

SOUTH AREA COMMITTEE

5 September 2022
7.00 - 8.10 pm

Present

Area Committee Members: Councillors Hauk (Chair), Page-Croft (Vice-Chair), S. Davies, Dryden, Lee, Levien, Beckett, Goodliffe and Slatter

Officers:

Head of Property Services: Dave Prinsep
Anti-Social Behaviour Officer: Marianne Crozier
Committee Manager: Gary Clift
Meeting Producer: Boris Herzog

Other Officers in Attendance:

South Area Police Officer Jamal Ali
Dr Kristin-Ann Rutter Executive Director Cambridge University Health Partners and Cambridge Bio-medical Campus (CBC) Ltd
Tony Taylorson Cambridge University Health Partners and CBC Ltd

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

22/14/SAC Welcome, Introduction and Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Ashton, Flaubert and McPherson.

22/15/SAC Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

22/16/SAC Notes of Previous Meeting

These were noted.

22/17/SAC Matters and Actions Arising from the Notes

Re. page 6 of the agenda, 21/13/SAC Open Forum, demolition of 1-2 Fitzwilliam Road and saving the window. Note repeated below for ease of reference:

The Principal Planner has discussed salvaging the window with the agent for the site. He would discuss it with the applicant and let the Principal Planner know in due course. Hopefully it could be salvaged. The next step would be for Councillor Ingrid Flaubert to have a plan for the window.

Cllr Davies asked that this be added to the Action Sheet for follow up and report back to Committee.

Re Open Forum minute reference 22/11/SAC (page 10 of the agenda), Cllr Slatter advised that there was no longer a need to involve planning officers as the councillors are organising the matter themselves.

22/18/SAC Open Forum

A member of the public asked the following:

Please provide an overall update on the current state of the full and final adoption of **the Abode development**

Please provide an update specifically on the current state of discussion / agreement between the Council and Countryside on the replacement of the trees and shrubberies that Countryside are obligated to maintain and replace both as part of their planning permission generally and as part of adoption specifically

Please provide an answer to my question posed on 16 July 2022 regarding the insufficient construction of kerbs in the Abode development, as well as whether / how this shortcoming will be addressed in adoption.

As the member of the public was not present the Chair gave a summary answer at the meeting. The full answer is produced below (and had been provided to the member of the public before the meeting).

“As I am sure you are aware there are quite a number of sites at various stages of the adoption process across the southern fringe. From a strategic point of view, I can advise which parcels have been transferred and which have not. However, updating the wider public on the general situation regarding the 106 transfers will not perhaps provide enough detail on specific issues such as the details relating to the highway transfers, and the Abode

highway trees which have been reported previously to the County Council. The County have their own people to monitor and progress the section 38 agreements. It may be prudent for the committee to seek a statement from the County Council or invite a representative from the County Council to provide an update on the highway adoptions. This would be useful as they are best placed to answer queries generally about detail on highway adoptions, including Abode. Enforcement action relating to the highway section 38 agreements is something for the County Council and the Cities New Communities team to deliberate/decide if enforcement is necessary. Has the committee considered asking Cllr Slatter to investigate?

The areas forming the transfers to City Council within the built up parcels at Abode have been transferred to City and queries relating to these areas can be processed in the usual way through City Council portal. There are a number of areas within Abode which are not intended to be transferred to City Council, but are to be transferred to Estate Management Company and or Housing Association depending upon their location. If residents have queries relating to these landscaped areas and are uncertain who is responsible for the areas then they can contact the developer Countryside who are still around, they will be able to pass the queries on to the management Company or Housing Association depending upon the specific location. In terms of enforcement again something for New Communities to consider if the developer is considered not to have met obligations under the terms of the Planning agreement.”

2. A member of the public asked the following questions:

I was walking across Hobson’s Square and saw a lot of upright logs. At first I thought it was a preparation for bonfire night. On-going closer I saw there were lights in the ground round the structure, so it was obviously something to be looked at and not burnt, but there was no information about it there, or anywhere else.

Does the structure have a name? Was someone responsible for creating it? Surely at the very least there ought to be a plaque on it, or very close to it, giving this information.

What is the point of ‘public art’ if those coming across it don’t recognize it as such?

As the member of the public was not present the Chair gave a summary answer at the meeting. The full answer is produced below (and had been provided to the member of the public before the meeting).

The Bronze House by Heather and Ivan Morison has been developed by artists Heather and Ivan Morison working with a steering group that comprised of local residents, Countryside Properties, architects, landscape architects and City Council officers as observers. The role of the Steering Group is to assist with the development of commissions, artist appointment and project delivery. The Group have overseen the development of the public art commission for Hobson's Square and the Great Kneighton site as a whole.

The Proposal- an artist brief for Hobson Square was developed, which required an artist to engage at very early stages with the design team and local stakeholders. The ambition was that through this close collaboration, the artist could bring creative thinking and ideas into the Square's design (as a whole), looking to the future as well as the past, and create a truly unique new public space for this new community.

The artists initial response to this brief focused on wanting to create a slowness of time, through a space that can support congregation and social interaction as well as providing an opportunity for people to contemplate and reflect on this new place in, which they live. Inspired by the archaeological digs on the site, Heather and Ivan Morison worked with Futurecity, Countryside Properties and PLACE Design to create a public art proposal for Hobson's Square; the Bronze House - a single sculpture integrated into the square and an artwork fabrication and installation process offering community participation and engagement throughout.

