cherry Hinton
----	--	----------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.4): Less than £10k devolved public art contributions now available to South Area.

Consultation feedback:

Friends of Cherry Hinton Hall (FCHH): We are unsure what “Cherry Hinton green” refers to. However, FCHH has undertaken consultation, and has held many discussions with Council officers regarding something to say thank you to Ken Woolard, widely recognised as a major contributor to the founding of the Cambridge Folk Festival, who sadly died in 1994. Ken’s widow is supportive of something being in-place to mark the 50th anniversary of the Folk Festival in 2014.

27	Benches on streets, including additional seating in Trumpington village	Trumpington
----	--	--------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.4): There are no devolved public realm contributions available to South Area.

Consultation feedback:

Trumpington Residents' Association: As with [8] (benches in parks), we think there is a strong case for additional benches in the established centre of Trumpington. As residents move into the new developments in the Southern Fringe, there will be a greater level of movement around the facilities and shops in the centre of the village and additional seating would be very useful. As there is no public realm budget, it might be appropriate to pursue this in 2014-15

28	Improve public realm around Colville Road car park & path to Fisher Lane	Cherry Hinton
----	---	----------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH ‘INITIAL FILTER’ (see paragraph 3.4): There are no devolved public realm contributions available to South Area.

Consultation feedback:

Cherry Hinton Residents’ Association: Wholeheartedly support. An excellent opportunity awaits with the imminent redevelopment of the adjacent Colville and Augers bungalows to what is currently an eyesore.

29	Improve streetscapes on Cherry Hinton High Street to supplement highways improvements	Cherry Hinton
----	--	----------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH ‘INITIAL FILTER’ (see paragraph 3.4): There are no devolved public realm contributions available to South Area.

Consultation feedback:

Cherry Hinton Residents’ Association: Wholeheartedly support. CHRA has been in discussions with County Highways who have now pledged £250,000 to improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians in Cherry Hinton High Street. However, this money is earmarked for cyclists and pedestrians only and other measures to enhance the street scape would be welcome. Councillors have been in discussion with officers, Gibson Developments, and Januarys for the last 5 years to have the final stage of the High Street improvements (Rectory Terrace) finally undertaken. S106 monies to enable this to happen would be welcome.

30	Information boards on local history/natural environment of Cherry Hinton village	Cherry Hinton
----	---	----------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH ‘INITIAL FILTER’ (see paragraph 3.4): There are no devolved public realm contributions available to South Area.

Consultation feedback:

Cherry Hinton Residents’ Association: Wholeheartedly support. we currently have just the one board! At Giant’s Grave.

31	Improve Cherry Hinton Road streetscape	Cherry Hinton
----	---	----------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH ‘INITIAL FILTER’ (see paragraph 3.4): As Cherry Hinton Road is in East Area, this idea has been taken off the South Area list and been reported to East Area Committee instead.

32	Improve streetscapes in Newtown	Trumpington
----	---------------------------------	-------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.4): There are no devolved public realm contributions available to South Area.

33	New information maps around Trumpington village (including history trails)	Trumpington
----	--	-------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.4): There are no devolved public realm contributions available to South Area.

Consultation feedback:

Trumpington Residents' Association: With so many new residents, it would be very useful to have a local map on the green in front of the shops on Anstey Way. One idea is for an artist to work on a two-sided display, with one side incorporating a representation of the current layout of the village including the new developments and the other concentrating on the local walking/cycling network. (With support from the Council, the TRA and the Local History Group are developing a series of history trails which will be finalised and published in 2014-15 and the map could include an overview of these routes. It could also incorporate ideas from the Southern Connections art project.) It might be appropriate to pursue this in late 2014-15 when the spine roads through the new developments will be open.

Summary of other comments from the Developer Contributions consultation feedback

This feedback has been passed on to relevant officers. Initial responses available at the time of report publication are shown in boxes.

A. *Friends of Rock Road Library*: We are proposing to take forward, with the support of Cambridgeshire Library Services, a project to refurbish and remodel the interior of the Rock Road Library building. Objectives that have been discussed so far include:

- improving the environmental footprint of the building (eg, installation of insulation, exploitation of natural light and sustainable energy generation)
- development of the community meeting room with a separate entrance and access to a kitchen
- provision of exhibition space for historical and artistic (possibly commercial) displays
- review of the use of space for book storage, IT workstations and reading areas
- restoration and enhancement of original architectural features of the building including roof-lights, flooring and arches.

