

# Public Document Pack



## Cambridge City Council

### COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**To:** **Scrutiny Committee Members:** Sinnott (Chair), Ratcliffe (Vice-Chair), Abbott, Austin, Barnett, Bird, Gillespie and O'Connell

**Alternates:** Councillors R. Moore and Nethsingha

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

*Despatched: Monday, 6 March 2017*

**Date:** Thursday, 16 March 2017

**Time:** 5.00 pm

**Venue:** Committee Room 1 & 2, The Guildhall, Market Square, Cambridge, CB2 3QJ

**Contact:** James Goddard

**Direct Dial:** 01223 457013

### AGENDA

#### 1 Apologies

To receive any apologies for absence.

#### 2 Declarations of Interest

Members are asked to declare at this stage any interests that they may have in an item shown on this agenda. If any member of the Committee is unsure whether or not they should declare an interest on a particular matter, they should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer **before** the meeting.

#### 3 Minutes (*Pages 5 - 18*)

To approve the minutes of the meeting on 19 January 2017

#### 4 Public Questions

## **Items for debate by the Committee and then decision by the Executive Councillor**

These items will require the Executive Councillor to make a decision *after* hearing the views of the Scrutiny Committee.

There will be a full debate on these items, and members of the public may ask questions or comment on the items if they comply with the Council's rules on Public Speaking set out below.

### **Decisions for the Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces**

## **Items for debate by the Committee and then decision by the Executive Councillor**

### **5 S106 priority-setting (Streets and Open Spaces) (Pages 19 - 44)**

Background paper: 170308 Pack of Public Art Applications.

This pdf is also posted on the S106 priority-setting web page (<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106-priority-setting>).

### **Decisions for the Executive Councillor for Communities**

No decisions required for this agenda

# Information for the Public

**Location** The meeting is in the Guildhall on the Market Square (CB2 3QJ).

Between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. the building is accessible via Peas Hill, Guildhall Street and the Market Square entrances.

After 5 p.m. access is via the Peas Hill entrance.

All the meeting rooms (Committee Room 1, Committee 2 and the Council Chamber) are on the first floor, and are accessible via lifts or stairs.

**Public Participation** Some meetings may have parts that will be closed to the public, but the reasons for excluding the press and public will be given.

Most meetings have an opportunity for members of the public to ask questions or make statements.

To ask a question or make a statement please notify the Committee Manager (details listed on the front of the agenda) prior to the deadline.

- For questions and/or statements regarding items on the published agenda, the deadline is the start of the meeting.
- For questions and/or statements regarding items NOT on the published agenda, the deadline is 10 a.m. the day before the meeting.

Speaking on Planning or Licensing Applications is subject to other rules. Guidance for speaking on these issues can be obtained from Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or [democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk).

Further information about speaking at a City Council meeting can be found at;

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/speaking-at-committee-meetings>

Cambridge City Council would value your assistance in improving the public speaking process of committee meetings. If you have any feedback please contact Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or [democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk).

**Filming, recording and photography**

The Council is committed to being open and transparent in the way it conducts its decision making. The public may record (e.g. film, audio, tweet, blog) meetings which are open to the public.

**Facilities for disabled people**

Level access to the Guildhall is via Peas Hill.

A loop system is available in Committee Room 1, Committee Room 2 and the Council Chamber.

Accessible toilets are available on the ground and first floor.

Meeting papers are available in large print and other formats on request prior to the meeting.

For further assistance please contact Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or [democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk).

**Queries on reports**

If you have a question or query regarding a committee report please contact the officer listed at the end of relevant report or Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or [democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk).

**General Information**

Information regarding committees, councilors and the democratic process is available at <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/>

**Mod.Gov App**

You can get committee agenda and reports for your tablet by using the mod.gov app

**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**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
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"> <li>• Cambridge Live is a grant recipient.</li> <li>• Member of Trumpington Residents Association.</li> <li>• Partner is the trustee of SexYOUality.</li> <li>• Other partner is a volunteer with the CAB.</li> </ul>
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**



To: Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces:  
Councillor Anna Smith

Report by: Urban Growth Project Manager

Relevant scrutiny committee: Community Services Scrutiny Committee 16/3/2017

Wards affected: All wards

## **S106 PRIORITY-SETTING REPORT (STREETS & OPEN SPACES)**

### **Key Decision**

---

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 In line with the agreed arrangements for the 2016/17 funding round, this report primarily focuses on the 22 small-scale public art proposals received from local groups in late 2016 which seek S106 public art grants (see Section 4 and the summary in Appendix A). A pack of the detailed applications themselves will be available from early March 2017 at [www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106-priority-setting](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106-priority-setting).
- 1.2 Officers thank all the grant applicants for investing considerable care and effort in putting forward creative and inspiring proposals aimed at making a difference to local communities. There are some exciting applications which will deliver high quality public art and help to mitigate the impact of development in Cambridge. At the same time, some other no-less-attractive proposals unfortunately do not meet the agreed eligibility criteria for the use of S106 public art funding, which the council is obliged to follow. Even so, officers are able to recommend the allocation of more than £160,000 of S106 public art contributions in the 2016/17 funding round to nine eligible, small-scale public art projects.
- 1.3 The report also provides an overview of wider S106 issues relating to contribution types within the Executive Councillor's portfolio. Section 5 features a couple of projects prioritised in previous S106 funding rounds that have been developed further and now seek some additional S106 funding to enable them to be taken forward. Section 6 then highlights the on-going review of the use of S106 funding to maximise the links between where S106 contributions come from and where (and on which types of project) they are spent.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces

- 2.1 approves 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;
- 2.2 approves 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”;
- 2.3 approves 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 £11,200 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
- 2.4 agrees 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).

### 3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 New homes and development leads to more demands on local facilities. Through legal agreements, the council asks developers to pay off-site S106 contributions to mitigate that impact when not addressed on-site. For off-site, generic S106 contributions<sup>1</sup>, the council has run annual funding rounds since 2012<sup>2,3</sup>. An overview can be found at <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/our-approach-to-s106>.
- 3.2 In October 2015, the Executive Councillor at the time agreed to earmark £100,000 of public art S106 contributions to a small-scale public art grant programme across 2016-18. This does not limit the level of public art grants that can be offered in 2016/17, but was simply intended to ensure that at least £100,000 would be available (which it is). Following a report to this Committee last October, the Executive Councillor agreed the 2016/17 S106 funding round process – with public art grant applications being considered at this meeting<sup>4,5</sup>.
- 3.3 Like all other generic S106 contribution types, public art has to be used for its intended purpose and cannot be switched for use on another category of S106 spend. The purpose of public art contributions is set out in the council's Public Art Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2010 and is reflected in the S106 agreements through which off-site generic public art contributions have been secured. In short, this is for: original, high quality public art<sup>6</sup> in Cambridge which involves an artist/craftsperson, engages the community in the process, reinforces local distinctiveness and cultural identity, is accessible to the public and has a lasting legacy.

