

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

REPORT OF: Director of Environment

TO: West/Central Area Committee

14/11/2013

WARDS: Castle, Market, Newnham

DEVOLVED DECISION-MAKING AND DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS: SECOND ROUND PRIORITY-SETTING FOR WEST/CENTRAL AREA

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This priority-setting report invites the Area Committee to identify its priorities for the second round of developer contributions devolved decision-making. These will be taken forward once the first round priorities have been completed.
- 1.2 This report follows the discussion at the Area Committee meeting on 5 September 2013 when ten local project options were short-listed, alongside the setting of two immediate, 'ready to go' priorities (see paragraph 3.3). The Area Committee expressed particular support being expressed for two short-listed proposals relating to extensions/upgrades of facilities at St Augustine's and St Mark's church halls. This is reflected in the recommendations in Section 2.
- 1.3 The task now is to choose four of these ten short-listed options (see Table 2 on page 5) as the Area Committee's second round priorities. A reminder of the how this ties in with the council's approach to devolved decision-making can be found in Section 3. Paragraph 4.1 suggests a way forward to make the task easier and the rest of Section 4 provides a commentary on each of the options. Paragraph 5.1 then summarises the key choices for Members to consider.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 To confirm that the West/Central Area Committee wishes to prioritise up to £100,000 and up to £150,000 respectively of the available devolved community facilities contributions for improvements to St Augustine's church hall (Castle ward) and St Mark's church hall (Newnham ward), subject to project appraisal, planning approval, community use agreements and other sources of funding needed for project delivery being secured.

- 2.2 To identify two other short-listed options that the Area Committee would wish to prioritise from devolved developer contributions funding in the second round, subject to project appraisal.
- 2.3 To instruct officers to explore the feasibility of specific options for play area provision in North Newnham, to be reported back to a future meeting of the Area Committee for consideration.
- 2.4 To instruct officers to consult local councillors about options for sports facilities in the West/Central Area with a teen focus and sports facilities with a Newnham focus and to report proposals to a future meeting of the Area Committee for consideration.

3. CONTEXT

- 3.1 The background to the Council's approach to developer contributions devolved decision-making was summarised in Appendix A of the report to the Area Committee on 5 September 2013. Further details can also be found on the Council's Developer Contributions web page (www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106). Particular emphasis has been given to pointing out that projects can only be taken forward where:
 - a. there is sufficient developer contributions funding already available in the relevant contribution type;
 - b. there is sufficient officer capacity to take forward the development, appraisal, procurement and delivery of projects; and
 - c. it is agreed as a priority by the Area Committee.
- 3.2 The two-stage devolved decision-making approach of short-listing and priority-setting applies to all four area committees and was mapped out in a report to the Environment Scrutiny Committee last June. The short-listing enables officers to focus in on a smaller number of proposals without distracting from the delivery of existing priority projects. It also helps to make sure that Members have sufficient information to make decisions about the use of significant amounts of devolved developer contributions.
- 3.3 Last September's short-listing report also highlighted that:
 - a. each area committee has been asked to set as many second round priorities as it has wards, plus an additional grant-funded priority (to be delivered by a local community group);
 - b. officers would recommend that devolved project priorities draw on a range of different contribution types to help make sure that contributions with expiry date conditions can be used on time;

- c. at the same time, area committees may wish to defer using up all the funding available in particular contribution types in order to leave some for future priority-setting rounds or allow more to accrue so that more larger projects can be undertaken in future.
- 3.4 As well as drawing up a short-list of 10 options for further consideration, the Area Committee last September prioritised a couple of project proposals that were 'ready to go' straightaway (the grant for community meeting space at Great St Mary's Church and better sign-posting of footpath to Grantchester from Lamma Land car park). This does not affect the number of priorities available to the West/Central Area Committee in the second round because the preparations for the grant had already been made and the sign-posting could be incorporated into the already programmed works to improve Paradise Local Nature Reserve.
- 3.5 Members queried at last September's meeting whether S106 community facilities grants would count towards the four 2nd round priorities that West Central Area Committee is being invited to identify as project delivery would be carried out by the grant recipients.
- a. Officers advised that these would need to count given the officer time taken up in project appraisal and the development of community use agreements. This is important to make sure that the overall programme of priority projects across the city is fair, manageable and achievable.
- b. That said, if it becomes clear by next Spring that some of the Area Committee's second round priorities are straightforward to deliver and there may be scope for more second round priorities to be taken forward within available staffing capacity, there may be an opportunity for a follow-up priority-setting report next spring or summer. See also paragraph 5.3.
- 3.6 The analysis of devolved developer contributions available to the West/Central Area has been updated to take account of allocations to the 'ready to go' priority projects identified in September and further developer contributions received and assigned to the Area fund up to the end of October 2013.