It is estimated that a six-figure sum will be required to undertake all the works, however, in order to prepare a detailed business proposal, it will be necessary to commission detailed electronic plans of the library building (which the County Council have not been able to provide) and to seek professional architectural advice on the development of options.

To enable the business plan to be prepared, the FRRL would like to apply for an initial grant of £6,000 from Section 106 funds.

Officer notes: We have separately agreed £20k specifically to create the community room and to provide access into the garden for community groups. This new idea looks to be a much bigger project to improve the library which presumably can't be funded from S106 'community facility' money as the County get specific 'Library' S106 money. Also, developer contributions can't be used for stand-alone feasibility work.

B. *Homerton Sure Start*: We have a Nest and Community Garden project at Homerton Children's Centre. The garden will be used by the two year olds in our care. Many of them have funded places under a government initiative to help the most disadvantaged. They particularly need safe but stimulating and challenging places to play in order to develop to their full potential. The Nest Garden Project aims to raise £15,000 to match our

existing funds of £10,000. The money raised will be used to provide both a large landscaped and wild garden area where children can enjoy a large sandpit, water play, an area for creative activities and a gardening and planting area.

Officer response: This proposal would not be an open space and, therefore, would not be eligible for informal open space developer contributions.

- C. *MG*: One request is to "green" Cherry Hinton Road. The neighbours around Cherry Hinton Road from the Budgens roundabout (Perne/Mowbray Roads) up to Coleridge Road would like to request that trees are planted on the right hand side of the road (going from the roundabout towards Coleridge Road). As it stands, this is quite a desolate piece of road, with no trees or greenery. There is an extremely wide pavement on the right and we propose that a planting of trees could function as a barrier between the traffic the path. This would also allow the pedestrian/bike path to be made clearer and to encourage cycling on the path rather than the road (Barton Road is a good example of this type of arrangement). This would also link this piece of the road to the trees around Cherry Hinton Hall and the tree plantings further up the road and would beautify this stretch and encourage walking and cycling.

Officer note: Cherry Hinton Road comes within the East Area of the city. This suggestion was received after the publication of the East Area report but will be mentioned in the officer update to the East Area Committee meeting on 12 September.

- C. *MG*: Make the Leisure Centre square (at the junction of Hills Road and Cherry Hinton Road) function more as a public space. Whatever the initial ideas were for the square, it doesn't work. Right now the public square is uninviting and no one wants to spend time there, (except perhaps teens in the evenings). We thought that, with innovative planning and design (be that changes in urban form or additions of art, fountains, trees, etc), the square could draw families in and make them want to linger!

Officer note: This suggestion will be included in the report to the Environment Scrutiny Committee on 8/10/13 as a strategic project idea.

- D. *MJ*: I am unsure whether this is a South Area committee matter, but a couple of years back, we put in a proposal for a Darwin sculpture in Christ's Lane in lieu of the proposed wall of words.

This suggestion has been taken up with a developer who is taking forward a public art project along these lines in the vicinity.

Further details on developer contributions devolved to South Area

Specific conditions and expiry dates

In general, most developer contributions collected by the city council are for the provision or improvement of, or better access, to facilities in Cambridge related to particular developer contribution types. In some in Section 106 agreements, more specific conditions have been set. Here are examples of specific conditions relating to contributions devolved to the South Area (including expiry dates in the next five years).

Community Facilities contributions

- £10,000 for improvement of existing community facilities in the city.

Informal Open Space contributions

- £76,500 to be contractually committed within 10 years of receipt of the final instalment of the contribution (not yet received)

Outdoor Sports Facilities / Formal Open Space contributions

- £32,000 to be contractually committed by December 2016
- £56,500 to be contractually committed within 10 years of receipt of the final instalment of the contribution (not yet received)

Provision for Children & Teenagers (play area) contributions

- £2,000 for the provision of play space within the vicinity of CB1. To be contractually committed within 10 years of receipt of the final instalment of the contribution (not yet received).

Figures rounded to the nearest £500. The list does not include contributions allocated to existing projects/programmes.

Explanatory note for Table 2

The report on developer contributions and devolved decision-making to the Community Services Scrutiny Committee in January 2013 highlighted that there would be around £75k of devolved 'provision for children and teenagers' contributions for South Area following allocations to projects in 2013/14. It was also explained that there would be £50k of spend on play area improvements in South Area in 2014/15. All these works are now being taken forward from 2013/14. This is reflected in the revised figures in Table 2, which shows that the South Area Committee now has around £25k of available/unallocated 'play provision' contributions for future projects.