

**ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** 3 October 2019  
5.00 - 6.40 pm

**Present:** Councillors Smart (Chair), Barnett (Vice-Chair), Collis, Hadley, Martinelli, Matthews, Sheil and Summerbell

Executive Councillors: Moore (Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre) and Smith (Executive Councillor for Communities)

**Also Present:** Councillor Bick

**Officers:**

Chief Executive: Antoinette Jackson

Strategic Director: Suzanne Hemingway

Head of Community Services: Debbie Kaye

Head of Corporate Strategy: Andrew Limb

Environmental Quality & Growth Manager: Jo Dicks

Sport & Recreation Manager: Ian Ross

Strategy and Partnerships Manager: David Kidston

Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager: Alistair Wilson

Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield

Committee Manager: James Goddard

<b>FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL</b>
---

**19/39/EnC Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Davies and Payne. Councillors Matthews and Sheil were present as Alternates.

**19/40/EnC Declarations of Interest**

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Collis	General	Personal: Chair of Abbey People.

**19/41/EnC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 June 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **19/42/EnC Public Questions**

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

1. What practical steps would the city council take in terms of absorbing best business practice into the arts development of the city to ensure that all Cambridge venues, artists and residents thrive in terms of arts access?

The Head of Community Services said the Council's arts development and Cambridge Live services were discretionary services. As part of this, the Council managed a facility, some events and services. It also provided advice, grants and guidance to the sector. It was the responsibility of organisations to manage their own businesses, it was not the role of the Council to provide business guidance.

2. Given that the report (Cambridge Live – Independent Review: Findings & Recommendations) states that "Cambridge Live would have been stronger and more effective if it had worked with the existing providers and community groups and if it had used and learnt from the expertise of the rest of the arts sector. It had a chance to be an organisation rooted in the arts and wider community but it failed to do so. The result was that it lacked the skills to survive and adapt and the ability to call on others for help and guidance", has the council made a decision on its development plans for the old bingo hall / old dot jazz club? If not, how would it rate the cultural & commercial value of a combined arts incubator / subsidised arts office space / arts school / arts studio-rehearsal space in the centre of Cambridge to the life of the city - pulling together a great number of the arts community, truly Cambridge Live - and would it commit to exploring the viability of this with a cross arts / business entrepreneurial team drawn from the city?

The Head of Community Services said the Council was taking a strategic, evidence based approach to cultural infrastructure needs. There was a live consultation taking place, commissioned in partnership with South Cambridgeshire DC, to gather information on creative workspace needs across Greater Cambridge. This would complement work already carried out on the provision of dedicated professional cultural space across the same footprint. This process of building a robust evidence base was a key part of developing a cultural infrastructure strategy, which would inform

future planning in Cambridge. It was important to look at questions of cultural infrastructure over the region, rather than in a piecemeal way

3. Given the financial losses incurred by the unfortunate failure of Cambridge Live, has the council ever considered the financial opportunity of repurposing the much loved but acoustically tricky Cambridge Corn Exchange as prime location business offices, and using the income derived from such a sale to create a world class concert / arts venue (see Sage Gateshead (<https://sagegateshead.com/>) as an example), able to service the full range of arts & audiences (including deprived areas of the city), while acting as a landmark venue in the East of England? If not, will it commit to exploring whether this idea is financially viable to recoup costs incurred by Cambridge Live's demise, while also increasing the cultural offering / spend in to the city by residents and further afield? And if not, why not?

The Head of Community Services said the Council would be looking at cultural infrastructure requirements (in light of answer 2 above) as well as other improvements as part of the Council's commitment to retaining the Corn Exchange. The Council would also work with the Local Enterprise Partnership/Combined Authority as they undertake work requested by Government to develop a local Industrial Strategy which would cover arts and culture requirements.

#### Supplementary Question

Public speaker: It was a hard hitting report and I was disappointed that we didn't make as a city the most of what could have been a real success. We had a previous City/South Cambs District Council strategy for the arts under Cambridgeshire Horizons that ended in 2016, and many of the things it called for like a large concert hall were not delivered, why are the things we needed for a growing population not delivered? What cultural facilities do we need for growing population and how does that link into public transport (Stagecoach are not talking to leisure providers on bus routes)

The Head of Community Services said the Cambridgeshire Horizons documents were now out of date but the recommendations were still pertinent. This would be followed up in the Council's study. For example liaising with Stagecoach on transport infrastructure for art providers.