Table 1: Devolved developer contributions available

Contribution type	£k	Contribution type	£k
Community facilities	£275k	Outdoor sport	£225k
Informal open space	£175k	Indoor sport	£50k
Play provision	£100k	Public art	<£10k
<i>Rounded down to nearest £25k</i>		Public realm	£25k

3.7 The key points to note from Table 1 are as follows.

- a. The devolved community facilities funding available to the West/Central Area has effectively increased. Having allocated £50,000 to the prioritised community facilities grant for Great St Mary's church, it was expected that there would be around £250,000 of these contributions available. However, further contributions received in the last two months mean that there is now over £275,000 available. This means that, in addition to up to the £250,000 (which Members have indicated that they would wish to allocate between the hall extensions at St Augustine's and St Mark's churches), there could be some funding left over for any further community facilities that the Area Committee may wish to support in future (for example, the suggestion for a new/improved scout hut at Newnham Croft).
- b. Over the last two months, the devolved informal open space contributions have increased from £150k to £175k; play area contributions have also risen from £75k to £100k.
- c. The devolved funding in the other contribution types has not changed significantly since the figures reported to the Area Committee last September. This is particularly important to note in the case of devolved public realm contributions (£25k), which is needed for lighting/solar stud projects on public rights of way. This issue is addressed in more detail in relation to option [C] in paragraph 4.7a and Table 3 on page 8.

4. CONSIDERATIONS OF THE SHORT-LISTED OPTIONS

4.1 Table 2 shows the project proposals that were short-listed in September 2013. To whittle the options down from 10 to four, the first steps could be to:

- a. prioritise those projects ([A] and [B]) which have already emerged from the Area Committees previous discussions as being of particular importance: see paragraphs 4.2-4.3; and
- b. recognise those proposals ([H, [I] and J]) which are not yet ready to be considered for priority setting now: see paragraphs 4.4 – 4.5.

Paragraph 4.6 and Table 3 then focus in on the remaining options [C] – [G] from which Members are invited to select two at this stage.

The key choices are then summarised in paragraph 5.1.

Table 2: West/Central Area short-list		Category	Estimate
A.	Upgrade kitchen/storage at St Augustine's Church hall	Community facilities grant	Up to £100k
B.	Kitchen/lobby extension at St Mark's Church hall		Up to £150k
C.	Lighting/solar studs on the Driftway & across paths on Lammas Land	Public realm	Depends on option
D.	Provide/improve electricity supply for (1) Jesus Green & (2) Parker's Piece	Informal open space	(1) £6k (2) £40k
E.	Histon Road Rec improvements: (1) noticeboard, seating, nesting boxes and (2) a trim trail		(1) £10k (2) £30k
F.	Climbing frame at Histon Road Recreation Ground	Play provision	£50k
G.	Rope pulley at Lammas Land		£15k
H.	New play area for North Newnham (possibly at Cockcroft Place)		See para 4.4
I.	Sports facilities (teen focus)	Sports facilities	See para 4.5
J.	Sports facilities (Newnham focus)		

Recommended for priority-setting:

- 4.2 Since the Area Committee's meeting last September, St Augustine's and St Mark's churches have been asked for more information. Their main replies can be found in the Appendix. Members will also recall the feedback from last summer's consultation exercise (reported to the Area Committee in September 2013) when these proposals received support from local residents and residents' associations.
- 4.3 The profiles in the Appendix help to provide some greater clarity about the proposed projects in which Members have already suggested investing up to £250,000. This would seem to provide sufficient basis for confirming these as priorities, subject to the conditions set out in recommendation 2.1. At the same time, it is important to recognise that both sets of project proposals need further work.
- a. The initial estimates for [A] St Augustine's church hall are around £300,000. When the church's reserves of £25,000 and the community facilities grant of up to £100,000 are taken into account, there is still a considerable amount of external funding

that needs to be secured if the full extent of the proposed project is to be delivered. Whilst the church will be fund-raising, the time that this may take could impact on the current planned delivery timescales and raise the need for the project to be undertaken in phases. If difficulties arise in raising the full target funding and the scale of proposed project had to be reduced, Community Development officers would need to advise on how this might need to be reflected in the size of the community facilities grant.

