

**NORTH AREA COMMITTEE**17 May 2012  
7.30 - 10.00 pm

**Present:** Councillors Ward (Vice-Chair), Abbott, Boyce, Bird, Brierley, Gawthrope, Kerr, O'Reilly, Pitt, Price, Todd-Jones, Tunnacliffe, Manning, Pellew and Wilkins

**County Councillors:** Manning, Pellew and Wilkins

**Officers (City Council):** Jonathan James (Head of Customer Services), Graham Saint (Strategy Officer) and Glenn Burgess (Committee Manager)

**Officers (County Council):** Dearbhla Lawson (Head of Transport, Infrastructure Policy & Funding), Mike Davies (Programme Manager, Major Infrastructure Delivery), Sian Phillips (Education Officer - Children and Young People's Services)

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

**12/30/NAC Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from County Councillor Sales.

**12/31/NAC Welcome and Introduction (including Declarations of Interest)**

The Vice Chair welcomed the public and explained the format of the meeting.

**Declarations of Interest:**

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Manning	12/32/NAC	Personal: Founder member of Cambridge Music Festival
Bird	12/32/NAC	Personal: Works with local groups that have previously been allocated grants
Pitt	12/33/NAC	Personal: Governor of Kings Hedges Primary School

## **12/32/NAC Community Development and Leisure Grants 2012/13**

The committee received a report from the Grants Manager.

### **Cambridge Music Festival**

**Decision: APPROVED (unanimously) a grant of £2000**

### **Eastern Region Roller Speed Association**

**Decision: APPROVED (unanimously) a grant of £500**

### **Grovebury Ladies Club**

**Decision: APPROVED (unanimously) a grant of £600**

### **Rowan Humberstone Ltd**

Councillor Gawthrope proposed and Councillor Pitt seconded an increased allocation of £520.84

**Decision: APPROVED (unanimously) a grant of £520.84**

### **Chesterton Gardening Club**

**Decision: APPROVED (unanimously) a grant of £300**

### **Cambridge Carbon Footprint**

**Decision: APPROVED (unanimously) a grant of £0**

It was agreed that this application be referred for consideration for a Sustainable City Grant as it was a better fit with the criteria.

**Chesterton Parent Club** (indoor soft play sessions)

**Decision: APPROVED (unanimously)** a grant of £200

**Darwin Drive Youth Association**

**Decision: APPROVED (unanimously)** a grant of £1500

**Chesterton Parent Group** (running of music group)

**Decision: APPROVED (unanimously)** a grant of £1000

**Vie Residents Association**

**Decision: APPROVED (unanimously)** a grant of £338

**Chesterton Community Association**

**Decision: APPROVED (unanimously)** a grant of £500

**St Andrew's Hall Chesterton**

**Decision: APPROVED (unanimously)** a grant of £400

**12/33/NAC Improving engagement with young people across the city**

The committee received a verbal presentation from the Deputy Head and the Chair of Governors of Chesterton Community College.

The following points were highlighted:

- i. The school is keen to maintain and enhance its links and communication with the local community.
- ii. The school currently teaches 950 students.
- iii. The school is fed by four main primary schools.
- iv. Students come from a diverse community, speaking a total of 40 different languages.

- v. The school is one of only two in the county that improve year on year.
- vi. Engagement that students undertake in the community includes:
  - 'Wicked Wednesdays' introduced with community input i.e. residents judging the invention competition
  - local residents with language skills invited to the school to assist with learning
  - ongoing liaison with the Folk Museum
  - 'Making a difference in the Community Project' which encourages improvements to local neighbourhoods
  - Christmas Party organised for Manor Care Home
- vii. The school is considering making the wearing of cycle helmets compulsory for students cycling to school.
- viii. The school run Sports Centre is now hugely successful and is used by the whole community.
- ix. As this is now seen as an outdated model, the school is reducing the number of students it is sending to the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU). These students are now kept on site with extra teacher support and the option of extended school hours.
- x. 'The Student Voice Project' allows students to:
  - meet with Governors every 3 weeks to give direct feedback on lesson plans
  - be consulted on all major changes to the school
  - receive funding directly from the PTA
  - be involved in staff recruitment
- xi. Members of the North Area Committee were encouraged to visit the school and meet the students.

