



To: Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places: Councillor Rod Cantrill and Executive Councillor for Community Development and Health: Councillor Mike Pitt

Report by: Director of Environment

Relevant scrutiny committee: Community Services Scrutiny Committee 17/1/2013

Wards affected: All Wards

## OPTIONS FOR THE USE OF CITY-WIDE DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

### Key Decision

#### 1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 The Council has given area committees some devolved decision-making powers over the use of funding from certain types of developer contributions. Whilst about two thirds of the unallocated funding in those categories has been devolved, around a third remains in a city-wide fund. Decisions about how this money should be spent on strategic projects (benefiting residents of more than one area or city-wide) rest with the Executive Councillors.
- 1.2 This report sets out a range of strategic project ideas including suggestions generated by Area consultation workshops, projects that are 'on hold' pending the identification of funding and requests for devolved contributions to be supplemented by city-wide funding. It considers ten project options in particular that the Executive Councillors have asked officers to focus on.

#### 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 It is recommended that the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places prioritises for delivery the following projects from the City-wide Developer Contributions Programme, subject to project appraisal and the identification of appropriate funding to meet any related revenue and maintenance costs (see paragraph 4.3-4.6):
- Logan's Meadow Local Nature Reserve extension (£160,000)
  - Paradise Local Nature Reserve improvements (£100,000)
  - Drainage of Jesus Green (£95,000 or, if possible, up to £119,000).

(If approved, the Logan's Meadow LNR extension and Upper River Cam Biodiversity projects will come off the Capital Plan on-hold list.)

- 2.2 It is recommended that the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places:
- a. confirms the allocation of two specific public art contributions with expiry dates in the short-term (totalling c.£88,000) to a public art project to mark both the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the city's role in formulating the rules of Association Football and the 400<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the city's acquisition of Parker's Piece;
  - b. assigns the full amount of city-wide developer contributions funding for provision for children and teenagers (based on the mid-December 2012 analysis) to the North Area Committee (£40,000 or, if possible, up to £52,000) and the East Area Committee (£35,000 or, if possible, up to £47,000), in recognition of the levels of funding currently available to those areas for play provision.

- 2.3 It is recommended that the Executive Councillor for Community Development and Health prioritises for delivery the following projects from the City-wide Developer Contributions Programme, subject to project appraisal and the identification of appropriate funding to meet any related revenue and maintenance costs:
- Grant for the Centre at St Paul's development – phase 3 (£50,000)
  - Grant for the Cherry Trees Centre refurbishment (£50,000) and
  - Grant for the extension of St Andrew's Hall (£140,000).

- 2.4 It is recommended that:
- a. the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport & Public Places allocates £100,000 of city-wide funding from outdoor sports/formal open space contributions; and
  - b. the Executive Councillor for Community Development & Health allocates £85,000 (or, if possible, up to £109,000) of city-wide funding from community facilities contributions

for the longer-term development of the Rouse Ball Pavilion on Jesus Green, subject to project appraisal and the identification of appropriate funding to meet any related revenue and maintenance costs.

- 2.5 It is recommended that the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places confirms that that all three of the water play projects at Abbey, Coleridge and Kings Hedges, which have already been approved, should each have £50,000 of developer contributions for public art assigned to them (see paragraph 5.1) and that this be included in the Council's Capital Plan for 2013/14.