- b. St Mark's church [B] will be able to finalise the scale and design of its project once the outcome of the appeal is known (expected by the end of November) over the council's refusal to allow the removal of a tree on the land. If this means that a lobby extension is not possible and the project has to focus on the kitchen extension and upgrade instead, the size of the community facilities grant will also have to reflect the reduced scale of the project.
- c. Both projects will also need to complete a capital grant application form and community use agreement as well as gaining planning permission and project appraisal approval (see paragraph 5.2).

Short-listed options not yet ready for consideration:

4.4 The need for a new play area for North Newnham [H] was highlighted via the S106 workshop in September '12. Whilst Penarth Place play area is set to be refurbished by March 2014 as part of the 2013/14 repairs and renewals programme, there is a demonstrable shortage of play areas in the West/Central and demand for further provision.

- a. The main constraint is the availability of land, however. It requires a site to be found and permission to be agreed. Beyond Cockcroft Place (which would need permission from the landowner), no specific suggestions for a site have been made. Given the focus on the delivery of existing projects, officers have not had the capacity to explore these issues further.
- b. Paragraph 2.3 recommends that officers be instructed to explore the feasibility of specific options for play area provision in North Newnham so that the findings can be reported back to a future Area Committee meeting. This is not a priority project at this stage (no developer contributions can be allocated yet because there is not a specific project), but it is a positive step forward.

4.5 The availability of over £225,000 of devolved outdoor sports facilities contributions presents significant opportunities for the Area Committee, but the report to the last meeting in September 2013

highlighted a lack of specific community suggestions about how this could be used. Through the short-listing process, the Area Committee asked officers to explore ideas for sports facilities with a teen focus [I] and sports facilities with a Newnham focus [J]. Officers have now done this initial brain-storming but are keen to give local Members opportunities to feed in their comments to the development of the proposals before any of these options is ready to be reported to the Area Committee. This is reflected in recommendation 2.4.

Other short-listed options that could be considered now:

- 4.6 Table 3 on pages 8-9 summarises the key issues relating to the remaining options [C]-[G]. Assuming that the approach set out in paragraph 4.1 makes sense to Members, the Area Committee would need to identify two short-listed projects as priorities. That said, further thinking through these options over the last couple of months has helped to identify some potential sub-projects and alternatives.
- a. [C1]-[C4] represent alternatives proposals for lighting and solar studs on Lammas Land, not least given that the likely costs of the lighting proposals exceed the devolved public realm funding available (see Table 1). Other alternatives for natural energy (luminescent) paths have also been ruled out on cost grounds.
 - i. If the Area Committee views this topic as particularly important, it might (for example) wish to consider identifying [C4] (solar studs on the diagonal paths across Lammas Land) as a local priority.
 - ii. The Area Committee might also wish to ask the Executive Councillor for Public Places to consider making [C3] (solar studs on the Driftway and across Sheeps Green) **combined with** solar studs on the continuing path as it crosses Coe Fen to Trumpington Road as a strategic public realm project from city-wide funding.
 - b. [D1] and [D2] present proposals for electricity supply improvements on Jesus Green and Parker's Piece respectively: if the Area Committee attaches particular importance to this issue, it may wish to consider prioritising one or both of these – and this could be counted as a single priority project.
 - c. Options [E1], [E2] and [F] all relate to proposed improvements to Histon Road Recreation Ground. Again, the Area Committee could consider prioritising one, two or all three of these sub-projects as a single priority project.
 - d. No sub-projects or alternatives have been identified for the proposal for a rope pulley at Lammas Land [G], but it is mentioned here for sake of completeness.