- 
1. Generic contributions relate to broad infrastructure types (eg, 'informal open space') and were the sort that the council tended to secure prior to the changes to government regulations in April 2015. Since then, however, the council can now only seek specific contributions relating to improvements to particular facilities.
  2. Over the last two years, this has included grants for small-scale public art projects (normally under £15,000 each) to local community groups working with an artist.
  3. A summary of S106-funded public art grant awards and other recent public art projects can be found in Appendix B.
  4. Although the possibility had been raised at this Scrutiny Committee last October, there are no reports or proposals for outdoor or indoor sports S106 contributions ready to be considered by the Executive Councillor for Communities at this meeting.
  5. It was agreed that proposals for S106 public realm improvements would not be considered in the 2016/17 round.
  6. The Public Art SPD gives examples (not a definitive list) of what can qualify as public art. This includes permanent work including sculpture, water features, kinetic works, sonic works, land art, memorials, text-based works, murals and art infrastructure. It can also encompass temporary artwork (for which there must be a permanent record) which can include exhibitions, film and video, web-based media, text/spoken word, performance art, hoardings/posters and street theatre.

- 3.4 The availability of generic S106 public art funds may appear buoyant but, like all other off-site generic contribution types<sup>7</sup>, they are running down. The impact has been masked by a time-lag (because public art contributions have been paid at the end of construction), but new receipts of previously secured amounts are tapering off<sup>8</sup>.
- a. Following the provisional allocation of £400,000 to the River Cam public art programme<sup>9</sup> in March 2016, there is around £550,000 of S106 public art funding still available<sup>10</sup>.
  - b. Beyond this public art grant-funding round in 2016/17, the council's approach to the use of public art contributions is being reviewed through the development of a new commissioning strategy, which is due to be reported to this Scrutiny Committee later this year.
- 3.5 Applications for public art grants were invited over seven weeks (end of October until 19 December 2016)<sup>11</sup>. Twenty one were received (one included two proposals). The pack of applications (100+ pages) will be available from early March 2017 at [www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106-priority-setting](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106-priority-setting). These have been assessed by a team of officers plus two members<sup>12</sup> of the Public Art Panel<sup>13</sup>. The assessment has been based on the 2016/17 S106 selection criteria<sup>14</sup>, which were agreed by the Executive Councillor last October and reflect the key issues from the Public Art SPD 2010 (see paragraph 3.3).

- 
7. The wider S106 funding availability issues for 'informal open space' and 'play provision for children and teenagers' contributions are explored in Section 6.
  8. In the context of the S106 regulations now in effect, please note also that the council no longer seeks planning obligations for public art but, instead, looks to secure on-site public art in appropriate case through planning conditions.
  9. This level of funding for the River Cam public art programme still requires the business case to be reported back to this Committee for approval. This will also need to be considered in the context of the developing Public Art Commissioning Strategy and the distribution of available S106 public art funding across the city once funding has been allocated to prioritised public art projects in known locations.
  10. The availability of S106 funding is spread unevenly across wards, reflecting different levels of development between wards and allocations of funds to relevant projects.
  11. Awareness of the funding opportunities was raised amongst local arts organisations, community groups, residents' associations, equalities and diversity bodies and local city and county councillors via emails, social media, the council's website and news releases and the 'Cambridge Matters' magazine to all households.
  12. Officers wish to thank Dipak Mistry of Acuity Arts and Andy Robinson of Future City (and other members of the Public Art Panel who provided advice) for their help.
  13. The Public Art Panel has an advisory role in helping the council to secure high quality public art in line with the Public Art SPD. It comprises individuals with established expertise and skills in art and art commissioning. Decision-making on funding public art projects continues to rest with the Executive Councillor.
  14. A similar assessment approach has been applied to the previous two rounds of S106 public art grant applications in 2014/15 and 2015/16.

## 4. ASSESSMENT OF PUBLIC ART GRANT APPLICATIONS

- 4.1 This assessment has considered whether proposals would:
- a. be high quality public art in Cambridge
  - b. be new/original;
  - c. involve an artist/craftsperson;
  - d. engage the community;
  - e. reinforce local distinctiveness and cultural identity;
  - f. be publicly accessible;
  - g. leave a lasting legacy; and
  - h. be consistent with wider 2016/17 S106 selection criteria<sup>15</sup>.
- 4.2 Table 1 outlines the outcomes of the assessment process, while a summary of the applications and assessments can be found in Appendix A. Of the 22 proposals (from 21 applications):
- a. nine are recommended for S106 funding, subject to conditions<sup>16</sup>;
  - b. four are not recommended;
  - c. eight are not eligible for S106 public art funding; and
  - d. one has been withdrawn from the 2016/17 round.
- 4.3 Although the public art grant-funding round was advertised for small-scale projects normally seeking up to £15,000 of grant-funding each, four of the recommendations (see paragraph 2.2) support slightly higher allocations. For these four, plus the “Mitcham’s Moving lighting project”, officers suggest offering a little more than has been requested by the applicants<sup>17</sup> from the local public art contributions available.
- a. The aim is to help the applicants to focus on making sure their projects can deliver high quality public art and meet the stated conditions.
  - b. In the case of the “Showcase of Queer Arts” project, officers would like to explore with the grant applicant the possibility of increasing the scale of, and funding for, project in order to increase the level of the community engagement and strengthen the impact of the project in celebrating diversity within the city.

---

15. The council's 2016/17 S106 selection criteria highlight the need for proposals to be: eligible for S106 funding; affordable within the S106 funding available; an effective use of resources; about providing additional benefit; accessible in line with the council's grants and equalities policies; realistic, achievable and ready to be considered; and financially viable with robust management plans.

16. Of the nine recommendations, there are two each from North, East and West/Central Areas, one from South Area and two projects relating to a number of areas.

17. The actual grants payable will reflect the costs incurred by a grant recipient in carrying out the project minus any other funding that the recipient has been able to raise separately.

**Table 1: Assessment summary for small-scale public art grant applications received in 2016/17**

The applications are lettered A – U (based on alphabetical order). Ward location is shown in [ ] brackets.

