

COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

16 March 2017
5.00 - 5.40 pm

Present: Councillors Sinnott (Chair), Ratcliffe (Vice-Chair), Abbott, Barnett, Bird, Gillespie and O'Connell

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

Officers:

Head of Environmental Services: Joel Carré

Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager: Alistair Wilson

Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield

Public Art Officer: Nadine Black

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Committee Manager: Emily Watts

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

17/1/Comm Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Austin; Councillor Nesthingha attended as an alternate.

17/2/Comm Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor O'Connell	17/5/Comm	Personal: Cambridge Live trustee and her partner is a trustee of KITE Trust
Councillor Nesthingha	17/5/Comm	Personal: Her daughter attends one of the schools which applied for the public art grant
Councillor Bird	17/5/Comm	Personal: Cambridge Live trustee

17/3/Comm Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

17/4/Comm Public Questions

A member of the public asked a question as set out below.

Helen Weinstein raised the following points:

- i. “As the Director of Historyworks I wanted to attend this Committee and thank you for the S106 funding that we received. The funding enabled us to deliver a walking history trail of the Riverside which was hugely successful. Students from many local schools had grown in cultural confidents after taking part in the activity. In addition to exploring more of the cities heritage they also had the opportunity to listen to experts detail the important stories of the past.
- ii. “Historyworks has since made two additional funding requests. However, since submitting them we have been able to include more detail in our proposals. Would there be an opportunity to include this detail?”

The Urban Growth Project Manager responded:

- i. Project ready to go now were being recommended for funding under the s106 process 2016/17.
- ii. There were a number of projects that were not currently ready, but may be eligible for funding in future if details were worked up further.
- iii. Public art projects could apply for funding. The projects/bids were not sufficiently developed to currently meet funding criteria. They could reapply in future and may wish to work with officers to revise their application details before doing so.

The Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces thanked Helen Weinstein for attending the meeting. She said that it was nice to hear about the progress of the project and hear what a positive impact the funding had made.

The Public Art Officer suggested that a report on public art proposals could be made at a future committee meeting.

17/5/Comm S106 priority-setting (Streets and Open Spaces)

Matter for Decision

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

The report detailed the outcome of the 2016/17 S106 public art grant funding round. After assessment the officers were able to recommend the allocation of more than £160,000 of S106 public art contributions to nine eligible, small-scale public art projects.

The report also provided an overview of wider S106 issues relating to contribution types.

The Urban Growth Project Manager made some amendments to his report:

- i. Some hard copies contained a typographical error listing “LGTB” instead of “LGBT”. This had been amended on the electronic version of the agenda on the City Council website.
- ii. (Original text struck through and revised in bold) A grant of up to ~~£44,200~~ **£13,000** Oblique Arts for the ‘Mitcham’s Moving Lighting project’, also subject to confirmation that all necessary approvals and safety certifications have been secured by the grant applicant
- iii. Agenda P24 “Recommendation Q. (Provisional) Showcase of Queer Arts [multiple wards]” contained a typographical error. This project was no longer draft and had the same status as other projects.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces

- i. Approved the following S106 grants for small-scale public art projects, subject to public art grant agreements, assuming that the proposals can be implemented as planned:
 - a. £15,000 grant to the Cambridge Junction for “Radio Local”,
 - b. £15,000 grant to Kettle’s Yard for performance art relating to the temporary installation of an Antony Gormley sculpture;
- ii. Approved the following S106 grants for small-scale public art projects, subject to the involvement of the Public Art Officer in developing the projects, business case approval and public art grant agreements:
 - a. up to £16,500 as a grant to Cambridge Live for “Colours in the Community”,
 - b. up to £25,000 as a grant to the University of Cambridge Primary School for the “Eddington Flag Parade” in 2018,
 - c. a grant of between £15,000 and £30,000 to the Pink Festival Group for the “Showcase of Queer Arts”,

- d. up to £19,000 as a grant to the Menagerie Theatre Company for “Trumpington Voices”;
- iii. Approved the following S106 grants for small-scale public art projects, subject to public art grant agreements and these other conditions:
 - a. A grant of up to £13,000 Oblique Arts for the ‘Mitcham’s Moving Lighting project’, also subject to confirmation that all necessary approvals and safety certifications have been secured by the grant applicant, and
 - b. Grants to Historyworks for both ‘Rhythm, Rhyme and Railways’ (£15,000 grant) and ‘History Walking Trails 2’ (£15,000), also subject to the completion of the final evaluation reports and financial accounts for previous projects for which Historyworks has received S106 public art grant-funding; and
 - iv. Agreed to allocate:
 - a. Up to an additional £30,000 of public art S106 contributions to the “Railway workers commemorative public art” project on the corner of Mill Road and Cavendish Road (on top of the existing £30,000 S106 funding allocation) subject to business case approval, and
 - b. Up to an additional £20,000 of ‘informal open space’ S106 contributions to the Sheep’s Green watercourse improvement project (on top of the existing £40,000 S106 funding allocation and £70,000 of partnership funding from the Environment Agency).

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.

Councillor Gillespie made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. He believed that some the projects should have been recommended for funding when they were not:
- ii.
 - I2. Raising awareness of LGBT issues through art: ‘community mandala’ [Petersfield]

- O. River Cycle at Rowan [West Chesterton]
 - S. Tales from Trumpington [Trumpington].
 - H. Hope can be found at The Edge [Romsey ward]
- iii. He highlighted that demand for some of the proposals was very high and perhaps there would be an opportunity for some of them to collaborate.

The Committee commented that the projects Councillor Gillespie highlighted were very worthwhile, but did not meet 106 funding criteria. It was noted the River Cycle at Rowan had already received £74,000 through a separate application.

The Executive Councillor commented that the projects had merit but would not receive funding if they did not meet eligibility criteria.

The Urban Growth Project Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The council's Public Art Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) set out criteria that projects needed to meet to receive funding. For example only projects undertaken in Cambridge were eligible so they could not be run in collaboration with schools outside of the City boundary eg Girton.
- ii. There was a requirement to ensure that funding related to the areas that the contribution has come from. In the case of Arbury and Castle, the funding also had an expiry date so it was used on the two schools closest to these areas. The schools were highlighted in the report to show they received funding before it expired, hence no other schools being mentioned.
- iii. Collaboration between projects could be possible but work would have to be undertaken to showcase their intention.
- iv. Groups can apply for funding even if they had previously made a successful application.
- v. Although many of the unsuccessful applicants proposed creative ideas they did not meet the eligibility criteria specifically assigned to public art. In addition, some of the proposals failed to exemplify how they mitigated the impact of development or did not pre-exist the development in question.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

The meeting ended at 5.40 pm

CHAIR