The committee received a verbal presentation from the Head of Manor Community College.

The following points were highlighted:

- i. He is proud to be the Head Teacher and has never worked with more willing or honest students.
- ii. Raised concern about how the school has been viewed in the past and the negative press that it receives.
- iii. The students work hard in sometimes very challenging circumstances.
- iv. The school has half the national average of the 'highest attaining' students, but twice the number of the 'lowest attaining' students.
- v. The school has a dedicated and hard working team of teachers.

- vi. The free meal figures stand at 32%, compared to an average across the county of 4%.
- vii. The Student Leadership Team is involved in staff recruitment.
- viii. The school currently teaches 420 students.
- ix. 240 students receive counselling and/or extra support and 30% are on the special needs register.
- x. Teaching assistants undertaking 1-to-1 tuition and organising family support provides extra support.
- xi. In a recent survey 96% of the students said that they felt safe at the school.
- xii. The school deals with up to 8 police reports of domestic violence each week.
- xiii. Research states that if students are in 'permanent trauma' at home their IQ drops by up to 50%.
- xiv. The school works closely with the regional colleges and currently 98% of its students go into further education or employment.
- xv. The school provided a free Breakfast Club but attendance significantly dropped with the introduction of a 50p fee. This indicates how hard things are for some families.

Members of the public asked the following questions, as set out below:

**1) Resident: Stated that their children had received an excellent service from Manor Community College.**

The Head Teacher thanked them for their comments.

**2) Councillor Price: Reiterated that many families were struggling in this area and needed extra support.**

This comment was noted

**3) Councillor Price: Suggested that it would have been beneficial for the students to have attended the meeting to give their views and comments.**

This comment was noted.

Councillor Todd-Jones commented that it was important to get the right setting and format in order to engage successfully with young people. It was suggested that an Area Committee was maybe not the right setting or format for this type of engagement.

The Deputy Head of Chesterton Community College and the Head of Manor Community College invited members of the Area Committee to visit the school and meet the students.

**4) Resident: Highlighted the lack of amenities in the area and suggested that the City Council should address this issue.**

This comment was noted.

**5) Councillor Kerr and resident: Raised concern that making the wearing of cycle helmets compulsory may discourage students from cycling to school.**

This comment was noted.

**6) Resident: Noted that the Chesterton Community Association had found the school very hard to engage with in the past. It was hoped that this meeting would be the start of better engagement between the school and the local community.**

This comment was noted.

**7) Resident: Noted that for a school to be successful in a deprived area it had to have an excellent Head Teacher. The Manor Community College had such a teacher and was a fantastic school.**

This comment was noted.

**8) Resident: Suggested that Cambridge was a divided City and more children and parents were becoming disenfranchised. It was noted that it takes time to build a cohesive community and natural interaction between schools and the local community was essential.**

This comment was noted.

The Vice Chair thanked everyone for their comments and reiterated the desire of the committee to work more closely with local schools and engage with young people.

## **12/34/NAC Meeting Demographic Pressures on Primary Schools in the North of Cambridge**

The committee received a report from the Education Officer (Children and Young People's Services). A copy of the report is attached at appendix A.

Members of the public asked the following questions, as set out below:

**1) Councillor Bird: Questioned why the number of school places had not been accurately determined before the building of the new Shirley School.**

The Education officer confirmed that early pre-planning work had pre-dated the building of the new Shirley School and that a rise in birth rates had also had an impact.

**2) Resident: Asked for clarification on the consultation process.**

The Education Officer confirmed that officers were currently working on the consultation timescales and further details would follow in due course.

**3) Resident: Questioned how much money had been given to the Old Schools Trust for the site in Nuffield Road and how much it was owed for using that site instead of the infant school site.**

The Education Officer agreed to liaise with colleagues and provide a detailed answer outside of the meeting.

**4) Councillor O'Reilly: Questioned what happened to children that did not have a guaranteed school place.**

The Education Officer confirmed that, to date, not a single child had failed to be found a space. It was also noted that officers met regularly with local schools to discuss ongoing need.

**5) Resident: Questioned what impact academy status would have on primary school places.**

The Education Officer confirmed that, whilst being challenging, the role of the local authority was veering towards commissioning schools places and not directly providing them.

Councillor Manning confirmed that he written to the local MP on this issue and would provide the committee with any response received.