Table 3: Summary of the other short-listed options in the West/Central Area

	WHAT THE PROJECT ENTAILS	BENEFITS / IMPACT	ISSUES TO CONSIDER
C.	Lighting/solar studs on the Driftway & across paths on Lammas Land	Lights would help address path users' concerns about safety after dark. BUT C1 & C2 cannot be afforded currently. C1 alone would exceed devolved public realm funding. Questions remain about the economic viability of traditional lighting given the distance from an electricity supply.	Does it make sense to light just the Driftway without the rest of the Barton Road-Trumpington Road path? Whilst lighting of public rights of way is permitted development, we would still need to consult, not least given the potential impact on the local character & the local nature reserve.
C1	Lighting columns along the Driftway (Barton Road to Lammas Land car park – £35k-£50k for cabling, trenching & fitting plus revenue running costs.		
C2	Lighting columns on Lammas Land paths.		
C3	Solar studs on the Driftway and across Sheeps Green – £3.5k to install.	Installing solar studs is simple & inexpensive & helps with way-finding in the dark. BUT do they address all the concerns about safety after dark?	Would Members wish to pursue C3 & C4 as they are affordable? Funding for solar studs for the whole Barton Road-Trumpington Road path could be sought from city-wide funding.
C4	Solar studs on Lammas Land paths: £2.5k to install.		
D.	Provide/improve electricity supply: would involve trenching and cabling.		Would require planning & Secretary of State (S38) approval for cabling.
D1	Jesus Green: improvements would support a low-level supply (eg, for jazz and brass events).	Would enable more events to be run, but need to be aware of extra costs of running more events.	Might it be better to address the electricity supply later as part of the Rouse Ball Pavilion development?
D2	Parker's Piece: would use the same conduits to be installed for the strategic lighting project there. This would cost £30k-£40k.	Would support the needs for some events (eg, Country Fair) and would reduce the need for use of diesel generators at other events. BUT it still wouldn't support high demand events (eg, Big Weekend or ice rink).	Providing an electricity supply to cater for all events would cost around £60k and would involve siting a sub-station on Parker's Piece (likely to divide opinion).

	WHAT THE PROJECT ENTAILS	BENEFITS / IMPACT	ISSUES TO CONSIDER
E E1	Histon Road Rec improvements: Additional noticeboard, seating and nesting box provision (say, 1 x tawny owl nesting box and 10 x boxes for blue-tits).	This could help to increase residents' use and enjoyment of the recreation ground. The nesting boxes would support biodiversity: there are not currently any nesting boxes there and officer advice is that this could be a really helpful idea (the nesting boxes could be supplied & installed for less than £1k).	Would need to consult on what specifically is being asked for. There is already a noticeboard & some seating. Bench replacement is already possible via the repairs & renewals programme. The public art project for the entrances to Histon Road Rec has already been prioritised as a first round priority.
E2	Provision of a wooden trim trail and/or provision of outdoor gym equipment, similar to projects recently completed at Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground and by Ditton Fields play area	This range of items is free to use and in some instances replicates activities found in gyms & health suites. It promotes good health, increases mobility and physical activity.	Would need to consult on specific location. No planning permission would be required. The equipment selection & installation would be straightforward.
F	Climbing frame at Histon Road Rec: select, supply and install a new, 4-metre high climbing frame that would complement existing provision. Around 30 metres of land would need to be allocated.	Good place for a climbing frame - not overlooking houses. (Note: under the Surface Water Management Plan, if the county council needs to make the recreation ground an attenuation site for flood water, equipment may be temporarily removed & reinstalled after works are completed.)	Assuming that a specific location at Histon Road Rec can be found and this is supported through local consultation, the equipment would be fairly straightforward to install.
G	Rope pulley at Lammas Land: select, supply and install a cable way to complement the existing play area provision and its surroundings.	Would provide an activity for older children in a play area that mainly caters for toddler and junior school children.	Would need to identify a specific location on Lammas Land and consult. The equipment would be fairly straightforward to install.

5. NEXT STEPS

- 5.1 Table 4 summarises the suggested choice that the Area Committee is being asked to consider in setting four 2nd round priorities.