Recommended	Not recommended in this round	Not eligible
<p><b>Subject to public art grant agreement</b></p> <p>M. Radio Local [Coleridge and environs]</p> <p>P. Performance art related to Antony Gormley sculpture [Castle]</p> <p><b>Subject to grant agreement and other conditions (see paragraphs 2.2-2.3)</b></p> <p>F. Colours in our Community [North Area]</p> <p>G. Eddington Flag Parade [Castle]</p> <p>J. Michael Rosen History Walking Trails 2 [in North, South &amp; West/Central Areas]</p> <p>L. Mitcham’s Moving Lighting Project [West Chesterton]</p> <p>N. Rhythm, Rhyme and Railways [Romsey/Coleridge]</p> <p>Q. (Provisional) Showcase of Queer Arts [multiple wards]</p> <p>T. Trumpington Voices [Trumpington]</p>	<p>B. Adventures in the Leper Chapel [Abbey]</p> <p>I2. Raising awareness of LGBT issues through art: ‘community mandala’ [Petersfield]<sup>18</sup></p> <p>O. River Cycle at Rowan [West Chesterton]</p> <p>S. Tales from Trumpington [Trumpington]</p> <p><b>Application withdrawn:</b></p> <p>R. ‘Simon Says’ [multiple wards]</p>	<p>A. Abbey Mosaics and Memories [Abbey ward]</p> <p>C. Ascension Burial Ground stone carving [Castle ward]</p> <p>D. Big Wednesday drumming workshops [East Area]</p> <p>E. Big Weekend pop-up gallery &amp; art space [multiple wards]</p> <p>H. Hope can be found at The Edge [Romsey ward]</p> <p>I1. Raising awareness of LGBT issues through art: ‘rainbow benches’ [multiple wards]</p> <p>K. Michael Rosen 'My Cambridge' Poems [multiple wards]</p> <p>U. Trees of Change [multiple wards]</p>

Page 24

18. Proposals I1 and I2 were included in the same public art grant application from SexYOUality.



- 4.4 Following scrutiny by the Committee, once the Executive Councillor has identified which public art grant applications she wishes to prioritise, officers will work closely with the grant applicants on the details of the grant agreement<sup>19</sup>. Each agreement will be tailored to fit the particular project, addressing the sorts of issues highlighted in the assessments in Appendix A.
- 4.5 In line with the council's standard procedures, business cases<sup>20</sup> are needed for any project involving over £15,000 of council spending (i.e., those recommended in paragraph 2.2).
- a. The development of the public art proposals will involve input by the council's Public Art Officer, working with the grant applicants.
  - b. The final business cases will be considered by the council's officer-level Capital Programme Board, chaired by the Head of Finance<sup>21</sup>.
- 4.6 Whether or not the prioritised public art projects require a business case, officers will carry out checks to ensure that the detailed project proposals meet the S106 selection criteria outlined in this report, can satisfy public art grant agreement conditions and are realistic and achievable. Whilst officers will make all reasonable efforts to help all the prioritised projects pass these checks, it is possible that some of these projects may not be able to come to fruition. Officers will keep the Executive Councillor and this Committee informed on progress.

## **5. FUNDING FOR OTHER S106 PROJECTS**

### **Railway workers commemorative public art on Mill Road**

- 5.1 The East Area Committee in 2013/14 allocated £30,000 of public art contributions<sup>22</sup> towards the "Railway workers commemorative public art" project on the corner of Mill Road and Cavendish Road. At the time, this was a 'ball-park' estimate of the costs that might be incurred.

---

19. The grant agreement includes terms to ensure that the grant recipient will reflect the council's commitment to equalities and diversity, uphold the council's reputation and not enter into party political activity. It covers such matters as publicity, use of council logo, insurance and public liability and safeguarding children and vulnerable adults. The recipient is expected to keep council officers informed and engaged in the progress of the project and to respond promptly to requests for information.

20. The business case will be prepared by council officers and will set out the project's scope, design, costs, delivery timescales and other pertinent implications (e.g., equal opportunities and anti-poverty, community safety).

21. For projects prioritised by the Executive Councillor which are under £250k, business cases can be signed off by the Capital Programme Board for implementation.

22. At that time, S106 public art funding was divided into strategic and devolved funds. Since 2014/15, all public art contributions have been centralised in a city-wide fund under the Executive Councillor's responsibility, albeit that the use of these contributions is focused on nearby projects.

- 5.2 Discussions with local groups<sup>23</sup> and councillors over the last year and a half have clarified local ambitions for the project. These place an emphasis on the need for originality, good quality materials (such as brass) and linking the public art to the visual setting of public realm improvements due to take place in the same location. This has informed the project brief for commissioning an artist.
- 5.3 Local groups have been involved in the artist selection process and Harry Gray has been appointed. His project may require up to an additional £30,000 of S106 public art funding, which is available from Romsey ward. This allows for installation of the art work within the public realm improvement project (with the use of lighting) and some extension to the programme of engagement. The contract with the artist is ready to be signed pending the Executive Councillor's decision on the recommended budget increase (see paragraph 2.4a). If agreed, the artist will then commence the planning application and public consultation element of the project.

### **Sheep's Green watercourse improvement project**

- 5.4 In October 2015, the Executive Councillor at the time agreed to allocate £40,000 of S106 'informal open contributions' in the strategic fund to improve the Sheep's Green watercourse. From further discussions with the Cam Valley Forum<sup>24</sup> and Environment Agency, however, it has become clear that a larger and better scheme is possible. The Environment Agency would be prepared to put £70,000 towards it, provided that their funding can be committed in 2016/17.
- 5.5 The larger project aims to enhance an existing watercourse on a local nature reserve to increase channel diversity and biodiversity, allow fish passage beyond the existing mill pond weirs and enhance the public open space for visitors. This meets the council's S106 selection criteria for the use of 'informal open space' S106 contributions.
- 5.6 In order to take advantage of this opportunity, council officers (in collaboration with Environment Agency colleagues) have developed a technical design for the larger project. Applications have been made for the necessary environmental permits and planning approvals, which seem to be on track. A public consultation on the revised proposals has been positive<sup>25</sup>. It has helped officers to make minor

---

23. Romsey Action Group, East Mill Road Action Group and Mill Road History Group.

24. The Cam Valley Forum proposed the original project in the 2015/16 bidding round.

25. The consultation (until early January 2017) invited views from local residents' associations, councillors for Market, Newnham and Trumpington, the Wildlife Trust, Cambridge Past, Present & Future and the Conservation Team. A consultation panel was also erected on site and posters were displayed in and around Newnham.

modifications to the scheme in order to ensure that the natural aesthetic of the watercourse and surrounding common is retained.

- 5.7 Estimates from contractors place the costs of the overall project between £115,000 and £130,000 – that is between £5,000 - £20,000 more than has been raised through existing Environment Agency and council S106 funding.
- 5.8 The Capital Programme Board has confirmed that the business case is sound and can go ahead, provided that: the necessary approvals are secured; this Committee is made aware of the project's extended scope; and the Executive Councillor approves the additional funding<sup>26</sup>. Paragraph 2.4b therefore recommends that up to a further £20,000 of 'informal open space' S106 contributions are allocated to this project.