**6) Resident: Questioned how catchment areas would be redrawn in East Chesterton.**

The Education Officer confirmed that, whilst catchment areas had no legal standing, there might be a need to revisit them as they currently bore little relation to the location of the schools.

**12/35/NAC Northern Corridor Area Transport Plan**

The committee received a report from the Head of Transport, Infrastructure Policy & Funding.

Members of the public asked the following questions, as set out below:

**1) Councillor Todd-Jones: Requested further information on how the funding process worked and future timescales.**

The Head of Transport, Infrastructure Policy & Funding confirmed that the aim of S106 funding which is allocated on the basis of the Area Corridor Plans is to help mitigate the impacts of developments on the network. The Area Corridor Plans were developed in conjunction with the City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. It was noted that as the plans were adopted in 2003, many schemes were already in place and that future proposed schemes would be assessed on project selection criteria for eligibility.

**2) Councillor Todd-Jones: Questioned whether any of the funding could be used to address the issues identified in Fen Road. It was also questioned how this related to the Community Infrastructure Levy.**



The Head of Transport, Infrastructure Policy & Funding confirmed that a separate Steering Group had been established to consider the issues identified in Fen Road, and that as part of this work, the full range of funding options would need to be explored. However S106 funding may not be appropriate given lack of links to development, but that eligibility would be considered as part of the options once there is clarity on proposals.

The Head of Transport, Infrastructure Policy & Funding confirmed that the Community Infrastructure Levy would be a charge on new developments per square meter over a certain size for most types of new development. It would be up to local authorities to charge and collect these payments, and the funding collected would go towards delivering infrastructure to support the delivery of the local plan. The levy is not currently in place within the city but that preparatory work was underway.,

**3) Resident: Questioned whether any improvements could be made to transport links on Mitchams Corner.**

The Programme Manager, Major Infrastructure Delivery, confirmed that this would be looked into as part of other projects particularly proposals related to the Better Bus Area Fund.

**4) Resident: Raised concern about the area around Carlisle Road and Chesterton Road and suggested that changes to the road environment may make it safer.**

This comment was noted and would be considered as part of wider work.

**5) Resident: Requested more detail on the proposed Chesterton Cycle Bridge and when consultation would take place.**

The Programme Manager, Major Infrastructure Delivery, confirmed that these were only early stage proposals and no detailed work had yet been undertaken. For the schemes to progress there would be a need for full planning consent and the related public consultation.

**6) Resident: Raised concern that these schemes were being brought forward as options without any consultation with the public. It was also noted that environmental impact assessments had not been undertaken.**

The Head of Transport, Infrastructure Policy & Funding confirmed that at this stage funding was being sought to undertake feasibility studies on the proposed schemes. And that if any proposals were to be progressed after this, there would be a need for full and wide pre-application consultation on the issues and options.

**7) Resident: Suggested that money should not be ring-fenced for the Chesterton Cycle Bridge when feasibility studies had yet to be completed.**

This comment was noted.

**8) Resident: Requested details on the cost of a feasibility study for Chesterton Cycle Bridge.**

The Head of Transport, Infrastructure Policy & Funding confirmed that the cost would be in the region of £10,000.

**9) Resident: Confirmed that proposals for a bridge had been in the Local Plan for over five years.**

This comment was noted.

**10) Resident: Stated that any proposal for a river crossing needed to be integrated with the station scheme.**

This comment was noted.

The Head of Transport, Infrastructure Policy & Funding confirmed that members of the public would be able to input their views through the upcoming Issues and Options Consultation. For the Local Plans and the Transport Strategy for City and South Cambridgeshire which are all being consulted on at the same time.

### **Adjournment of meeting**

Due to time restrictions at the venue the Vice Chair adjourned the meeting at 10pm.

It was confirmed that any submitted Open Forum questions would be responded to electronically.

**12/36/NAC Policing and Safer Neighbourhoods**

This item was not covered.

**12/37/NAC TO CONFIRM WHAT WAS SAID (MINUTES) AT THE LAST MEETING AND WHAT WE HAVE DONE (ACTION LIST)**

This item was noted covered.

**12/38/NAC YOU WANT TO KNOW (OPEN FORUM)**

This item was not covered.

The meeting ended at 10.00 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank