

COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

19 January 2017
5.00 - 6.55 pm

Present: Councillors Ratcliffe (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Abbott, Austin, Barnett, Bird, Gillespie, R. Moore and O'Connell

Executive Councillors: Johnson (Executive Councillor for Communities) and Smith (Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces)

Officers:

Strategic Director: Suzanne McBride

Head of Community Services: Debbie Kaye

Operations Manager – Community Engagement and Enforcement: Wendy Young

Community Funding and Development Manager: Jackie Hanson

Culture and Community Manager: Jane Wilson

Sport & Recreation Manager: Ian Ross

Community Review Manager: Allison Conder

Principal Accountant (Services): Chris Humphris

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Others Present:

Head of Commercial Services: James Elms

Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

17/1/Comm Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Sinnott.

17/2/Comm Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Barnett	17/6/Comm	Personal: Works at Addenbrooke's Hospital
Councillor Bird	17/7/Comm	Personal and prejudicial:

		Council appointed Trustee of Cambridge Live. Would not vote on this item
Councillor O'Connell	17/7/Comm	Personal and prejudicial: Council appointed Trustee of Cambridge Live. Would not vote on this item
Councillor Bird	17/7/Comm	Personal: Supports a disability group that receives grant funding.
Councillor O'Connell	17/8/Comm	Personal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Live is a grant recipient. • Member of Trumpington Residents Association. • Partner is the trustee of SexYOUality. • Other partner is a volunteer with the CAB.
Councillor O'Connell	17/9/Comm	Personal - Member of Trumpington Residents Association.

17/3/Comm Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 October 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

17/4/Comm Public Questions

Members of the public asked a number of questions, as set out below.

1. Ms Glasberg raised the following points:

- i. **“A couple of years ago there was no consultation when 106 funding was used to ‘improve’ Lammas Land play area. Very large items of play equipment were installed with inappropriate re-surfacing - this was not at all what local people would have chosen, and there was chaos there for months.”**

- ii. **“Now residents are dismayed that Community Services has approved 106 funding for the Canoe Club’s Storage Containers as ‘sport and community provision’. Yet siting them in the small enclosure of the Learner Pool at Sheeps Green has a very adverse impact on a long established and important facility enjoyed by children learning to swim from across the city. The pool has been sadly neglected in recent years, and people are asking, ‘Why is this money not being spent instead to improve the facilities there?’ Why is 106 money being used to drive through projects without any consultation, which often do not have the support of councillors and are actually detrimental to our environment and communities?”**
- iii. **“The Canoe Club application gave the location of the storage containers as ‘The Basket Room, Lammas Land’, which does not actually exist, and it went through 2 meetings of this committee as a couple of lines in the appendix with no mention of the Learner Pool. It is therefore not surprising that members did not know the impact of what was proposed and had no opportunity for proper scrutiny, which does not seem right to us.”**
- iv. **“We would like to see the containers moved from the pool area into a less obtrusive location behind the Canoe Club as soon as possible, and hope you will support this.”**
- v. **“We would also like to be assured that in future residents and local councillors will be consulted when 106 projects are planned for their area.”**

The Executive Councillor for Communities responded:

- i. Officers and Councillors were aware of residents’ concerns regarding the siting of containers.
- ii. Officers had contacted Ms Glasberg.
- iii. Officers and Ward Councillors were looking at alternative sites for the containers. Proposals were being reviewed and action expected in the near future.
- iv. The Learner Pool was covered by the contract with GLL until 2023. Investment was being made to enhance facilities across the city.
- v. S106 proposals were now scrutinised by scrutiny and area committees. Funding was running down so there was less available for projects in future. Any projects put forward would be judged against criteria.