The Executive Councillor for Communities said the Industrial Strategy needed to represent the needs of Cambridge and she would ensure it did.

4. What support can you offer independent arts producers in future? Especially under the growing financial strain of the current government?

The Head of Community Services said as part of the arts development activity Cambridge City Council ran Cambridge Arts Network (an on-line networking and information resource) and an annual conference. Arts Development Officers also provided advice and guidance on request, they were keen to signpost people with questions to the experts in that team.

5. Raised the following points:

- i. What scope is there to fund murals, busts and statues as part of commemorating Vote100 & beyond and the women who made Modern Cambridge?
- ii. Next year – Cambridge will hopefully celebrate the centenary of the appointment of our first women magistrates in 1920.
- iii. We have high quality source materials to work from. (Showed pictures of two artworks – large murals would cost about £8,000 – and a photo of Eva Hartree, first woman mayor.)

The Urban Growth Project Manager responded:

- i. The availability of S106 funding held by the City Council for all types of future off-site public art was running down and was unevenly spread across the City, as set out in the Public Art Commissioning report featured in the Committee's agenda papers for this evening's meeting. However, as set out in previous public art reports, the scope for funding public art in Cambridge (like the suggestions mentioned in the question) need not be limited to those commissioned by the Council. Developers could provide public art as part of their new developments. Other sources of funding can also be explored (for example, from businesses and other institutions in Cambridge or from benefactors with connections to the city).
- ii. The City Council had already allocated (in June, 2018) £30,000 of public art S106 grant-funding for a proposal from Unison to mark the 100th anniversary of Representation of the People's Act; and to celebrate the courage and resilience of the women of Cambridge. The vision for this project was to engage Cambridge residents and tell the story of women's lives and how women have contributed to the way Cambridge has developed since 1918, both politically and socially. The artist appointed by Unison would create opportunities for local residents to get involved in the development of the artwork. This reflects the rallying call from

Suffragette(\* - **see below**) and former Cambridge councillor, Clara Rackham, in her speech to the National Council of Women in Cambridge in 1962 - that we must remain “eternally vigilant!”. The project is called “Women at Work” and is due to be completed in March, 2020.

- iii. Recognising that remaining off-site public art funds are limited, the Council is in the process of developing a Public Art Strategy. This would help to make sure that suggestions for the use of off-site S106 funds for particular public art projects are considered in the context of other public art proposals, which are also seeking funding from the same finite resources.

Supplementary Points

- i. Correction by public speaker: Clara Rackham was a Suffragist not a Suffragette.
- ii. There was a huge opportunity for the city and university to get together and pool ideas and resources to really leave a lasting legacy. We lost two titans this year – Michael Marshall and Nigel Gawthrop – is there scope to work with family estates to establish an institute for local history?

The Executive Councillor for Communities responded:

- i. She was happy to talk about an exhibition (here or in another public building) to display the fantastic photos and the information from the talks you’ (the public speaker) have done.
- ii. As we develop public art policy – we can set a steer and give ideas and guidance to companies who are developing public art. There are future projects coming up where we still have some control – I look forward to celebrating Clara Rackham, and others with connections to the ward in Romsey. We need to keep talking about this and keep it on the agenda.

6. Raised the following points:

- i. We applaud the Council's policy to develop charging infrastructure for electric vehicles.
- ii. We also applaud the strategy to further develop Car Clubs (objective 3.6 within the Climate Change Strategy).
- iii. Q: Please, will you consider the combination of these two progressive measures as a means to accelerate the zero carbon agenda, towards 2030? Dedicated Car Club parking bays are the perfect opportunity within strand 11 of the EV Infrastructure Strategy to deliver a vision of shared electric mobility, as already demonstrated in Oxford.

The Environmental Quality & Growth Manager responded:

- i. The City Council through its 'Air Quality Action Plan' and this 'Electric Vehicle and Infrastructure Strategy' supported the need for reduction in individual car use through car clubs.
- ii. On the specific ask to deliver dedicated EV Car Club bays as part of section 11: On Street Charge Point Provision, this was something that would need to be taken forward in partnership with highways colleagues at the County Council. This is because any alteration to public highway allocation, markings, signage and other street furniture such as a charging post must be approved by the relevant transport authority (in this case Cambridgeshire County Council).
- iii. Acknowledged the merits of the suggested approach and will seek opportunities to facilitate charge point provision for car club spaces through the processes and networks set out in this strategy.