### 3. Background

- 3.1 Developers are often asked to make financial contributions to the City Council to address the impact of their developments on Cambridge. These payments are used in line with national and local planning policy and the purposes and conditions set out in legal (Section 106) agreements. Previously, Executive Councillors have decided how to use contributions after reports to scrutiny committees. Examples of completed projects can be found on the [Developer Contributions](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106) web page (www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106) . A list of projects that are in the process of being delivered can be found in Appendix A.
- 3.2 The decision to devolve to area committees decision-making powers over the use of developer contributions was made following a report to this Committee in January 2012. It was agreed that:
- a. this would apply to the following contribution types: community facilities, informal open space; provision for children and teenagers (also referred to as play provision); indoor sports facilities; outdoor sports facilities (and its predecessor, formal open space); public art and public realm;
  - b. the funding to be devolved to an area committee would be based on 100% of contributions from minor planning applications determined by the area committee or by officers under delegated powers and 50% of contributions from major applications from that area determined by the Planning Committee;
  - c. the other 50% of contributions from Planning Committee decisions would be held in a city-wide fund for strategic projects benefiting residents of more than one area of the city. Decisions on the use of this funding would remain with the relevant Executive Councillors following reports to this Scrutiny Committee;
  - d. the relevant Executive Councillor would have the power to reallocate any devolved contributions getting close to 'expiry dates' to schemes that would enable the money to be used appropriately and on time.
- 3.3 The agreed approach to implementing devolved decision-making, following a report to this Committee last June, highlighted that:
- a. residents and community groups would be consulted, in early autumn 2012, about the need for new or improved local facilities and ideas for projects that could help to meet those needs;
  - b. these three-year needs assessments would be reported in November 2012 so that each area committee could prioritise an initial set of projects in its area, to be taken forward for project appraisal and delivery in the short-term (by March 2014).

- 3.4 Since the report last June, significant progress has been made.
- a. Four area workshops took place between mid-September and early October, involving over 100 members of the public (not including city councillors). Others put forward their comments and ideas by email. In all, the consultation generated over 250 ideas for projects.
  - b. The area committees last November identified 16 initial priority projects (see Appendix B). Around £550,000 have been allocated to these priorities – the details will be confirmed at the project appraisal stage. All the ideas raised via the area consultations were summarised in the area committee reports.

#### 4. City-wide funding and strategic project options

- 4.1 The consideration of strategic project options is set in the context of existing (received and available) city-wide funding. More details of this latest (mid-December 2012) analysis can be found in Appendix C.

<b>Contribution type</b> (Rounded down to the nearest £25,000)	<b>City-wide funding</b>
Community facilities	£325,000
Informal Open Space	£275,000
Outdoor Sports (including Formal Open Space)	£250,000
Indoor Sports	£25,000
Play provision	£75,000
Public Art	£150,000
Public Realm	£100,000

- 4.2 There are a range of strategic project options from which to choose:
- a. Appendix D sets out the projects from the ‘on-hold’ list of the Council’s Capital Plan pending the identification of specific funding;
  - b. Appendix E provides an assessment of 24 project ideas generated via last autumn’s area consultations, which could benefit residents of more than area;
  - c. the North and East Area Committees have both made specific requests that the Executive Councillors provide additional money from city-wide funding to supplement the amounts devolved to their areas in view of the particular needs that they face.
- 4.3 The Executive Councillors have asked officers to focus on ten options that have already been worked up in some detail. All ten of these projects are recommended for funding.

## Focus on ten strategic project options for the use of city-wide funding

Project idea	Type	Where idea came from	Proposed allocation
<b>Proposals for delivery by the Council in the short-medium term</b>			
A.	Logan's Meadow LNR extension	Informal open space	'On hold' project £160k
B.	Paradise LNR extension	Informal open space	'On hold' project £100k
C.	Drainage of Jesus Green (see paragraph 4.4)	Informal OS	West/Central workshop £15k-£39k
		Formal OS	
D.	Public art to mark 150 <sup>th</sup> anniversary of city's role in formulating the rules of Association Football and the 400 <sup>th</sup> anniversary of the city's acquisition of Parker's Piece	Public art	South Area workshop £88k
<b>Proposals for supplementing devolved funding for Areas</b>			
E.	Supplement the play provision contributions devolved to North Area	Play provision	North Area Committee £40k-£52k (see para 4.4)
F.	Supplement the play provision' contributions devolved to East Area	Play provision	East Area Committee £35k-£47k (see para 4.4)
<b>Proposals for delivery by others in the short-medium term</b>			
G.	Extend St Andrew's Hall	Community facilities	North Area workshop £140k contribution
H.	Improvements to Cherry Trees Centre	Community facilities	East Area workshop £50k contribution
I.	Centre at St Paul's development - phase 3	Community facilities	South Area workshop £50k contribution
<b>Proposals for delivery by others in the longer term</b>			
J.	Rouse Ball Pavilion development (see paragraph 4.4)	Outdoor sports	West/Central workshop £100k contribution
		Community facilities	