## **6. UPDATE ON S106 FUNDING AVAILABILITY**

- 6.1 Decision-making on the use of off-site, generic S106 funding for play area and open space improvements in the 2016/17 funding round has been devolved to the city's four area committees. A list of the proposals to be considered by the area committees at their meetings in March and April 2017 can be found in Appendix C. As the Executive Councillor is responsible for the priority-setting arrangements for these S106 contribution types, this report still considers the availability of generic S106 funding for these categories.
- 6.2 Last October's S106 report set the 2016/17 priority-setting round in the context of dwindling funding levels and significant variations in availability between wards. It explained that, whilst S106 contributions have been devolved on an area basis, the need to provide a ward-level analysis becomes more important in this context.
- a. This does not mean that S106 contributions from a ward can only be used to fund projects in the same ward (as parts of other wards may come within the catchment area for an improved facility too).
  - b. Officers aim to fund local projects from relevant, devolved S106 contributions from nearby developments in the same ward before allocating contributions from nearby developments in neighbouring wards in the same Area.

---

26. Whilst it is likely that this larger project will be able to go ahead with Environment Agency funding committed in 2016/17, its delivery may be at risk if the project were to be delayed for any reason. If this were to happen, the Capital Programme Board would consider other funding options without the Environment Agency's input. If any significant issues do arise, these will be reported back to the Scrutiny Committee.

- 6.3 An analysis last November<sup>27</sup> highlighted, that whilst most wards had less than £15,000 of contributions for ‘play provision for children and teenagers’ and less than £30,000 of ‘informal open space’ contributions, Trumpington still had over £200,000 available in each contribution type. A number of other wards also had more than £75,000 available for particular contribution types, often related to previous, local major developments<sup>28</sup>.
- 6.4 Over the last six years, officers have conducted regular reviews of previous S106 spend/funding allocations and have strengthened S106 management systems considerably. The reviews have helped to:
- a. double-check that the use of particular S106 contribution types reflects the nature of the completed projects; and
  - b. make sure that S106 contributions are spent on time and on nearby projects which help to mitigate the impact of the development.
- 6.5 In the context of the increasing constraints on S106 funding availability, officers have embarked on a repeat of this exercise for these two contribution types. Whilst this exercise is on-going and it has not been possible to a completed analysis in this report, there are some emerging findings in paragraphs 6.6 – 6.8 below.
- 6.6 It has come to light that, for a few recreation ground improvements over six years or so ago, too much S106 spend was attributed to ‘play provision’<sup>29</sup>. Rectifying this is likely to boost funding levels in some parts of East and South areas where availability is currently low.
- 6.7 The availability of ‘informal open space contributions in Castle ward has previously been inadvertently over-stated and those in Market ward understated. It has been possible to rectify this and still leave sufficient ‘informal open space contributions’ in Castle ward for a project proposal supported by local councillors.
- 6.8 A reallocation of ‘informal open space contributions’ to nearby projects (particularly those from major developments which had been in ‘strategic funds’) is helping to address the issues in paragraph 6.6 and strengthen links between where contributions are from and where they are spent. Whilst this may lead to some reduction in the very high levels of contributions in some wards (see paragraph 6.2), those wards will still be left with substantial amounts available.

---

27. This funding analysis was posted on the council’s Developer Contributions web pages at the same and sent to all city councillors.

28. For example, ‘informal open space contributions’ in Castle and East Chesterton wards, and ‘play provision for children and teenagers’ contributions in Coleridge.

29. There should have been more use of ‘informal open space’ and ‘formal open space’/‘outdoor sports contributions instead.

6.9 An updated analysis will be posted on the council's Developer Contributions web page within the next month and sent to all councillors. Whilst it is unlikely to mean substantial increases in S106 funding levels in most wards, the aim is to maximise the benefits of S106 funding for all wards, wherever possible, and to maintain a fair and consistent approach.

## 7. IMPLICATIONS

7.1. **Financial Implications:** Appropriate S106 contributions are available for the projects proposals recommended for funding. Officers are mindful that in the region of £40,000 of public art S106 contributions from Castle ward need to be contractually committed by summer 2019. These contributions will be allocated to relevant projects which will be able to meet the time limit requirements - either those prioritised in this 2016/17 grant funding round or to on-going or completed public art projects.

7.2 **Staffing implications:** The arrangements for taking forward the prioritised projects and managing the relationships with the grant applicants will be overseen by the council's Public Art Officer and other members of the Streets and Open Spaces Development team.

7.3 **Consultation and communication:** The process for involving local residents and groups in the 2016/17 funding round has been set out in paragraph 3.5 and related footnotes. Paragraphs 5.2 and 5.6 have also outlined the community engagement in the "Railway workers commemorative public art" and the Sheep's Green watercourse improvement project. As part of its standard approach to the development of business case (where appropriate), the council does not tend to consult on the details of grant-funded projects. That said, community engagement is a key feature of the small-scale public art projects that are recommended for funding in Section 2.

7.4 **Equal Opportunities and anti-poverty implications:** A number of the recommended public art proposals include objectives for celebrating the diversity of Cambridge and its residents, particularly "Colours in our Community" and the "Showcase of Queer Arts". Paragraph 4.4 highlights that the public art grant agreement requires recipients to reflect the council's commitment to equality and diversity.

## 8. BACKGROUND PAPERS

8.1 These background papers on the S106 devolved decision-making process were used in the preparation of this report:

- Redacted versions of the 2016/17 public art applications (not including personal informal/contact details) – these are featured in the pack of applications that will be available from early March 2017 at <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106-priority-setting>)
- Public Art Strategy Supplementary Planning Document 2010
- “S106 priority-setting process (Streets and Open Spaces)” report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee, 6/10/2016
- 2016/17 S106 selection criteria, October 2016 (currently available at <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106-priority-setting>)
- S106 business case for Sheep’s Green Watercourse improvement project, January 2017
- “Overview of S106 funding” briefing note, November ‘16 (currently available at <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/our-approach-to-s106>)
- ‘S106 devolved decision-making: 2016/17 priority-setting’ report to North Area Committee, 2/3/2017
- ‘S106 devolved decision-making: 2016/17 priority-setting’ report to West/Central Area Committee, 9/3/2017.

8.2 Further information can be found at the council’s Developer Contributions web page ([www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106)). This includes sections on the council’s approach to S106 funding, S106-funded projects, the S106 priority-setting process and changes to S106 funding.