#### Supplementary Points

Public Speaker:

- i. One parking space had already been identified on the Accordia Estate where a street light could be used as an electric vehicle charging point.
- ii. It was left to the City and County Council to liaise on how to provide the facility as the light provider was happy to.

The Environmental Quality & Growth Manager responded the officer's report was a statement of intent that the City Council wanted to work with partners.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre undertook to liaise with the County Council about the parking bay charging point.

### **19/43/EnC Electric Vehicle and Electric Vehicle Charging Strategy**

#### **Matter for Decision**

Moving to a future where electric vehicles are the norm, presents many challenges both technical and social and as a lower tier authority Cambridge City Council only has control over some aspects of the transition.

Key areas where we can act and those where we are taking action are identified in the Electric Vehicle and Infrastructure Strategy document and

include Taxi Licencing; Fleet; Planning; and the management and operation of our car parks and housing developments.

The document sets out the approach of Cambridge City Council in identifying those areas where we can take a lead and where funding opportunities exist. Where opportunities for grant-funding exist, and the City Council is the appropriate lead, we will pursue that funding.

Where there is an obvious need to provide infrastructure on a commercial basis e.g. within our car parking asset, the aim is to engage the market and find a financially manageable solution.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre**

- i. Acknowledged both the opportunities, and limitations of Cambridge City Council's role in supporting the transition to Electric Vehicles as set out in the appended Electric Vehicle and Infrastructure Strategy.
- ii. Endorsed the recommended strategic approach notably:
  - a. The key areas for action within Cambridge City Council (Car parks, Taxi licencing, planning policy, commercial property and Housing.)
  - b. Identification of Government, public and commercial sources of funding; and
  - c. Working in partnership with other relevant authorities (County Council, Other Districts, Greater Cambridge Partnership, the Combined Authority to identify and deliver electric vehicle support in areas where it is appropriate for others to take the lead.

### **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 Environmental Quality & Growth Manager.

The Environmental Quality & Growth Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The purpose of the strategy was to set out how many officers/organisations were involved in projects and who could do what.
- ii. The strategy set out performance indicators the council had signed up to. The aim was to match projects against funding available. The document was not 'fixed', metrics could be developed/amended in future as the Electric Vehicle and Infrastructure project developed.
- iii. A fleet review was being undertaken. The aim was to replace a significant number of vehicles with electric ones. A framework was being put together for a cost/benefit analysis.

The Executive Councillor said vehicles would be replaced by electric ones where practicable at the end of their working life.

- iv. The council was trying to facilitate car club spaces with charging points for electric vehicles with partners. There were a number of schemes where this was being championed.
- v. The City Council were looking to liaise with other councils to learn from their experience. The Environmental Quality & Growth Manager had already liaised with Dundee and Oxford.
- vi. Owner/occupiers could install charging points on their driveways etc. These were harder to install on-street as the Highways Authority managed the highway. Drivers could access rapid charge points at petrol stations.
- vii. Referred to details in the Officer's report concerning the electrification of the Stagecoach bus fleet. This was not the responsibility of the City Council, but the Greater Cambridge Partnership had some influence. There was a statement of intent in the report that diesel buses would be replaced with electric ones.

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.

### **19/44/EnC Clean Air Zone City Council Policy Position Statement**

#### **Public Question**

Councillor Bick addressed the committee as a Ward Councillor and Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership representative.



- i. Welcomed the Officer's report. Hoped this would encourage Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership to develop a long term strategy to address issues.
- ii. Agreed it is a priority to apply the clean air zone to Class A vehicles as they were needed to service the city so had to be 'clean'.
- iii. Other cities had imposed clean air zones.
- iv. Queried if the clean air zone would apply to delivery vehicles in future.
- v. Agreed the clean air zone should not be applied to private motor vehicles yet. Public realm improvements, road safety and congestion needed to be reviewed in future. A way to reduce the number of vehicles on the road would be welcome (instead of changing 'polluting' vehicles to 'clean' without reducing the overall number).

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The City Council was responsible for clean air, but Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership had the power to actually take action on this and mitigating congestion.
- ii. The City Council was working with Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership to influence them.

### **Matter for Decision**

The report set out below aims to acknowledge the work done to date and to reiterate the City Councils on-going support for a significant transport intervention to cut road traffic emissions and improve air quality.

In acknowledging the findings of the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership funded Clean Air Zone Feasibility Study, delivered by the City Council in February 2019, the Council seeks to reinforce the key findings and recommendations.