4.4 The cost estimates are provided in the context of the latest analysis of available funding (Appendix C), which is rounded down to the nearest £25,000. If it is possible for some more funding to be made available to prioritised projects from the actual existing developer contributions available, officers will explore this during the project appraisal process. This explains why proposed allocations for projects C, E, F and J are presented as ranges (eg, £84k - £109k).

4.5 Given that strategic projects are larger and more complex than those being taken forward by the area committees, the aim is for most to be delivered in the short to medium term (the delivery timescales for prioritised projects will be clarified via the project appraisal process). The timing of project delivery for some of the proposed projects involving certain types of construction or grounds works will be informed by the environmental and weather conditions.

4.6 **Commentary on the ten strategic project options:**

<b>A.</b>	<b>Logan’s Meadow Local Nature Reserve extension</b>	
	Proposed allocation: £160,000 (Informal Open Space)	Where: East Chesterton ward, North Area

a. This includes wetland habitat creation and access improvements at this nature reserve, which is visited by residents from across the city. A project appraisal has already been approved, but the project is currently on the Capital Plan ‘on hold’ list. See Appendix D. The latest analysis of available contributions has identified significant city-wide funding to enable this project to happen, including informal open space contributions from post-July 2006 Section 106 agreements, which can be used for habitat creation.

b. Whilst the current proposed allocation is less than the original project estimate (£30,000 less) in order to enable other projects to be funded at the same time, officers advise that this would enable the delivery of a substantial project. The North Area Committee in November 2012 agreed to urge the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places to fund this project from city-wide funding.

<b>B.</b>	<b>Paradise Local Nature Reserve improvements</b>	
	Proposed allocation: £100,000 (Informal open Space)	Where: Newnham ward, West/Central Area

a. This is also aimed at increasing biodiversity and improving access (including new and extended boardwalks) at another of our local nature reserves, which is used by residents from across the city.

- b. It has previously been presented as part of the Upper River Cam Biodiversity Project, which is on the 'on hold' list of the Capital Plan pending identification of suitable funding (see Appendix D). Given the other proposed uses of the city-wide Informal Open Space funding (projects A and C), it would be difficult to fund the full Biodiversity Project. However, there would be enough for a substantial part of the Paradise LNR improvement project (albeit £10,000 less than the current estimate for this element). Officers advise that this would enable the delivery of a substantial project.

<b>C.</b>	<b>Drainage of Jesus Green</b>	
	Proposed allocation: £95,000 or, if possible, up to £120,000 (£80k Formal Open Space and £15k-39k Informal Open Space)	Where: Market ward, West/Central Area

- a. Heavy rain causes water-logging on parts of Jesus Green, not just in the winter months. This has made significant areas of this major park, which is used by residents from across the city, unusable. Drainage would not only enable greater informal uses of the park throughout the year, but also formal sports pitch provision at Jesus Green. The scheme has already been prepared and has been estimated as costing in the region of £120,000. Please note the links between this scheme and the proposals for developing the Rouse Ball Pavilion (project J).
- b. To enable the extension of the two local nature reserves to move forward at the same time, it may only be possible to provide £15,000 of city-wide informal open space contributions for the drainage work. This should not be a problem, however, as officers are exploring a range of options such as: examining ways to bring down the overall costs; seeking funding from other sources for sustainable drainage; and checking whether there may in fact be more than £15,000 of suitable informal open space contributions available (see paragraph 4.4).