Ms Glasberg raised the following supplementary points:

- i. Expressed dissatisfaction that the original storage position of the container was in such a prominent position in the conservation area. Siting it behind the Canoe Club would be more preferable.**
- ii. Suggested that local residents, Ward Councillors and the Executive Councillor were not properly consulted about the site of the storage container.**

The Executive Councillor for Communities responded:

- i. Re-iterated that (Ward) Councillor Cantrill's proposal for the relocation of the container should address residents' concerns.**
- ii. All procedures had been followed in the planning process.**

2. Ms Blythe (FeCRA Chair) raised the following points:

- i. "The City Council has been asking people to tell it which parks and open spaces should benefit from the remaining funds given by developers. But FeCRA is hearing from residents that people would rather see the money spent on preserving open green spaces in the city."**
- ii. "Local historian and Blue Badge Guide Allan Brigham refers to the City Council's Local Plan for 2006 which states that open space should 'enhance the setting of the city, and add to its special character, amenity and biodiversity'."**
- iii. "Residents are telling FeCRA that the city council has rolled over to developers and taken commuted payments for open spaces elsewhere, not on the site which is being developed. They say this policy is leading to overdevelopment on parks such as Romsey Rec where it is now proposed to install a climbing wall, and suggest wouldn't it be more appropriate instead to fund astroturf at St Philip's School where the hard tarmac playground is not conducive for children to play sport safely."**
- iv. "At Sheeps Green ugly industrial containers have been funded by 106 money for the Cambridge Canoe Club. These have been installed in the enclosure of the Learner Swimming Pool with a serious impact on the amenities of the pool area itself and the surrounding Conservation Area, a prime riverside location."**
- v. "Residents tell us that Council policy is failing to provide new open spaces in areas of greatest need around new developments in the inner city while 106 money is being spent in ways that are detrimental to our existing parks and open spaces."**
- vi. "In all the great cities of the world what makes them great is the quality of the public spaces. People care about where they live, the**

- quality of the spaces near their homes and the way in which they are used by local communities. It's all about making loved space."**
- vii. **"Given this, residents would like to know what is the criteria for S106 funding? On what basis are decisions being made? Is the allocation of S106 funding part of a long-term vision for the city? And if not, why not?"**

The Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces responded:

- i. The Council was committed to protecting open spaces.
- ii. Referred to the s106 criteria summary tabled by the Urban Growth Project Manager.
- iii. S106 projects have helped to:
 - a. Promote nature reserves.
 - b. Provide public open spaces on major developments.
- iv. £4m had been received in offsite mitigation.
- v. The new Local Plan was more robust about offsite mitigation and where it could be done (than the 2006 one).
- vi. Details would be brought to Community services in March 2017 regarding changes to legislation affecting Romsey Rec.
- vii. Consultation was expected in future on how funding would be used regarding Romsey Rec.
- viii. St Philip's School could liaise with the Council about future applications.

Ms Blythe raised the following supplementary points:

- i. **Asked what kind of city the Council wanted in future?**
- ii. **Queried how many planning applications were given planning consent in 2013 – 2016 where a commuted sum was accepted either:**
 - a. **Instead of on site provision of play/open space.**
 - b. **With a reduced level of play/open space.**

The Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces responded that she and the Strategic Director would liaise with Ms Blythe after the meeting.

17/5/Comm Streets & Open Spaces Portfolio Revenue and Capital Budget Proposals for 2017/18 to 2021/22

Matter for Decision

The report detailed the budget proposals relating to the Streets and Opens Spaces portfolio that are included in the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2017/18.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Streets and Opens Spaces

Review of Charges

- i. Approved the proposed charges for this portfolio's services and facilities, as shown in Appendix A of the Officer's report, subject to published amendments.

Revenue

- ii. Noted the revenue budget proposals as shown in Appendix B of the Officer's report, subject to published amendments.

Capital

- iii. Noted the capital budget proposals as shown in Appendix C of the Officer's report, subject to published amendments.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Principal Accountant (Services) updated his report by referring to amendments published on-line and tabled at committee.

The committee made no comments in response to the report.

The Committee resolved to endorse the recommendations as amended by 6 votes to 0.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations as amended.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

17/6/Comm City Centre Accessibility Review: Advertising 'A' boards

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 report was considered at the March 2015 Community Services Scrutiny Committee; and in July 2015, a plan of action was developed and approved at committee to take the next steps to bring about the identified changes needed. A progress update of the actions undertaken from the action plan was presented in July 2016. In March 2016, a survey of advertising signage use in the city centre was undertaken and the views of local business users sought on the voluntary removal of advertising signs, such as A-boards.