Officers would like note the importance of the on-going independent Citizens' Assembly organised to help inform any transport interventions to be taken forward by the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership.

The combination of a significant technical evidence base supporting an intervention to curb road traffic emissions and a robust independent, representative view of potential interventions from the Citizens' Assembly should lead to a comprehensive proposal for a package of measures to be considered by the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership board in December 2019.

The City Council will work with the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership to support such a package of measures to include actions to significantly improve air quality in the City for the medium and long term.

The City council also notes the recent public commitment by all the UK major bus operators to *'Only purchase next generation ultra-low or zero emissions buses from 2025 (but starting this process by 2023 in some urban areas).'*

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre**

Agreed to:

- i. Support the contents of the Cambridge Clean Air Zone (CAZ) feasibility study and its key finding that:

***'Without intervention and with the expected doubling of the bus fleet, there is a risk that the air quality in Cambridge will not improve over the next decade.'***

- ii. Support the key recommendations of the CAZ feasibility study, namely,
  - a. Without intervention and with the expected doubling of the bus fleet, there is a risk that the air quality in Cambridge will not improve over the next decade. Air pollution accounts for 106 deaths each year in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.
  - b. The most effective interventions are those focussed on improving the whole bus fleet to cleaner vehicles through a charging Clean Air Zone 'Class A' (all buses and coaches to be Euro 6, diesel taxis to be Euro 6 and petrol taxis to be Euro 4). This would deliver compliance with the limit value for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) across most of the city in 2021.
  - c. The most effective intervention to improve air quality and protect public health **in the long term** is a charging 'Class D' Clean Air Zone which includes all vehicles. Improvement in the bus fleet should be a priority due to their large contribution to emissions. It is recommended that focus is given to improvement in the vehicle fleet within the city centre area by 2021. It is expected that the implementation of a Clean Air Zone would take approximately 18 months.
  - d. By 2031, reductions in concentrations across the whole of Cambridge will bring further public health benefits. Introducing a more ambitious charging CAZ (including light goods vehicles, buses and coaches to be 'Zero Emission Vehicles (ZEV) or ' Ultra Low Emission Vehicles

(ULEV)) is predicted to reduce NO<sub>2</sub> levels to below 80% of the air quality objectives across Cambridge; it is recommended that this option is pursued.

**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 Environmental Quality & Growth Manager.

In response to the report Councillors commented that parents left their vehicle engines idling outside schools whilst waiting for children. Queried actions being taken to address this.

The Environmental Quality & Growth Manager said:

- i. The issue was being reviewed.
- ii. The County Council and schools were trialing a no-idling zone outside two schools in 2020. The impact would be monitored. Various schools had volunteered for the trial.
- iii. Street management was the responsibility of the transport authority (Highways Authority).

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.

**19/45/EnC Annual Climate Change Strategy, Carbon Management Plan And Climate Change Fund Update Report****Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report provided an update on progress during 2018/19 on actions to deliver the five objectives of the City Council's Climate Change Strategy 2016-21. As part of this, the report includes an update on progress in implementing the Council's Carbon Management Plan which details the

actions the Council will take to reduce carbon emissions from its estate and operations.

The report also provided an update on:

- i. The current position of the Climate Change Fund, which provides support to projects that help to reduce the Council's own carbon emissions and/or manage climate change risks to Council staff and property.
- ii. The council's Greenhouse Gas Emissions for 2018/19.
- iii. A proposed response to Shepreth Wildlife Park's Plastics Pledge

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre**

- i. Noted the progress achieved during 2018/19 in implementing the actions in the Climate Change Strategy and Carbon Management Plan.
- ii. Approved the proposed response to Shepreth Wildlife Park's Plastic Pledge (as set out at Appendix E of the Officer's report).

### **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 Strategy and Partnerships Manager.

The Strategy and Partnerships Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Ward clean up days were run by the Shared Waste Service and Housing Service. There were a number of clean up days run across the city over the year. Undertook to liaise with these services to ascertain if more clean up days could be offered.
- ii. Will follow up if participating in the 50 Fountains Challenge is practicable.
- iii. The Council delivered or funded a number of activities in 2018/19 to encourage and support Council staff, residents and businesses to reduce single-use plastics such as promoting the 100 plus drinking water taps in Cambridge which can be found on the Refill app, including free drinking taps and fountains such as the new one installed by the Council on Parkers Piece.