<b>D.</b>	<b>Public art to mark both the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the city's role in formulating rules of Association Football and the 400<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the city's acquisition of Parker's Piece</b>	
	Proposed allocation: £88,000 (Public art)	Where: Market ward, West/Central Area

- a. Although this proposal has been inspired by a suggestion made at the South Area workshop, it relates to Parker's Piece. Whilst there will be public consultation on the nature of the public art that could

be produced for this level of funding, initial suggestions have included the possibility of benches on the open space incorporating public art related to the anniversaries.

- b. The level of funding suggested is informed by the fact that two public art contributions (£88,000 in total) are due to expire in March and June 2014 (see note 6 under Appendix C). The public art project on Parker’s Piece would enable the contributions to be used on time in accordance with the relevant Section 106 agreements.
- c. Officers have considered the alternative public art project option of a memorial to the Far East Prisoners of War, but it is clear that this project could not be completed within timescales required for the use of the two developer contributions.

<b>E.</b>	<b>Supplement the play provision contributions devolved to the North Area with city-wide funding</b>	
	Proposed allocation: £40,000 (or, if possible, up to £52,000) (Provision for children & teenagers)	Where: North Area

- a. Three of the four wards in the North Area are amongst the top 20 most deprived in the whole of Cambridgeshire, according to the County Council’s Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2010. Despite this high need, the amount of developer contributions devolved to the North Area Committee was relatively low. This reflects the North Area’s comparatively low levels of development and its previous spending on completed projects and allocations to on-going projects. More details were set out in the report to the North Area Committee last November (see background papers).
- b. Since producing the provisional devolved funding analysis last September, a review of past spending on (and allocations to) projects has enabled more funding to be found for the North Area for community facilities, as well as a little more play provision.
- c. Even so, the devolved funding available to the North Area for the provision/improvement of play areas is still only around £10,000. Last autumn’s North Area consultation identified requests for improvements to eight play areas, which could not be considered due to the lack of funding. The North Area Committee in November agreed to urge the Executive Councillor to make available more funding.



<b>F.</b>	<b>Supplement the play provision contributions devolved to the East Area with city-wide funding</b>	
	Proposed allocation: £35,000 (or, if possible, up to £47,000) (Provision for children & teenagers)	Where: East Area

- a. There is a similar case for more funding for the East Area.
- The Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2010 show the Abbey ward is the 11<sup>th</sup> most deprived in Cambridgeshire (out of 123 wards).
  - Even though some more funding for play provision in the East Area has been found through the recent review of past spending on (and allocations to) projects, the latest analysis still shows only around £20,000 for the East Area.
  - The East Area Committee was unable to consider any of the seven suggestions for play area improvements arising from its workshop, given the insufficient funding. It agreed to urge the Executive Councillor to make available more play provision funding.
- b. The reason why the proposed allocation for the East Area is less than that for the North Area relates to the latest analysis of play provision funding currently available to the areas (around £10,000 in the North Area and around £20,000 in the East Area).

See paragraph 5.3a for the next steps in relation to both North and East Area play provision.

<b>G.</b>	<b>Extend St Andrew's Hall</b>	
	Proposed allocation: £140,000 contribution (Community facilities)	Where: East Chesterton ward, North Area

- a. St Andrew's Hall runs a community café from its main hall and this has already proved popular. Its location next to Riverside Bridge means that it draws people not just from the north of the city.
- b. The proposal is to expand St Andrew's Hall to provide a café space which can operate independently from the main building but with the option of being incorporated into other hall uses if required.
- c. St Andrew's Hall has been liaising closely with Community Development officers in developing these proposals. The total cost of the project is estimated at around £330k. The rest of the funding would come from St Andrew's Hall and other grant providers.

