

COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

19 March 2015
2.30 - 5.35 pm

Present: Councillors Moghadas (Chair), Ratcliffe (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Reid, Reiner, Sarris, Sinnott and Sanders

Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation: Councillor Johnson

Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places: Councillor O'Reilly

Director of Customer and Community Services: Liz Bisset
Director of Environment: Simon Payne
Sports and Recreation Manager: Ian Ross
Head of Arts and Recreation: Debbie Kaye
Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield
Head of Community, Arts and Recreation: Debbie Kaye
Head of Streets and Open Spaces: Joel Carré
Head of Tourism and City Centre Management: Emma Thornton
Head of Planning: Patsy Dell
Community Funding and Development Manager: Jackie Hanson
Arts and Events Manager: Jane Wilson
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

15/13/CS Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Austin

15/14/CS Declarations of Interest

Item	Councillor	Interest
15/20/CS	Reid	Personal: Trustee of Cambridge Literary Festival, Trustee of Cambridge Leisure and Ice Centre, Trustee of Cambridge Live, Trustee of Storey's Field, Member of Cambridge Preservation Society

15/22/CS	Reid Reiner Baigent	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
----------	---------------------------	---

15/15/CS Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the 15th January 2015 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

Councillor Reiner suggested that an, Area Committee style, action sheets would assist Committee members in tracking actions requested at previous meeting.

15/16/CS Public Questions (See information below)

Councillor Hipkin addressed the Committee regarding item 15/22/CS and 15/23/CS in his role as Ward Councillor. His comments can be found at the beginning of those items.

15/17/CS Community Arts and Recreation Portfolio Plan 2015/16**Matter for Decision**

The Committee received the draft Community, Arts and Recreation Portfolio Plan 2015-16, which set out the strategic objectives for the portfolio for the year ahead, described the context in which the portfolio was being delivered and detailed the activities required to deliver the outcomes and the vision. Performance measures and risks were also shown for each strategic objective.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation

The Executive Councillor resolved:

- i. to approve the draft Community, Arts and Recreation Portfolio Plan 2015-16.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received the Portfolio Plan from the Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation who outlined his aspirations for future.

In response to a question from Councillor Reid, the Executive Councillor confirmed that he was happy for update reports to be circulated regarding the Storey's Field and Clay Farm projects. However, decisions behind the projects' implementation (such as management structures) were outside the remit of the committee.

Members commented on the number of Community Groups referenced in the report and wondered what relationships those group would have with this committee.

The Executive Councillor suggested progress reports could be provided to members of the committee as those groups developed. The Director of Customer and Community Services stated that the details of how Vision Statement 2 would be delivered were still under discussion. Progress would be reported in due course.

The Committee questioned the performance targets related to young people and measuring their engagement at area Committees. The Head of Community, Arts and Recreation suggested that this may link to S106 decision being taken at Area Committees. She suggested it was more about how young people influenced the process than necessarily their attendance at an area committee. However, positive outcome were noted on occasions when young people had attended area committees.

Head of Community, Arts and Recreation stated that the performance measure 3.1, 'Number of community initiatives supported in Year 1 target', should read Year 1 aspiration. She confirmed that the performance measures were under development and undertook to circulate details in the future.

The Committee resolved by 5 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

15/18/CS Cambridge City Council Arts Plan Delivery Framework

Matter for Decision

The report followed on from the Arts Plan report presented at committee on 15th January 2015 and provided the detailed action plan as mentioned in that report.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation

The Executive Councillor resolved:

- i. to approve the Arts Plan Delivery Framework 2015-18 and action plan 2015-16.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Arts and Event Manager regarding the Cambridge City Council Arts Plan Delivery Framework.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. A briefing note would be helpful to clarify the functions of the various partnership bodies.
- ii. Questioned how a multi partner approach would be monitored.
- iii. Asked how Mental Health was being prioritised.
- iv. Welcomed the links to the anti-poverty strategy.

In response to Members' questions the Arts and Event Manager said the following:

- i. The listed partnerships were an efficient use of officer time. Several are convened by other partners and they provide an effective way of engaging with multiple organisations at one time.
- ii. External partners were encouraged to share skills and to take on responsibility for project delivery.
- iii. Mental Health would be an important priority for the well-being partnership and external City based experts would be invited to contribute.

The Arts and Event Manager undertook to circulate details of membership of partnerships and, where relevant, minutes of meetings.

The Committee resolved by 5 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

15/19/CS Updated Sports And Physical Activity Plan 2014-2017

Matter for Decision

The Sports Strategy 2014-17 was adopted in March 2014 following local consultation with clubs and sporting organisations to identify and prioritise themes for areas of work and development within the City.

After a change in Administration following the May 2014 elections the work on delivering the adopted Sports Strategy continued, but had been updated to reflect and incorporate the new Council Vision and Policy Objectives to bring a focus on tackling Anti-Poverty and health and well-being related issues on the key themes previously identified through consultation. There was now an updated action plan for delivery within new priority areas and targeted interventions over the remaining term of the strategy.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation

The Executive Councillor resolved:

- i. to approve the approach outlined in the report and agree for the delivery of the Sports Action Plan 2015 – 2017.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Recreation Services Manager regarding the Updated Sports and Physical Activity Plan 2014-17.