## 9. APPENDICES

- A. Summary of grant applications for small-scale public art projects
- B. S106-funded public art projects in Cambridge since 2010
- C. 2016/17 S106 proposals for play area & open space improvements

## 10. INSPECTION OF PAPERS

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

Author’s Name: Tim Wetherfield  
Author’s Phone Number: 01223 – 457313  
Author’s Email: [tim.wetherfield@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:tim.wetherfield@cambridge.gov.uk)

## Summary of 2016/17 public art grant applications

Appendix A

Grant proposal <sup>30,31</sup>	Summary of proposal	Summary of assessment <sup>32</sup>
<p><b>A. ABBEY MOSAICS AND MEMORIES</b></p> <p>From: <b>Abbey People</b>            Grant request: <b>£15,000</b>            Overall budget: <b>£27,000</b>            Already raised: <b>Some match-funds for stage 2</b>            Expected start: <b>June 2017</b>            Expected finish: <b>June 2019</b></p>	<p>A project in three stages: (1) installation of existing, large historic mosaic walls (saved from the demolition of the former Ditton Fields Nursery School) in green public spaces in Abbey ward; (2) the creation of new mosaics (involving local artists, residents and children) on the blank side of each wall; (3) mosaic walls act as a social gathering point in each green, serviced by coffee / snack vans.</p>	<p><b>Not eligible.</b> The existing public art to be installed in phase 1 is not site-specific or new - the community would not be engaged in its development. The other funds for the overall project are not in place. Plans to start in 2017 are unrealistic. This proposal will be reported to East Area Committee in April 2017 in case it could be considered for S106 informal open space funding instead.</p>
<p><b>B. ADVENTURES IN THE LEPER CHAPEL</b></p> <p>From: <b>Historyworks</b>            Grant request: <b>£15,000</b>            Overall budget: <b>£15,000</b>            Already raised: <b>£0</b>            Expected start: <b>Jan. 2017</b>            Expected finish: <b>Mar. 2017</b></p>	<p>This is the first of five applications from Historyworks in the 2016/17 round. Creating a series of art inventions in/ around the Leper Chapel. Bringing artists and local community together to engage with the history of the building. Making a link with people of the past who lived and worked here. Artworks/soundworks to be show-cased in February half-term 2017.</p>	<p><b>Not recommended.</b> Project timing does not fit in with the advertised timescales for the priority-setting round. Other proposals make a more compelling case for the use of S106 funding in terms of impact and legacy.</p>

Page 31

30. Since the original grant applications, council officers have raised some follow-up queries with a number of applicants and their answers have been incorporated into this summary. Updated applications have been received for applications G, N and Q.
31. The 'overall budget' field represents the applicants' estimates of the estimated total costs of their project proposals.
32. This summary aims to highlight the key points from the assessment only. To view the detailed '2016/17 public art applications pack', visit <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106-priority-setting>

Grant proposal <sup>30,31</sup>	Summary of proposal	Summary of assessment <sup>32</sup>
<p><b>C. ASCENSION BURIAL GROUND STONE CARVING</b>            From: <b>Friends of Ascension Burial Ground</b>            Grant request: <b>£2,000</b>            Overall budget: <b>£2,800</b>            Already raised: <b>£240</b>            Timescale: <b>When raised</b></p>	<p>Raising funds to purchase the carving by renowned local stone carver, Eric Marland, of a poem by the deceased poet, Frances Cornford (grand-daughter of Charles Darwin). The aim is to save the carving, already situated close to her grave, from being sold to a private buyer.</p>	<p><b>Not eligible.</b> Whilst it involves a great artist, this proposal is not a new work but is a retrospective application for funding. The community would not be engaged in the development of the public art. The funding could be raised in other ways.</p>
<p><b>D. BIG WEDNESDAY DRUMMING WORKSHOPS</b>            From: <b>Historyworks</b>            Grant request: <b>£10,000</b>            Overall budget: <b>£10,000</b>            Already raised: <b>£0</b>            Expected start: <b>July 17</b>            Expected finish: <b>Aug. 17</b></p>	<p>Workshops on how to make/play drums for children in East Area from mid-July ahead of 'Big Wednesday' event (9/8/2017) on Coldham's Common. Similar event last year.</p>	<p><b>Not eligible.</b> Not original as it was done last year. Not clear how this would help to mitigate the impact of development.</p>
<p><b>E. BIG WEEKEND POP-UP GALLERY &amp; ART SPACE</b>            From: <b>Changing Spaces</b>            Grant request: <b>£3,050</b>            Overall budget: <b>£4,900</b>            Already raised: <b>£2,000</b>            Expected start: <b>April 2017</b>            Expected finish: <b>July 2017</b></p>	<p>Running workshops for school students and the public for making art as well as displaying the art in the Arts Marquee at the Big Weekend in July 2017. Have been running the marquee at this event for last five years.</p>	<p><b>Not eligible.</b> The Arts Marquee has run in previous years - not original. Not clear how it would help to mitigate the impact of development and how it adds to existing art teaching or engages the wider community.</p>



Grant proposal <sup>30,31</sup>	Summary of proposal	Summary of assessment <sup>32</sup>
<p><b>F. COLOURS IN OUR COMMUNITY</b></p> <p>From: <b>Cambridge Live</b>  Grant request: <b>£15,000</b>  Overall budget: <b>£16,500</b>  Already raised <b>£0</b>  Expected start: <b>April 2017</b>  Expected finish: <b>Feb. 2018</b></p>	<p>Temporary light art collective creation by artist Zoe Chamberlain. Public involvement (i) via workshops with North Cambridge Academy, Chesterton Community College &amp; Asian Women's Network and (ii) at Arbury Carnival and Big Weekend (creating pattern stencils to form part of animated sequence. Collaboration with Anglia Ruskin University (ARU) in producing animated sequence. Presentation at the e-Luminate Cambridge Festival of Light.</p>	<p><b>Recommended for up to £16,500 grant, with conditions.</b> Pleased to see the involvement of a talented local artist and collaboration with ARU. The Public Art Officer would want to be involved in developing this project with Cambridge Live, not least because the plans for ensuring the project is recorded and has a lasting legacy need clarifying. The applicant hopes the project will become an annual tradition, but the funding for future years it is not clear.</p>
<p><b>G. EDDINGTON FLAG PARADE</b></p> <p>From: <b>University of Cambridge Primary School</b>  Grant request: <b>£15,000</b>  Overall budget: <b>£25,000</b>  Already raised: <b>£0</b>  Expected start: <b>Jan. 2018</b>  Expected finished: <b>July '18</b></p>	<p>This project in the new NW Cambridge neighbourhood of Eddington would involve Year 2–4 school children from the University of Cambridge Primary School and other nearby primary schools in the city (potentially, Mayfield and/or St Luke's). In outside school sessions, they would design and make silk batik flags (working with professionals from outdoor arts specialists, Kinetika) depicting the story of their family/household. The project will culminate in a flag parade finishing at the new community centre.</p>	<p><b>Recommended for up to £25,000 grant with conditions.</b> The Public Art Officer needs to work closely with the applicant to make sure the project meets the public art selection criteria. It will be important to: involve other local primary schools (promoting wider community engagement); confirm that Kinetika has the capacity to be involved in 2018; liaise with other projects that are part of the existing public art programme for the NW Cambridge development; and ensure a long-term legacy. More details are needed about how the project would be sustained/financed beyond the first year.</p>