- iv. The council has a target to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from its estate and vehicle fleet by 15% by 2021, with an aspiration to achieve a 20% reduction by this date. The council had implemented a number of carbon reduction projects (see Officer's report for details) as set out in the Carbon Management Plan. Officers were actively pursuing carbon reduction across the estate and vehicle fleet.
- v. In March 2016, the Council set an aspiration for the city of Cambridge to achieve zero carbon status by 2050. The UK Government's new national target is in-line with this, as is the most recent advice from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the UK's Committee on Climate Change. In February 2019, the Council had called upon the Government to give the Council and other local partners the powers needed to make Cambridge zero carbon by 2030.
- vi. Undertook to find out more details for Councillors about advertising and promotion of the new car club scheme jointly with Cambridgeshire County Council, which allows residents to hire vehicles for short periods, reducing the need for car-ownership.
- vii. The Council has increased cycle parking provision, by providing 55 new stands with 110 parking spaces across a number of sites. This included 2 cargo bike parking bays at Queen Anne Terrace car park. Undertook to find out more details for Councillors regarding scope for more cargo bike spaces in future.

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.

### **19/46/EnC Updates to the Playing Pitch and Indoor Sport Strategies**

#### **Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report provided an update on the Playing Pitch and Indoor Sport Strategies action plans for the City, which were adopted in June 2016.

The strategies include action plans which have been updated to reflect completed works to date, and prioritisation of identified project areas, along with the addition of new opportunities for investment to include Tennis, Bowls, Rowing and Canoeing, to be included for consideration for funding from

existing and future S106 Developer Contributions or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding for Outdoor, Indoor and Swimming funds.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities**

- i. Approved the updated project lists in appendices 1 and 2 of the Officer's report to for Indoor and Outdoor Sports projects for inclusion into the City's Playing Pitch and Indoor Sport Strategies for potential investment as strategic project areas for use of Indoor and Outdoor S106/CIL Developer Contributions.
- ii. Adopted Tennis and Bowls projects listed in appendices 3 & 4 of the Officer's report for inclusion into the indoor sport and playing pitch strategies for potential investment as strategic project areas for use of Indoor and Outdoor S106/CIL Developer contributions.
- iii. Adopted Rowing and Canoeing projects listed in appendix 5 of the Officer's report for inclusion into the Playing Pitch Strategy for potential investment as strategic project areas for use of Outdoor S106/CIL Developer contributions.

### **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, Sport & Recreation Manager.

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

- i. Community use agreements were wide ranging to encourage the public to participate in sports at the centres, and include a provision for meetings with the centres management teams to monitor progress, accessibility and usage of the public sessions at their sites.
- ii. Multi-use game areas in the city can facilitate volley ball, but most sessions are played indoors. In the summer temporary courts are setup mainly by the language schools & colleges for informal games in the open spaces such as Parkers Piece, but there are no permanently marked grass courts at present.

- iii. The Council worked with different partners to encourage the public to access different sports facilities, and now negotiate a range of times too, with Netherhall Sports Centre facilitating Exercise Referral sessions at the new Gym during school hours.
- iv. S106 agreements all included triggers when developers should pay over the sporting contributions if the developments go ahead, and range from levels of occupation of completed units to “upon commencement” terms.

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.

## **19/47/EnC Jesus Green Lido Improvements**

### **Matter for Decision**

A range of investigatory work was being undertaken at the Jesus Green Lido to consider current issues, future requirements and options to achieve these. This includes investigative work and structural assessment of the current buildings and pool tank along with potential investments required to maintain them for either their continued use or provide replacement facilities.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities**

- i. Approved the phased approach outlined in this report to implement short term and consider longer term improvements to Jesus Green Lido.
- ii. Approved, subject to business case approval, the use of all remaining S106 developer contributions collected under the ‘swimming pool’ contribution type for eligible improvements at Jesus Green Lido proposed in this report. This includes unallocated swimming pool S106 contributions already received and those received in future.
- iii. Agreed to de-allocate £250,000 of generic S106 contributions from the Jesus Green Rouse Ball Pavilion project, so that these funds can, instead, be made available for other projects to mitigate the impact of development in Cambridge (that is, £125,000 back to community facilities S106 funds and £125,000 back to outdoor sports S106 funds).