<b>H.</b>	<b>Improvements to Cherry Trees Centre</b>	
	Proposed allocation: £50,000 contribution (Community facilities)	Where: Abbey ward, East Area

- a. Age UK operates this day centre for elderly people, which is used widely by older people from across the city. It is redeveloping the centre into a multi-purpose facility to address the needs not just of older people, but the wider community. This would include further work with ethnic groups, disability services and advocacy.
- b. The proposals are well advanced and Age UK have tendered the works. The total cost of the project is estimated to be around £225,000, including around £80,000 which would be eligible for funding from community facilities contributions.
- c. Alongside this proposed allocation of city-wide funding, the East Area Committee at its meeting on 10 January 2013 is also considering funding from its devolved developer contributions.

<b>I.</b>	<b>Centre at St Paul's development - phase 3</b>	
	Proposed allocation: £50,000 contribution (Community facilities)	Where: Trumpington ward, South Area

- a. The Centre at St Paul's is well-used by a wide range of community groups from the local area and across the city. It has undergone a major refurbishment of its main hall to provide a large open-plan and multi-use community hall (Phases 1 and 2).
- b. The centre is now ready to start Phase 3 of the development in January 2013. This will deliver a new reception hall, disabled toilets and meeting space where residents, community groups and visitors can meet and enjoy tea and coffee. The total cost of this phase is £200,000: the proposed allocation for phase 3 from the Council would complement the other fund-raising by the centre.

<b>J.</b>	<b>Rouse Ball Pavilion, Jesus Green</b>	
	Proposed allocation: £185k-£209 (£100k Formal Open Space and £85k-£109k Community Facilities)	Where: Market ward, West/Central Area

- a. This would involve replacing the existing pavilion with an expanded and more sustainable building (in a similar style) that could encompass sports changing rooms, public toilets, a community hub / community meeting space and a café. This would benefit visitors to the park from across the city.

- b. A business plan for this project, which was prepared for an earlier (unsuccessful) bid for lottery funding, put the overall costs of this project above £500,000. This will need to be refreshed alongside the development of detailed proposals.
- c. This project is one for the longer-term. It is hoped that the proposed allocation will signal the Council's commitment as it seeks to secure other funding from partners and other external sources.

## **5. Other issues and next steps**

5.1 Recent reviews of spending and allocations to particular projects have highlighted an issue relating to the Abbey, Coleridge and King's Hedges water play (splash pad) projects (Capital Plan project references SC476, SC477 and SC478 respectively).

- a. The water play projects were approved in March 2011 (including the use of informal and formal open space and play provision contributions) following a report to this Scrutiny Committee. It has come to light recently, however, that the public art funding element of these projects may not have been fully reflected in subsequent records.
- b. It is proposed that this now be rectified in the Capital Plan with £50,000 of public art funding allocated to each project. In addition to some funding already allocated from public art contributions, this will need to draw on all the remaining/currently available city-wide funding for public art (following the proposed prioritisation of the public art project on Parker's Piece).
- c. If any further public art developer contributions that are due in soon could top up the public art funding for these projects (say, up to £60,000 per project) this would be addressed in an updated project appraisal.

5.2 In terms of the next steps, the focus is on getting delivered those projects identified as priorities for 2013/14.

- a. For city-wide projects prioritised following this report, projects appraisals will be taken forward from January 2013, where these are still needed. Those involving more than £75,000 of developer contributions funding will be reported back to this Committee, apart from the Cherry Trees Centre proposals which are being reported to the East Area Committee in January 2013.
- b. Arrangements will be put in place for giving area committees regular updates on project delivery progress.

5.3 The Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places has confirmed with officers that previously proposed timescales for reporting back to area committees will need to be rescheduled in order to dedicate the necessary time and resources to short-term delivery. The impact of this will be:

- a. reports back to the North and East Area Committees, to enable them to consider possible uses of the city-wide play provision contributions being added to their devolved funding, are now planned for the second quarter of 2013.
- b. Longer-term project options will be reported back in the second half of 2013. Given the number of longer-term options identified in each area, it may be necessary to focus on a smaller number that local councillors consider to be particularly important for their areas.