Grant proposal <sup>30,31</sup>	Summary of proposal	Summary of assessment <sup>32</sup>
<p><b>H. HOPE CAN BE FOUND AT THE EDGE</b></p> <p>From: <b>The Edge Café (Mill Road social enterprise)</b>            Grant request: <b>£12,000</b>            Overall budget: <b>£15,000</b>            Already raised: <b>£1,000</b>            Expected start: <b>June 2017</b>            Expected finished: <b>Aug. '17</b></p>	<p>3-stage project: (1) public art exhibition by local artists to foster dialogue between the public and those recovering from substance misuse; (2) art workshops for the recovery community to share their experiences creatively; and (3) a self-published book as a lasting record of the exhibition and their artwork.</p>	<p><b>Not eligible.</b> Not clear how this proposal mitigates the impact development. The proposal seems to be premature before the arrival of the new managers mentioned in the application. This proposal would benefit from being developed further with Arts/Health partnership bodies.</p>
<p><b>I1. RAINBOW BENCHES</b></p> <p>From: <b>SexYOUality</b>            Grant request: <b>£5,750</b>            Overall budget: <b>£5,750</b>            Already raised: <b>£0</b>            Expected start: <b>April 2017</b>            Expected finished: <b>June '17</b></p>	<p>Raising awareness of LGBT issues through art. Young LGBT people would paint 'rainbow benches', which would then be installed in parks, on streets and in the public realm.</p>	<p><b>Not eligible.</b> Nice idea, but this does not involve an artist in the development of high quality public art.</p>
<p><b>I2. COMMUNITY MANDALA</b></p> <p>From: <b>SexYOUality</b>            Grant request: <b>£6,750</b>            Overall budget: <b>£7,250</b>            Already raised: <b>£500</b>            To be produced: <b>Sept. 2017</b></p>	<p>Raising awareness of LGBT issues through art. A community mandala, on land opposite Dale's Brewery (Gwydir Street), would be designed by an artist (following consultation with members of the LGBT community). Members of the public would create individual segments. Could be refreshed every year (as it will fade over the year).</p>	<p><b>Not recommended.</b> There are a number of drainage access points on the proposed site, which might affect the mandala design and its longevity. It is not clear how an annual refresh of the mandala would be resourced. Streets &amp; Open Spaces already have plans to enhance the site as a small community garden area.</p>

Grant proposal <sup>30,31</sup>	Summary of proposal	Summary of assessment <sup>32</sup>
<p><b>J. HISTORY WALKING TRAILS 2</b>            From: <b>Historyworks</b>            Grant request: <b>£15,000</b>            Overall budget: <b>£15,000</b>            Already raised: <b>£0</b>            Expected start: <b>Apr/May '17</b>            Expected finished: <b>July '18</b></p>	<p>Having already produced 8 customised trails, the proposal is to work with 8 more primary schools<sup>33</sup> to develop walking routes which connect with places/people of Cambridge past and present. The children would write their own poems and songs. The introduction to each trail will be narrated by poet Michael Rosen.</p>	<p><b>Recommended for £15,000 grant with conditions.</b> Whilst the concept is not new, the trails to be developed with the children at these schools would be. It is important, however, that Historyworks is able to provide a financial breakdown of their use of previous public art grants.</p>
<p><b>K. MICHAEL ROSEN 'MY CAMBRIDGE' POEMS</b>            From: <b>Historyworks</b>            Grant request: <b>£15,000</b>            Overall budget: <b>£15,000</b>            Expected start: <b>Sept. 2017</b>            Expected finished: <b>July '18</b></p>	<p>Commissioning Michael Rosen to write a set of poems about Cambridge places and people (steered by the history trail content) so that there can be enough for a 'My Cambridge' collection celebrating his connection to the city and the poetry he has composed for Cambridge.</p>	<p><b>Not eligible.</b> Does not comply with the definition of public art. It is not clear how local communities would be engaged in the development of this further poetry collection. Other proposals make a more compelling case for the use of S106 funding.</p>
<p><b>L. MITCHAM'S MOVING LIGHTING PROJECT</b>            From: <b>Oblique Arts</b>            Grant request: <b>£9,992</b>            Overall budget: <b>£11,200</b>            Already raised: <b>£0</b>            Expected start: <b>May 2017</b>            Expected finished: <b>Mar. '18</b></p>	<p>A public lighting installation at key sites<sup>34</sup> across the CB4 area. Images will be edited from a selection of art workshops to be delivered throughout the year, with local community groups and local traders. The images (which will not be dazzling or moving) will be projected away from any main roads and set back off the highway.</p>	<p><b>Recommended for a grant of up to £11,200 with conditions.</b> The applicant has heeded concerns to make sure that this would not pose a risk to road users/pedestrians. Initial advice from planning officers is that this art work would be regarded as temporary, although the applicant will need to get this confirmed.</p>

33. Suggested schools: Trumpington Federation, Queen Edith's, Shirley, Chesterton, Mayfield, Newnham, Arbury and King's Hedges.

34. Rowan Centre, Cambridge Victoria Homes, Cambridge Manor Care Homes, Museum of Cambridge, St George's Church, Wintercomfort.