Table 4: Suggested choices
PRIORITISE
[A] Upgrade kitchen/storage at St Augustine's Church hall
[B] Kitchen/lobby extension at St Mark's Church hall
CHOOSE TWO FROM FOUR:
[C4] Solar studs along the diagonal paths on Lammas Land PLUS formally support the proposal for a strategic priority project to install solar studs on the path from Barton Road to Trumpington Road [C3], which would need to be considered by the Environment Scrutiny Committee and Executive Councillor.
Provide/improve Explore electricity supply for: [D1] Jesus Green <i>and/or</i> [D2] Parker's Piece <i>Need to be clear whether it is one or both sub-projects</i>
Histon Road Rec improvements including: [E1] Noticeboard, seating, nesting boxes <i>and/or</i> [E2] Trim trail <i>and/or</i> [F] Climbing frame <i>Need to be clear whether it is one, two or all three sub-projects</i>
[G] Rope pulley at Lammas Land
NOT READY YET, BUT EXPLORE FURTHER
[H] New play area for North Newnham (possibly Cockcroft Place)
[I] Sports facilities (teen focus)
[J] Sports facilities (Newnham focus)

- 5.2 Once the Area Committee has identified its second round priorities, the next steps will be as follows.
- a. Follow-up discussions will be arranged with the applicants for community facilities grants, as appropriate. Officers will make clear that the costs of feasibility studies/designs/other professional fees can only be paid where these relate to projects that come to

fruition. Grant payments cannot begin until planning permission has been granted and community use agreements are in place. In the context, it is important that the prospective grant recipients are aware that there are, therefore, some costs that they may have to bear or, at least, meet up-front before subsequent grant payment.

- b. Project appraisals will be developed. These will provide more details about the projects and will highlight any particular implications (including any revenue implications). Depending on the size of the projects, the appraisals will either be reported to the Area Committee for approval (if above £75k) or for sign-off by the Area Chair, Vice Chair and Opposition Spokes (if below £75k).
- 5.3 If recommendations 2.3 and 2.4 are agreed, there will be a follow-up report (or reports) to provide an update on options for play area provision in North Newnham, sports facilities with a teen focus and sports facilities with a Newnham focus. The timing of this reporting back will need to be clarified in due course but, as mentioned in paragraph 3.5, if it becomes clear by next Spring that some of the Area Committee's second round priorities are straightforward to deliver, there may be an opportunity for a follow-up priority-setting report next spring or summer.

6. IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 **Financial implications:** The importance of ensuring that local priorities are affordable within the devolved contributions available has already been stated in paragraph 3.1. This has been reinforced by the update on the availability of devolved funding in Table 1 and the commentary in paragraph 3.7. The role of the project appraisal process in identifying any revenue implications for the council arising from running and maintenance costs of prioritised projects has been mentioned in paragraph 5.2. Whilst there would be none arising from community facilities grants, some potential running costs from options [C] – [G] have already been alluded to in Table 3.
- 6.2 **Staffing implications:** The number of local priorities which each area committee is invited to identify principally reflects the need to make sure that the overall programme of local and strategic priorities across the council is manageable and achievable within the staffing capacity available. This has been addressed in paragraphs 3.1 and 3.5. A delicate balance has to be maintained across all the area committees to safeguard this fundamental principle which is crucial to delivering local and strategic S106-funded projects across Cambridge. At the same time, paragraphs 3.5b and 5.3 reflect

officers' commitment to enable area committees to take forward as many priority projects as possible.

- 6.3 Equality and environmental impact assessments and community safety implications will be addressed for prioritised projects as part of the project appraisal process.

7. CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1 Whilst this report is focussed on the second round of priority-setting (and the process that this involves), the reason why we are doing this is to help take forward and deliver S106 -funded projects that help to address the impact of development in Cambridge and make a difference to local communities. Please see the Developer Contributions web page (www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106), which provides an overview of the Council's overall approach. This features an up-to-date list of projects that have been and are being delivered as well as photos of some recently completed projects that have been funded by developer contributions.

8. APPENDIX

- Profiles received from community groups seeking community facilities grants

9. BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

- Report to West/Central Area Committee – 5/9/13
- Report to Environment Scrutiny Committee, 11/6/13
- Report to Environment Scrutiny Committee, 8/10/13
- Report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee, 10/10/13

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

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

Profiles received from community groups seeking community facilities grants

	Short-listed option	Ward	Estimate
A.	St Augustine's Church Hall: extension & upgrade to facilities	Castle	Up to £100k (Community facilities grant)

1. About the project

A1.1 The full project includes the following work:

- a. an extension to the main hall to provide additional meeting/event space
- b. an upgrade to the main kitchen and the provision of improved storage space
- c. a remodelling of the entrance and front of the building, including a new toilet.