The Officer's report reviewed the survey findings and set out a proposed policy for advertising signage and the associated process and timetable for its consultation, review and implementation.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces

- i. Authorised officers to consult on the proposed advertising 'A' board and sign policy, as set out in Appendix A.
- ii. Authorised the expansion of the advertising 'A' board and sign policy to include the whole of Cambridge (rather than just the city centre), as defined by the City Council's administrative boundary

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 Operations Manager – Community Engagement and Enforcement.

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

- i. Condition, width and gradient of pavements affected accessibility. 'A' boards should not be placed on 'good' areas as these were generally used by people with sensory/mobility impairments.
- ii. Wind could knock over boards and cause obstructions.

The Operations Manager – Community Engagement and Enforcement said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Enforcement action would be taken against obstructions on public land/highway, but not private land.

- ii. The policy allowed for flexible interpretation on a case by case basis eg location of 'A' boards on a verge instead of a pavement if it was a better location.
- iii. Feedback from the consultation in February – April would help to clarify the text in the final policy. The consultation would take into account that different issues arise at different times of the year.

The Committee unanimously resolved 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.

17/7/Comm Communities Portfolio Revenue and Capital Budget Proposals for 2017/18 to 2021/22

Matter for Decision

The report detailed the budget proposals relating to the Communities portfolio that are included in the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2017/18.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

Review of Charges

- i. Approved the proposed charges for this portfolio's services and facilities, as shown in Appendix A of the Officer's report, subject to published amendments.

Capital

- ii. Noted the capital budget proposals as shown in Appendix C of the Officer's report, subject to published amendments.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Principal Accountant (Services) updated his report by referring to amendments published on-line and tabled at committee.

The Committee resolved to endorse the recommendations as amended 6 votes to 0.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations as amended.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

17/8/Comm Cambridge Live - Review of Performance

Matter for Decision

This was the second year of trading for Cambridge Live, the independent charity set up by the Council. Cambridge Live had a contract with the Council to run the Cambridge Corn Exchange, The Guildhall Event Programme, Cambridge Folk Festival and the City Events Programme. The Officer's report provided an overview of performance and contractual arrangements to date in 2016-17 and highlights of 2015-16.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

- i. Noted the performance information outlined in the report.
- ii. Agreed the timetable outlined in section 3.5(b) of the Officer's report for a review of future funding arrangements.

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 Community Services.

The Committee resolved by 6 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.

17/9/Comm Community Grants 2017-18 and Voluntary Sector Support

Matter for Decision

This was the third year of the Community Grants fund for voluntary and community not-for-profit organisations. The Officer's report provided a brief overview of the eligibility criteria, support provided and process undertaken. Applications received were detailed in Appendix 1, alongside recommendations for awards.

The report also provided updates on:

- The budget available for Area Committee Community Grants 2017-18.
- Community Grants 2018-19.
- The programme of activities for Volunteer for Cambridge 2017.
- The Living Wage.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

Approved the Community Grants to voluntary and community organisations for 2017-18, as set out in Appendix 1 of the Officer's report, subject to the budget approval in February 2017 and any further satisfactory information required of applicant organisations.

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 Community Funding and Development Manager.

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

- i. The City Council funded more voluntary organisations than neighbouring councils.
- ii. Asked for their thanks for Officer's hard work to be put on record.

The Community Funding and Development Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. There were considerable financial pressures on the voluntary sector at present. In order to keep groups viable, Officers did not recommend

- imposing criteria that organisations must pay the living wage in order to receive grant funding.
- ii. The report detailed the high number of organisations that did pay the living wage, and others indicated they aimed to do so in future.

The Committee resolved by 7 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.

17/10/Comm Strategic Review of Community Provision - Building Stronger Communities: Community Centres Strategy

Matter for Decision

In October 2015 the Executive Councillor for Communities, Arts & Recreation made a decision to undertake a strategic review of community provision. Subsequent decisions have been taken to agree progress at each stage (refer to section 8 of the Officer's report).