Councillor Reiner questioned the position of Rouse Ball Pavilion and the possibility of a visionary project linking pool improvements to a wider scheme for Jesus Green. The Executive Councillor stated that no detailed work has yet been done on a proposal to link Rouse Ball Pavilion with Jesus Green Pool. Regarding the latter, discussions have been held with Jesus Green Association and Friends of Jesus Green Pool about the possible redevelopment of the pool and that Rouse Ball could feature. He reminded the Committee that the S106 money underpinning any Rouse Ball project had to be linked to the conditions attached to the S106 funds.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Suggested that clarification was needed regarding Mental Health and Homelessness through-put targets.
- ii. Suggested that bookable tennis courts had been popular in other areas.

In response to members' questions the Recreation Services Manager stated the following:

- i. Expanded on the geographical spread of projects and stated that some were spread across the City while others were targeted at areas of identified need. Sport England had been involved in the needs mapping.
- ii. Confirmed that S106 agreements provided greater opportunities to encourage private sports and leisure providers to share their facilities and expertise.
- iii. Private schools were also being encouraged to share facilities.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

15/20/CS City Centre and Public Places Portfolio Plan 2015/16

Matter for Decision

The report covered the draft City Centre and Public Places Portfolio Plan 2015-16, which set out the strategic objectives for the portfolio for the year ahead, described the context in which the portfolio was being delivered and

detailed the activities required to deliver the outcomes and the vision. Performance measures and risks were also shown for each strategic objective.

Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public places

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

- i. approve the draft City Centre and Public Places Portfolio Plan 2015-16.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Streets and Open Spaces regarding the City Centre and Public Places Portfolio Plan.

The Executive Councillor stated that much of the work detailed in the plan was already under way. Vision statements 1 and 2 highlighted the mooring review and the review of 'friends' groups. She stated that work was on-going to channel the existing high level of public engagement in a positive directions.

Some members of the Committee suggested that there might be some conflict between the aspirations of different Executive Councillor Portfolios.

In response to Members' questions, the Director of Environment confirmed that savings and surpluses from the Bereavement Services would continue to support Cambridge City Council's objectives. Once basic targets had been achieved, surpluses could be reinvested in the service.

The Committee resolved by 5 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

15/21/CS S106 Funding And Interim Arrangements Ahead Of The Local Introduction Of The Community Infrastructure Levy

Matter for Decision

Under national Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations, new restrictions from 6 April 2015 would limit substantially the extent to which councils can enter into new S106 agreements with developers (and, therefore, significantly reduce the number and value of new S106 contributions from new developments). This was in addition to further constraints covered by a ministerial announcement in November 2014. Cambridge was particularly affected by the latest restrictions as the city council cannot introduce (or receive payments via) the Community Infrastructure Levy until after the examination of its draft Local Plan and CIL proposals has been concluded.

Whilst working within the CIL Regulations, the city council (working closely with County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council) was actively seeking an interim solution prior to the implementation of CIL, in order to minimise the impact of these changes.

Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

- i. delegate authority to the Head of Planning Services to finalise the city council's interim approach to seeking S106 contributions from 6 April 2015 until the local implementation of a Community Infrastructure Levy for Cambridge. The final details of this interim approach will be agreed in consultation with the Executive Councillors for City Centre & Public Places and Planning Policy & Transport, their Opposition Spokes and the Chairs of the Community Services and Environment Scrutiny Committees;
- ii. confirm that the scheduled fourth S106 priority-setting round (based on S106 developer contributions already received and available) will go ahead in 2015.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Urban Growth Project Manager.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Queried whether some developers might seek to rush through applications in the knowledge that in the interim period they might avoid both CIL and S106 contributions.
- ii. Queried what steps had been taken to inform MPS about the situation.

In response to Members' questions the Urban Growth Project Manager and the Head of Planning stated the following:

- iii. Alternative approaches to mitigation measures were under investigation, albeit that the options were quite limited in the interim period prior to the implementation of the Community Infrastructure Levy.
- iv. Counsel's advice was being sought on what was possible.

The Head of Planning stated it had been expected that the Local Plan would be in place by now and had that been achieved, this situation would not have arisen. Her team had responded to government consultation and had been in contact with local MP's. More details would be circulated outside the meeting.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

15/22/CS Cambridge City Centre Accessibility Study

Councillor Hipkin addressed the committee and made the following remarks:

- i. Concerned about the theme 'people with disability' and suggested this matter applied to all people using Cambridge.
- ii. Suggested that some actions in the plan would take time to deliver and that initially it might be useful to address the quick wins. For example: removal of 'A' boards.
- iii. Improved engagement with the County Council to address the spread of tables and chairs into the street.
- iv. Congratulated all concerned for recent successes in addressing punt touts and securing the removal of sail type advertising signs.
- v. Street signage should be reviewed as soon as possible.
- vi. The Cambridge BID could be encouraged to take on such matters.