A1.2 The architect's provisional drawings have been sent to the Planning Department as part of the pre-application stage, and to the Diocesan Advisory Committee as part of the process of obtaining a faculty. Further discussions are underway with community users in order to refine the proposals.

2. How it would make a difference

A2.1 The building is used extensively by a range of community groups on a regular basis, and is also a venue for concerts, talks and other events including children's parties and receptions. In the absence of comparable premises locally, we are expecting an increased demand for hire from the new community in Darwin Green, and wish to welcome them and others seeking a community venue.

A2.2 The current building has served the needs of the local community for over 100 years and, although there have been small additions and alterations, it remains much as built at the end of the 19th century, particularly at the front. We want to keep the best features, improve the quality and range of facilities on offer, and make better use of the space that is available, in order to make the building more accessible to all, regardless of ethnic origin or faith.

A2.3 The list of current regular users embraces groups for children, adult learners, and the elderly. The majority draw their support from the locality but others have a wider membership. Many of the ad hoc enquiries we receive are from community groups and families living locally who wish to stage a special event, often for charity. Being able to offer them all upgraded facilities (including improved acoustics and better wheelchair access to toilets and entrance), an extended choice of meeting space, and more scope for putting on different types of event would be the principal outcomes we are seeking from this project.

A2.4 One particular facility we should like to offer, for example, is a drop-in café venue on some weekday mornings: this would be designed to meet the needs of many of the elderly residents who regularly attend our monthly lunch club (which attracts c 50 people each month) but parents of children using the Hall may also find it a welcoming place to meet whilst waiting for events to finish.

A2.5 We work with the three local Residents' Associations and with the Friends of Histon Road Recreation Ground to stage events separately and together, lending out both building and equipment on a regular basis. Access to better storage facilities and an improved venue for community use are important statements of our joint intent to build an inclusive and vibrant community in the area.

3. Project management

A3.1 The project is being managed by St Augustine's Church working with user groups and the three local Residents' Associations and the Friends of Histon Road Recreation Ground. An open meeting has been held – including with local residents - and another planned. Discussions with individual groups will continue in order to ensure that all issues raised are addressed and accommodated as far as possible. A steering group will be set up with representatives of church, community and users once a first tranche of funding is secured.

A3.2 An architect (Nigel Walter of Archangel Ltd. based in Histon) has been appointed and is leading on securing planning and other consents (a faculty for example). The provisional Project Plan shows that the work is being scheduled for the summer of 2014, at a time designed to minimise disruption to the regular users of the Hall. The Plan will be adjusted monthly to take into account progress on securing consents and funding, and in finding suitable contractors.

4. Costs

- A4.1 Our initial estimate for undertaking all the work is £300,000 including fees and charges. We have commissioned a quantity surveyor to provide more precise estimates, and we will forward these once available. The Church itself has reserves of c£25,000 and the work is therefore subject to our securing funding from a variety of other sources, including national and local charities and the City Council. We are in discussion with the Diocesan Board of Finance which has provided a list of possible donors, and we are putting together a fund-raising campaign that should start later this year.
- A4.2 We should like to undertake all the work specified at the same time, but if we are unable to raise the necessary funds we shall prepare contingency plans which would enable us to carry out the work in two phases: initially remodelling the front of the Hall and upgrading the facilities, and later extending the main Hall. Much depends on the conditions and timing of commitments received from the different sources.
- A4.3 Subsequent running costs would be funded as they are now. Users would be expected to hire the Hall at a reasonable rent, covering running costs and essential overheads. Our current charging policy recognises that different groups have different needs and ability to pay, and generally we negotiate a special rate for groups or organisations using the Hall on a regular basis. New ventures such as the proposed coffee house would seek to be self-financing and we would market test this and similar ideas before going live. We would not expect to seek any running cost support other than for initiatives which the community has requested but is unable to finance fully from receipts or charges.