Grant proposal <sup>30,31</sup>	Summary of proposal	Summary of assessment <sup>32</sup>
<p><b>M. RADIO LOCAL</b>            From: <b>The Junction</b>            Grant request: <b>£15,000</b>            Overall budget: <b>£32,000</b>            Already raised: <b>£17,000</b>            Expected start: <b>April 2017</b>            Expected finished: <b>May '17</b></p>	<p>A very local, live public art show for people within half a mile of The Junction on 27 May 2017. Led by resident artists, Hunt &amp; Darton, it is an opportunity for the local community to be part of a live art piece which shares their stories, their feelings about the area and helps create and explore our collective sense of place.</p>	<p><b>Recommended for £15,000 grant, subject to grant agreement.</b> Good application. Arts Council funding has also been secured. The applicant has clarified the steps taken to publicise the event locally/encourage community engagement and ensure that the project is recorded and has a legacy.</p>
<p><b>N. RHYTHM, RHYME &amp; RAILWAYS</b>            From: <b>Historyworks</b>            Grant request: <b>£15,000</b>            Overall budget: <b>£15,000</b>            Already raised: <b>£0</b>            Expected start: <b>May 2017</b>            Expected finished: <b>Dec. '17</b></p>	<p>A flashmob &amp; song performance, based on a poetry/lyric project on the history of the railway coming to Cambridge. Would involve pupils from Ridgefield &amp; St Philip's Primary Schools and Coleridge/ Parkside Federation. As well as summer performances within schools, the aim is for a large community performance at the Mill Road Winter Fair on 2/12/2017.</p>	<p><b>Recommended for £15,000 grant with conditions.</b> Good. Pleased with links made with the 'Railway workers public art project on Mill Road/Cavendish Road. However, Historyworks must provide a financial breakdown of their use of previous public art grants and commit to doing the same for this project before this grant award can be confirmed</p>
<p><b>O. RIVER CYCLE AT ROWAN</b>            From: <b>Rowan Centre</b>            Grant request: <b>£5,000</b>            Overall budget: <b>£9,000</b>            Already raised: <b>£4,000</b>            Production: <b>April-July 2017</b></p>	<p>A permanent sculpture in the front garden of the Rowan Centre (Humberstone Rd), with a practical application as cycle racks for the community facility. It would be created by learning disabled artists at the Centre and be alongside other public art in the front garden for which a £2,000 public art grant was awarded last year<sup>35</sup>.</p>	<p><b>Not recommended.</b> Nice idea, but not clear how the community would be fully engaged in developing the bike racks in a way that would help mitigate the impact of development. Would be open to other proposals from Rowan once the previous £2,000 grant-funded public art project has been completed.</p>

35. Rowan has also received a £70k+ S106 community facility grant for new community meeting space (completed in 2016).

Grant proposal <sup>30,31</sup>	Summary of proposal	Summary of assessment <sup>32</sup>
<p><b>P. PERFORMANCE ART RELATED TO ANTONY GORMLEY SCULPTURE</b></p> <p>From: <b>Kettle's Yard</b>  Grant request: <b>£15,000</b>  Overall budget: <b>£40,000</b>  Already raised: <b>£13,000</b>  Kettle's Yard has plans to raise the further funding needed.  Expected start: <b>Oct. '17</b>  Expected finished: <b>Nov. '18</b></p>	<p>Performance pieces based on the local community's response to an Antony Gormley sculpture (about the body and its relationship to space) coming to Northampton Street green as a temporary installation. The proposal aims to engage internally renowned dance artist Casson &amp; Friends. One performance piece would involve people of all ages from Castle and neighbouring wards who would help to shape the choreography (and perform). The second (by professional dancers) would reflect local ideas generated by creative workshops. Performances would take place during a special celebrating weekend of the Gormley exhibition and at the annual Castle Hill open day (2018)</p>	<p><b>Recommended for a £15,000 grant subject to grant agreement.</b> Whilst the temporary installation of a Gormley sculpture would not qualify for S106 funding itself, the performance art would be suitable. The applicant has clarified how local communities (including those from the North Area of the city) would be engaged. The proposal is strongly based on the assumption that Casson and Friends will be involved in this project, but this has yet to be confirmed. If not possible, officers would want to be satisfied that alternative arrangements suggested by the applicant would maintain the artistic quality of the proposal.</p>
<p><b>Q. SHOWCASE OF QUEER ARTS</b></p> <p>From: The Kite Trust  Grant request: <b>£14,500</b>  Overall budget: <b>£15,000</b>  Already raised: <b>£500</b>  Expected start: <b>May 2017</b>  Expected finished: <b>Feb. '18</b></p>	<p>Workshop programme &amp; showcase event that provides a platform for (and raises awareness of) gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender art. This may include drama, cabaret, comedy, film, fine art, performance art, spoken word, dance and debate. As well as celebrating the LGBT community, it will raise awareness amongst other communities in the city</p>	<p><b>Recommended for £15,000 - £30,000 grant, subject to conditions.</b> The Public Art Officer needs to be closely involved in developing the proposal with the applicant to ensure that it fulfils the public art selection criteria. It would reflect the council's commitment to equality &amp; diversity. Options for increasing the scale of the project will be considered.</p>

Grant proposal <sup>30,31</sup>	Summary of proposal	Summary of assessment <sup>32</sup>
<p><b>R. SIMON SAYS</b>            From: <b>Cambridge Sustainability Residency</b>            Grant request: <b>£15,000</b>            Overall budget: <b>£15,000</b>            Already raised: <b>£0</b>  <b>Application withdrawn</b></p>	<p>Engraved plaques (designed to look like decorative manhole covers, which provide links to digital/online material, which provides an expanded geographic narrative that tells the story of the water flowing below/sometimes along the city's streets.</p>	<p><b>Withdrawn by applicant.</b> Could not be recommended in 2016/17 without more details about the nature of the public art and the extent of community engagement. If actual manhole covers were proposed, the county council would need to be involved. The applicant is looking to develop the proposal further.</p>
<p><b>S. TALES FROM TRUMPINGTON</b>            From: <b>New International Exchange Theatre Company</b>            Grant request: <b>£18,500</b>            Overall budget: <b>£18,500</b>            Already raised: <b>£0</b>            Expected start: <b>Sept. 2017</b>            Expected finished: <b>Jul. '18</b></p>	<p>Family story workshops as part of the official launch event of the Clay Farm Centre. This would take the form of story workshops, live theatre performances and celebratory tea parties. Workshops at two local schools would involve the local history group. Stories would be transformed through story-telling techniques and live music into a new play, which would draw on the experiences of living and moving to Trumpington. A £5 ticket price for two performances is envisaged.</p>	<p><b>Not recommended.</b> Both this application and the next one are from theatre companies and propose performances at the Clay Farm Centre, relating to Trumpington and the development of new neighbourhoods on the Southern Fringe. Given that there is an existing public art programme for the Southern Fringe, it makes sense to choose only one of them.</p> <p>Whilst 'Tales from Trumpington' is a nice idea, it seems to have more to do with community development and the personal development of the children taking part in the project - with the public art itself as a secondary concern. It would be difficult to justify the use of S106 public art funding for this purpose.</p>