- vii. The City was becoming an unconvivial and difficult place to visit. This was encouraging local people to go elsewhere.

Matter for Decision

In 2014 a review was commissioned to gain a fuller understanding of the issues affecting ease of access in and around the city centre for a range of users but particularly pedestrians, disabled and wheelchair users. The review was completed recently and the final draft report was attached for consideration.

Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places

The Executive Councillor resolved:

- i. to agree the findings of the city centre accessibility review and to note the recommendations for further action set out in the study at Appendix A; and
- ii. to agree the development of a detailed action plan to be brought back to Scrutiny Committee at its next cycle for consideration.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Planning regarding the Cambridge City Centre Accessibility Study.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Welcomed the report and suggested that it was needed.
- ii. Suggested that the pictures were very useful at highlighting the problems.
- iii. Suggested that access was not just an issue for those with mobility issues and had an impact on the all user of the City Centre.
- iv. Suggested this was an opportunity to raise wider disability issues.
- v. A greater problem would be enforcement.
- vi. Welcomed the involvement of College Bursars.

Head of Tourism & City Centre Management added clarity to the legal position of A boards which were not permitted on the highway. However, she added

that the County Council did not have the resources or staff to enforce this. A joint approach was planned for the future. An officer group had been formed recently to develop more effective partnership working between the City, and County Councils, Police and Cambridge BID on City Centre operational issues such as illegal street trading, anti-social busking and punting. This group will meet monthly throughout the year to ensure that this joined up approach continues throughout the busy summer months.

The Head of Planning stated that the Local Plan included a Public Realm Strategy and sections on visual pollution. Once the plan was in place, these could be used to protect the City Centre.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

15/23/CS A Future Model for Tourism for Cambridge and the Surrounding Area

Councillor Hipkin addressed the committee and made the following remarks:

- i. Suggested that other European nations encouraged wider travel by using rail subsidies.
- ii. Overnight visitors to Cambridge appear to be static whilst day visitor numbers were rising.
- iii. Concerned that Queen's Road, a beautiful part of Cambridge, was allowed to be used as a coach park.
- iv. Suggested coaches should stop at the Park and Ride sites.
- v. Make the Cambridge brand distinct and valued as a quality destination.
- vi. Offer discounted passes to colleges and attractions to overnight visitors and charge more to day-trippers.

Matter for Decision

On 16th October 2014 the Executive Councillor made an "in principle" decision, following Community Services Scrutiny Committee, to establish a new Destination Management Organisation (DMO) as an alternative delivery mechanism for the future provision of tourism services in Cambridge and the surrounding area. This model was based on guidance from Government and

best practise nationally. This move would deliver a long term financially sustainable model for tourism, whilst increasing investment, safeguarding the visitor economy as a key economic driver for the city and the surrounding area, and reducing the cost to the City Council.

The report provided an update on progress with this project and sought final approval to create the new DMO.

Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places resolved:

- i. to approve the creation of a new Destination Management Organisation (DMO) as a private sector led, public/private sector tourism partnership and a “Not for Profit” Company Limited by Guarantee on the basis described in this report; and
- ii. to delegate authority for all decisions necessary to implement and establish the DMO to the Director of Environment after consultation with the Executive Councillor, Chair and Opposition Spokes, subject to existing delegations to other officers and to compliance with budgetary procedures.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer’s report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Director of Environment regarding the establishment of a new DMO.

The Head of Tourism and City Centre Management highlighted that a key aim of the new DMO would be to increase the value from our visitor economy through increased promotion of the Beyond Cambridge area. In doing so the aim would be, over time to change the perception of Cambridge as only a day trip destination. She also emphasised that the new DMO would continue to have a key focus on the management issues as this was essential in ensuring that visitors enjoyed a positive experience when visiting Cambridge.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. If overnight visitors are to be encouraged there would need to be an increase in hotel capacity.
- ii. Suggested that the Park and Ride services and other bus route needed to be operational into the evening period.
- iii. Suggested that engagement from neighbouring authorities and the County Council would be needed.
- iv. Cautioned against making Cambridge so expensive that school trips were discouraged.
- v. Raised concerns that tourists were distorting the commercial make-up of the City Centre.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Tourism and City Centre Management stated the following:

- i. Surrounding areas had capacity for more visitors and these needed to be better promoted to visitors.
- ii. The DMO would take the lead on the development of a Destination Management Plan for the Cambridge and beyond area but this would be in within its first 12-18 months. Whilst the DMO would facilitate this process, it would be a shared plan with broad stakeholder involvement including District and County Authorities, Business Improvement Districts (and other business Networks in the area) and the GCGP LEP.
- iii. Currently tourism promotion and management in the surrounding districts is diminishing.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

The meeting ended at 5.35 pm

CHAIR