	Short-listed option	Ward	Cost estimate
B.	Proposed extension to St Mark's community hall	Newnham	Up to £150k (Community facilities grant)

1. About the project

B1.1 The proposed project involves the extension outwards of the existing kitchen by approximately 4 metres and also the provision of an adjacent lobby. In this context there are two alternatives, the kitchen extension and lobby or solely the kitchen extension. The former is preferred for the reasons given later, but this option is dependent on approval for removal of a tree (robinia), which is close to where the lobby would be built.

B1.2 The proposed works fit easily within the St Marks land, extending by solely 4 metres at the front entrance, at present occupied by an informal small covered area. The kitchen will be required to be fitted out with new equipment to enable catering for up to 60 people.

2. How it would make a difference

B2.1 The present kitchen is only 4 metres long and 2 metres wide (external dimensions) making it very difficult for more than two people to occupy the room at any one time. The Community Hall is used by a large number of different groups and all have commented and several complained over a long period of time about the very limited space in the kitchen.

B2.2 The activities and groups at present using the Community Hall, which would benefit from the proposed extensions, are:

- a. Newnham parishioners and from outside the Parish who attend services at St Marks and a wide range of social and cultural events open to all and attended by many people from the Cambridge area; this includes many visiting scholars providing the opportunity to meet people outside of the two Universities.
- b. Children covering the whole community, including Toddlers (for under 3 years) twice a week, Brownies once a week, Bumps and Babes also once a week. In addition there is Messy Church, after school in the afternoon once a month, started only two years ago and proving very successful with typically over 20 children coming mainly from Newnham but also further afield. This activity includes a cooked meal for all the children and it has been quite obvious that the present kitchen is totally inadequate for this.

- c. Other community events, every weekday morning and afternoon, as indicated on the attached page from the “What’s on in Newnham” booklet. In addition regular ploughman lunches are organised, particularly for the elderly but open to all.
- B2.3 In terms of accessibility, there is good parking available, both directly adjacent to the entrance and by the recent conversion of the front garden of the Vicarage into a gravel car park, both of which are very convenient for the elderly or disabled.
- B2.4 A considerably larger lobby, apart from providing much better internal access, will enable people to wait in comfort (and socialise) before their classes or other activities, with a coffee machine and seating provided. A future plan is for weekly coffee mornings (or more frequently depending on its success), manned by volunteers, where local people and particularly elderly and retired people can meet. There would be internet access and probably provision of a computer at these mornings for elderly people who do not have these facilities.
- B2.5 Once the new kitchen extension is in place, it would be the intention to expand the use of the Community Hall with more activities and larger groups and with a particular emphasis on more evening and weekend use. Once more the emphasis will be events for the wider community.

3 Project management

- B3.1 The design layouts were prepared two years ago by Jerry Lander from Cambridge architects, Freeland Rees Roberts. Mr Lander is the architect for all the building and property inspection work for St Marks.
- B3.2 To save the cost of professional fees, we have not initiated further designs and correspondingly detailed cost estimates until there is a decision on the robinia tree referred to in Section 1. The Appeals Inspectorate carried out their inspection of the robinia tree on 25 October, with the results of the Appeal available by the end of November.
- B3.3 A planning application, along with any additional drawings required, will be made directly following this decision. Once the extension is approved, envisaged by the end of February 2014, we would expect construction to start within three months following a normal tendering procedure. We are conservatively allowing six months for the actual

construction, including outfitting the kitchen. With this programme the extension would be completed before the end of December 2014.

4. Costs

B4.1 Detailed cost estimates will be produced by a professional quantity surveyor directly a decision can be made on the choice between the two options. Prior to this, we have consulted with our architect to obtain an approximate cost estimate. Leading from this, the cost of the “kitchen +lobby” option, including the kitchen equipment supply and installation and after allowing for VAT, will be in the range £100,000 to £120,000. After allowing for professional fees (architect and quantity surveyor) and also contingency allowance, we are confident that the total cost will be less than £150 000.

B4.2 In terms of funds available and possible funding, we are at present expending a significant amount over our income, due to a range of commitments, particularly paying for a full time youth worker and also outlays for a range of major maintenance issues with respect to the over 100 year old church. Although this is manageable, we will not be able to have, or source, funds to supplement the s106 funding. We therefore hope that the s106 funding will cover the whole of the extension costs.

B4.3 There will no significant extra running costs with respect to the extensions, with the management still falling under the voluntary work already carried out by the various committees at St Marks.