Grant proposal <sup>30,31</sup>	Summary of proposal	Summary of assessment <sup>32</sup>
<p><b>T. Trumpington Voices</b>            From: <b>Menagerie Theatre Company</b>            Grant request: <b>£19,000</b>            Overall budget: <b>£19,000</b>            Already raised: <b>£0</b>            Expected start: <b>Nov. '17</b>            Expected finished: <b>June '18</b></p>	<p>An original piece of staged text and spoken word, which records and shapes the voices of the community in a process of radical change. Interviewing at least 100 people who live (or about to live) in Trumpington and the new neighbourhoods, the project aims to reflect their hopes, fears and dreams. A playwright will compose these voices into a text to be performed by both community members and professional actors. The legacy will take the form of a film, photography and textual documentation about the development and performance of the project.</p>	<p><b>Recommended for a grant of up to £19,000 with conditions.</b> This proposal is stronger than [S] and provides a clearer basis for the use of S106 public art funding. The Public Art Officers needs to be involved with the applicant in developing the project to make sure that it meets the S106 public art selection criteria and that it would help to mitigate the impact of development constructively. The applicant has clarified that the opening of the Clay Farm Centre is likely to be the springboard for the project, with public performances planned for mid-May-June 2018.</p>
<p><b>U. Trees of Change</b>            From: <b>Cambridge Art Salon</b>            Grant request: <b>£7000</b>            Overall budget: <b>£6,700</b>            Already raised: <b>£400</b>            Expected start: <b>April 2017</b>            Expected finished: <b>Feb. '18</b></p>	<p>The installations would fuse light, text, coppice indigenous trees and leaves made from recycled materials. It would be based on a programme of community-led discussions , plus workshops in schools and care homes in East Chesterton, West Chesterton, Abbey, Coleridge and Romsey.</p>	<p><b>Not eligible.</b> There are concerns about the extent of community engagement in the project, the limited public display and the lasting legacy of this project. Given the importance of living trees, a project based around coppiced and painted trees may strike the wrong note. The estimate budget and grant request figures are a little confused.</p>

## S106-funded public art projects in Cambridge since 2010

## Appendix B

Ref.	Public Art project	Ward	£S106	Status
432	Mill Road Cemetery memorial artwork	Petersfield	£69.9k	Complete
433	Snowy Farr public art	Market	£72.4k	Complete
454	Logan's Meadow Swift Tower public art	East Chesterton	£24.9k <sup>36</sup>	Complete
519	Wulfstan Way public art	Queen Edith's	£45.0k	Complete
520	Olympic public art commission (alongside other funds)	City-wide	£87.3k	Complete
548	Southern Connections public art	Queen Edith's/ Trumpington	£107.0k	On-going
PR030j	Mill Road/Cavendish Road railway works public art (see recommendation 2.4a to increase overall budget to £60k)	Romsey	£30.0k	Being developed
PR031j	Grant to Mitcham's Models public art	West Chesterton	£2.0k	Complete
PR033c	Histon Road Rec entrances public art (actual public art spend may be slightly more than original allocation)	Castle	£50.0k	Complete
PR034d	Cambridge Rules public art (focussed on project spend within city, alongside other funding)	Market	£115k	On-going
PR040a	Grant: Big Draw event – October 2015	East Chesterton	£1.0k	Complete
PR040b	Grant: Rock Road library community garden public art	Queen Edith's	£5.1k	Complete
PR040c	Grant: Clicking to Connectivity (My Cambridge) involving Abbey Meadows Junior School with Historyworks)	Abbey	£15.0k	Complete

36. Also received £15,000 of 'informal open space' S106 funding for habitat creation.



<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Public Art project</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>£S106</b>	<b>Status</b>
PR040d	Grant: Twilight at the Museums	Market	£14.0k	Complete
PR040e	Grant: Cambridge Sculpture Trails	Market	£2.6k	Complete
PR040f	Grant: Syd Barrett memorial at Corn Exchange	Market	£10.0k	Complete
PR040g	Grant: Mural at Chesterton Co-op	East Chesterton	£3.4k	On-going
PR040h	Grant: Growing Spaces public art	East Chesterton	£2.0k	On-going
PR040i	Grant: History Trails (Historyworks)	Multiple	£15.0k	Complete
PR040j	Grant: Sounds of Steam (Historyworks)	Multiple	£15.0k	Complete
PR040k	Grant: Mitcham's Models at Christmas	West Chesterton	£6.0k	Complete
PR040l	Grant: Newnham Croft Primary School stained glass window	Newnham	£15.0k	On-going
PR040m	Grant: North Cambridge Academy public art (with Kettle's Yard)	King's Hedges	£15.0k	Complete
PR040n	Small-scale grant: Rowan Humberstone public art	West Chesterton	£2.0k	On-going
PR040o	Small-scale grant: St Matthew's School for 'The Place Where We Stand'	Petersfield	£15.0	On-going
PR040p	Small-scale grant: Trumpington Stitchers wall-hanging	Trumpington	£7.5k	On-going
PR040q	River Cam public art programme (see footnote 9)	Multiple	£400.0k allocated	Scoping

## **2016/17 S106 proposals for play area and open space improvements**

The reporting of these proposals to area committees in March/April 2017 have included / will include an assessment against the council's 2016/17 S106 selection criteria, setting out which ones would be eligible for funding.

### **North Area Committee – considered on 2 March 2017**

(Report now available)

- Alexandra Gardens play/open space improvements
- Alex Wood Road benches and bins (public realm improvements)
- Bramblefields local nature reserve – open space improvements
- Chesterton Rec Ground skate/scooter park
- Halingway towpath widening
- Nun's Way Rec Ground - additional play equipment

### **West/Central Area Committee – being considered on 9 March 2017**

(Report now available)

- Histon Road Recreation Ground – further improvements
- Histon Road Rec Ground – footway construction, landscaping and play safety surface refurbishment
- Jesus Green ditch - biodiversity improvements
- St Clement's Churchyard – creating a sustainable open space

### **East Area Committee – to be considered on 6 April 2017**

- Abbey green public spaces - installation of large historic mosaic walls
- Ashbury Close play area improvements
- Brother's Place open space landscaping improvements
- Coldhams Lane play area improvements
- Coleridge play provision for older children and teenagers
- Coleridge Rec Ground landscaping and path improvements
- Donkey Common skate park improvements
- Gwydir Street open space by Dales Brewery- improvements
- Lichfield Road landscaping
- Romsey Rec Ground basketball hoop

## **South Area Committee – to be considered on 24 April 2017**

- Accordia development open space improvements
- Coe Fen – improvements to paths leading to the open space
- Empty Common Community garden meeting hut
- Fulborn Road landscaping and green space improvements
- Gunhild Close play area improvements
- Nightingale Avenue Rec Ground - structures for community garden
- Tenby Close play area improvements
- Trumpington community facilities – improvements to outdoor areas
- Trumpington (King George V) Recreation Ground trim trail
- Trumpington Rec Ground and other reaction grounds in South Area - noticeboards and signs
- Trumpington Rec Ground play area improvements
- Trumpington Rec Ground (children's) scooter park

This page is intentionally left blank