Following a review of existing provision and a needs assessment, a draft Community Centres Strategy has been developed with the overarching theme of 'Building Stronger Communities'. A review of community development resources and funding would follow. The Council was now in a position to consult more widely on the draft Community Centres Strategy, and to begin detailed work to develop specific, deliverable proposals.

The draft strategy was attached to the Officer's report. It contained recommendations affecting a number of current centres and proposals to enhance facilities in certain areas (pages 32-45).

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

- i. Agreed to consultation with stakeholders and the wider community on the draft Community Centre Strategy (Appendix A of the Officer's report) and the recommendations in section 3, pages 32-45. The Executive Councillor for Communities, the Chair of the Community Services Committee and the Opposition Spokesperson would be consulted on the design of the consultation.

- ii. Agreed to further work and detailed feasibility studies of individual sites where changes are proposed in the draft strategy. This work would also seek to mitigate against any instability that could be caused as any changes are implemented.
- iii. Agreed the feedback and findings from (i) and (ii) would inform further recommendations which would be brought back to the relevant committee for scrutiny before any final decisions are made by the appropriate Executive Councillor.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Head of Community Services updated her report by referring to amendments published on-line and tabled at committee.

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

- i. Residents asked for more community centre provision in the city centre to aid community cohesion.
- ii. Asked if community facility details could be signposted through social media.
- iii. Councillor Gillespie offered his data visualisation skills to help compile information if this would help officers.
- iv. Green space needed to be protected around community facilities.
- v. Asked for their thanks for Officer's hard work to be put on record

The Community Funding and Development Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Strategy recommendations were not set in stone. Having completed analysis work, and developed draft proposals, officers wanted to hear people's views. The responses received to the consultation would help inform the final strategy which will be brought back to Community Services in June for consideration.
- ii. The proposals were based on population and deprivation analysis and were 'future proofed' as much as possible at this stage with new centres planned on major growth sites as detailed in the report. Growth will need to be considered in the future with master planning on larger sites and S106/CIL contributions on smaller developments. Alongside the centres

- strategy we will be reviewing our community development resource to be flexible to meet future needs.
- iii. The review was not expected to lead to any loss of provision and service level agreements could be put in place to protect community use if voluntary sector partners took on the management of a centre.
 - iv. The strategy proposed to look at appropriate ways to promote the facilities identified for wider public use.
 - v. The consultation would be designed then comments sought from Chair, Executive and Spokes.

The Strategic Director said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. General details were put in the consultation document, not detailed information, so it had a broad and accessible format. It was felt detailed information would be unhelpful. Officers would respond to any specific questions.
- ii. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mayor would come into effect in May 2017. Department for Communities and Local Government housing proposals were expected in February. Proposals would be considered by the Housing Scrutiny Committee. A briefing was pending for councillors on the 500 homes expected for Cambridge. Community Services Scrutiny Committee would look at community centre provision. Officers would try to link the two subjects, but they would be considered at the 2 scrutiny committees.
- iii. Undertook to liaise with Councillors post meeting about concerns regarding walking time to access community centres. Housing and community facility needs were considered through planning policy.
- iv. The Council would liaise with community centres if the consultation highlighted they could provide more services (higher demand than expected, gap in local provision etc).

The Community Review Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Officers have audited and verified 107 community facilities across the city. Within this are 25 dedicated community facilities which are available for community use at all times, and 8 of these are the City Council's community centres, which are the focus of this review.
- ii. Only the 25 dedicated community facilities were included within the evidence base for the catchment analysis work to assess whether the city council community centres are targeted at areas of greatest need.

The Sport & Recreation Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The County Council owned the land Cherry Hinton Village Centre was built on, but the City Council owns the building and is leased to GLL under the Leisure Contract.
- ii. Provision of community facilities at Cherry Hinton Village Centre was a council priority.

The Committee resolved by 6 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.

The meeting ended at 6.55 pm

CHAIR