### **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 Sport & Recreation Manager.

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

- i. Phase 1 will continue and not be reported back to committee. Anything concerning phase 2 would come back to committee for consideration.
- ii. Project phase two: Officers would liaise with stakeholders to identify possible options and additional investments to improve the facility, and considered as part of the new leisure contract offer from October 2023 onwards. Any future proposals would also require approval from both elected members and planning permissions.

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.

## **19/48/EnC Public Art Commissioning**

### **Matter for Decision**

Over the last couple of years, public art reports to this committee have taken a two-pronged approach, focussed on the following:

- i. Developing a Public Art Strategy, which includes proposing a framework and associated principles new public art commissions; and
- ii. Bringing forward a few public art commissions prior to the development of the Public Art Strategy, in order to make effective and timely use of existing time-limited S106 contributions.

While progress continues to be made on developing the Public Art Strategy, research and advice received from external public art specialists has underlined the need to work closely with the shared Planning Service as it



reviews related planning policies. Officers aim to report back on the Strategy in the first half of 2020/21.

In the meantime, this latest report provided updates, which had been scheduled for this committee meeting:

- i. The need to commission a public art project in/ around Trumpington ward's boundary with Petersfield and Coleridge.
- ii. The need to take stock of the River Cam public art programme.
- iii. Other proposals that could be developed ahead of the development of the Public Art Strategy.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities**

Agreed to:

- i. Allocate up to £90,000 of S106 public art contributions to develop the 'Art of Play' public art project in accordance with the outline brief in Appendix A of the Officer's report.
- ii. De-allocate £330,000 of public art S106 contributions currently allocated to the River Cam public art programme;
- iii. Instruct officers to develop proposals for the following projects and report back to this Committee in 2020/21, so that the project proposals and associated s106 funding allocations can be considered:
  - a. A public art project in/around Trumpington ward's boundary with Petersfield and Coleridge, using up to £75,000 of time limited, local s106 contributions (if these cannot be related to the 'Art of Play' public art project);
  - b. A public art project in Romsey ward using time-limited public art S106 contributions that have to be contractually committed during 2023; and
  - c. A city-wide urban art project and associated urban art space at Newmarket Road roundabout subway, in accordance with the concept proposal in Appendix C of the Officer's report.

### **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 Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager.

In response to the report Councillors asked if the council used outside agencies for public art instead of in-house providers. The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager said there were a number of providers who the council used as consultants.

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.

**19/49/EnC Cambridge Live - Independent Review: Findings & Recommendations****Matter for Decision**

Following the decisions taken by this Council, and by Cambridge Live, to end the contract for services with Cambridge Live, and transfer all its staff and undertakings to Cambridge City Council, a review was commissioned into the events that led to this point.

A review has now been conducted by an industry expert, Mark Taylor, on behalf of the East of England Local Government Association.

The review reported on an investigation into events that are seen very differently from different viewpoints, and finds that both the Council and Cambridge Live could have acted differently at key points, in ways that might have increased the chances of the independent trust developing into a successful and viable entity for the long-term. It highlights the learning from other trusts, in particular that the first five years at least of a new trust are often difficult, and that establishing a trust with an intention of achieving savings is unlikely to create a sustainable basis from which to build a thriving organisation.

The intent of the report is not to cast blame on any individual or organisation, but to highlight areas where lessons can be learned, which might be valuable

in managing other arms-length relationships, or in any future decision to create an arms-length trust.

The review has the benefit not only of hindsight into what happened, but also of the passing of time in respect of other organisations, to give a different view on trust formation from that which was taken at the time of the trust's formation.

This review did not examine in depth the financial position of Cambridge Live. Members will be informed separately when the auditors complete the accounts for the trust, on the balance sheet at the point of transfer.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities**

Noted the report, and to ask officers to consider how the learning might best be applied to current and future relationships.

### **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 Strategic Director.

The Committee noted the report referred to "An unnecessary and unhelpful hostility was allowed to build up between the two organisations". (Cambridge Live and the City Council.) Queried why did this happen and could it have been avoided.

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

- i. Part of the Cambridge Live role was to seek private sector sponsorship. The City Council will seek sponsorship in future.
- ii. The report said there were some difficult relationships between Cambridge Live and the City Council. Officers tried to make the relationship work. Other arms-length organisations reported the same issue.

The Chief executive said the two organisations were trying to establish their own identities (when Cambridge Live was set up) so needed to recalibrate their relationship. She was not aware of any issues at the time but the report said there was a difficult relationship.

The Committee unanimously resolved 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.

The meeting ended at 6.40 pm

**CHAIR**