The site provided archaeological evidence of numerous Bronze Age posthole arrangements. The artists have been inspired by these finds, and in particular with one from the mid Bronze Age period labelled by the archaeologists as Structure 827, and found close to the Hobson's Square site. The sculpture proposes an unknown architectural form starting from that pattern of postholes and is fabricated using burnt oak and chestnut. Taking that exact footprint the artists have designed a structure that looks as if it could be as much a relic from the future as from the past. The sculpture is located in the centre of the Square and has a direct relationship to the adjacent Bronze Age ditch line that demarcates the square.

The design of the Square has evolved through artist/design team collaboration and the layout of the square has been orientated around the traces of two converging Bronze Age ditches that cut diagonally across the plan of the square. These historic lines become the lines of the drainage swales and the boundaries for the treatment of different areas of the new square. The

entrance of the Community Centre has also been designed to link to the ditches.

The soft landscaping design and the ditch line provide a setting and context for the sculpture. The trees also provide a context the sculpture. The artists describe the sculpture as being 'cradled by the trees' and for it to enable children to imagine the past and the future and provide 'myth making', as they interact with it. The intention of the sculpture is to create a focal point. As the trees mature and the seasons change, the view and appearance of the sculpture will change too and encourage people's continued interest in it, as at a point in time, the sculpture will not be seen as a whole. Once mature, the trees will have a playful relationship with the work. A key element of the design of the sculpture is to provide opportunity for informal play and seating and this is also a reason for it being located within the soft landscape area; to encourage people and in particular children to play and sit and enjoy the space with an emphasis on young children interacting. The Landscape and sculpture have been designed together and therefore are intrinsically linked.

The steering group are currently looking at the best ways to provide information about the work and all the other works on site and we are hoping this will be agreed in the very near future. The reception desk and spiral staircase in the Community Centre have also been designed by the same artists to provide a link to the Square. We believe that there is or will be some information made available in the library.

There is information about the work online.

<https://www.greatkneighton.co.uk/great-kneighton/public-art.html>

<https://cambridge.futurecity.co.uk/portfolio/bronze-house/>

The member of the public asked supplementary questions which have been passed onto officers to respond to and be published with papers for the next meeting:

1. Why isn't it council policy to label all public art installations with their title and the name of the artist/s who made them, when they are put up?

The Council encourages the dissemination of information for public art projects. The works are varied, and the type of work and the context of the work may not always provide an opportunity 'to label' the work. Some works have 'labels' and others do not because of this. Also, the artists sometimes

wish their work to be experienced as a moment; where there is surprise and the meaning to be interpreted by the audience upon discovering the work (of course this is dependent on what the work is, but there's usually an online presence with more information too). The Council has a public art webpage, where there is more details of works (albeit, it requires updating) and also most of the large development sites who have delivered public art have a public art section on their own websites. Many public artworks are also included in the Cambridge sculpture trails. (As previously explained, the work at Great Kneighton is currently in the process of designing information panels).

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public-art-commissions>

<https://www.cambridgesculpturetrails.co.uk/>

2 How are such works financed? Are they paid for out of our council tax?

Public art is financed through the Planning process via Planning Conditions or s106 agreements. The Council also commissions public art through commuted s106 contributions from developers in lieu of the developer delivering public art on their development site. Public art is not funded through Council Tax.

Members of the Committee contributed to a general debate on public art in the urban fringe sites, the upkeep of it after installation (by whom) and the information about it. Should there be a log of all the public art and if it is not satisfying the planning conditions.

Officer response after the meeting: Public art developed and delivered through the correct process will satisfy s106 agreements or planning conditions. There is a robust process involving community engagement and also involvement from the Council's Public Art Panel, where appropriate. Proposals are not approved unless a maintenance plan has been submitted.

The public art on Nine Wells it has been intentionally made to weather and erode over time.

22/19/SAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods

The committee received a presentation from the police on activity on local priorities since last reported in March 2022.

The full police presentation can be viewed on the committee recording on the Council's You Tube page.

Members made the following points to the police officers:

It would be helpful if councillors were advised how to most effectively work with the police on casework-the police advised calling them direct was recommended.

Although Babaram Road Park and Ride site was not fully within Cambridge City jurisdiction, could the police work with South Cambridgeshire police to address the anti-social behaviour associated with the site-the police took that action away.

A Member had found using the 101 number a frustrating process and asked if the police had received customer feedback on this service?

The Council's community safety officer updated the Committee on the recently launched Peer Group and Places initiative (page 6 of the report).

22/20/SAC Update on Cambridge Biomedical Campus

Representatives from Cambridge University Hospitals/CBC presented on the development work on the biomedical campus site and the 2050 strategic vision.

The full presentation can be viewed on the YouTube channel here:

[Agenda for South Area Committee on Monday, 5th September, 2022, 7.00 pm - Cambridge Council](#)

The committee appreciated the presentation and engagement with the CBC representatives and noted that they wish to engage with Councillors on South Area Committee on-going.

The meeting ended at 8.10 pm

CHAIR