## 6. Implications

### 6.1 Financial Implications

- a. Proposals for area and city-wide developer contributions programmes are being reported separately in budget reports to this Committee so that funding for the agreed short-term priority projects can be included in the Council's Capital Plan for 2013/14.
- b. Assuming that the recommendations in this report are approved, this paves the way for spending around £820,000 of city-wide funding in the short-to-medium term and another £185,000 of contributions in the longer-term. The table, below, shows that this would leave around £200,000 of city-wide funding currently available for spending in future. This will be supplemented by the receipt of further contributions accruing to the city-wide fund.

<b>Contribution type</b>	<b>Available funding (Before)</b>	<b>Proposed allocations</b>	<b>Remaining funding (After)</b>
Community facilities	£325,000	£325,000	£0
Informal Open Space	£275,000	£275,000	£0
Outdoor Sports	£250,000	£180,000	£70,000
Indoor Sports	£25,000	£0	£25,000
Play provision	£75,000	£75,000	£0
Public Art	£150,000	£150,000	£0
Public Realm	£100,000	£0	£100,000

- c. The Executive Councillors are asked to note that no specific provision has currently been identified for the running and maintenance costs of new or improved council-run facilities arising from the priority projects. This is not an immediate issue for 2013/14 (when the focus will be on the delivery of new projects), but officers are exploring options to address this.
- d. The situation is different in the case of grant-funding by the Council (from developer contributions funds) to community groups for the provision of local projects (eg, community facilities): The grant recipients would normally be expected to meet the running costs and maintenance costs of its new or improved facilities.

**6.2 Staffing Implications:** The approach to devolved decision-making for developer contributions is based on making sure that the overall programme of area and city-wide priority projects for short-term delivery is manageable and achievable. Staffing capacity has been strengthened by the introduction of the Project Facilitation Fund. Even so, it is important to recognise that alongside the appraisal and delivery of the new developer contribution-funded priority projects, services are also:

- a. delivering around 20 on-going projects funded by developer contributions, which were already approved before devolved decision-making was introduced (see Appendix A); and
- b. managing other contributions-funded grant programmes that are running in parallel with devolved decision-making (including the East Area Community Facilities grants programme and the New Town Community Development Capital Grants Programme).

### **6.3 Equal Opportunities Implications:**

- a. Equality impact assessments will be undertaken for particular prioritised projects as part of the project appraisal process. For now, it is worth noting that:
  - i. all the community facilities projects recommended for city-wide funding will benefit Black and Minority Ethnic residents and people with a disability
  - ii. consultees highlighted the benefit of access improvements (including better/more even footpaths) at the local nature reserves for elderly people and parents with pushchairs.

- b. An initial equality impact assessment (EqIA) of the proposals for devolved decision-making overall was undertaken in December 2011: the key points were included in the report to this Committee in January 2012. Officers are in the process of updating this EqIA in relation to the implementation of devolved decision-making for developer contributions. This will be made available on the Council's website at least five working days before this Committee meeting. Two of the main learning/action points that have already emerged from the on-going review are the need to:
- i. engage more fully with young people, people with a disability and people from ethnic minorities and related community groups. This is about both improving distribution lists for consultations and meetings arranged by the consultation and being more proactive in offering to attend existing meetings held by harder-to-reach groups. (In this context, it is worth noting that Community Development is already working with young people to understand their priorities in a more general way, not just in relation to developer contributions).
  - ii. consider the possibility of using city-wide developer contributions to supplement devolved funding where this is out of step with needs in particular areas of the city. This is already being addressed via recommendation 2.2b of this report.

**6.4 Environmental Implications:** Climate change assessments will be undertaken for particular prioritised projects as part of the project appraisal process. Looking at the overall package of proposed priorities for city-wide funding, however, there would seem to be a low negative impact on carbon emissions, primarily arising from extensions to community centres. At the same time, there could be a positive impact on addressing climate change, primarily through promoting biodiversity and improving access at local nature reserves.

**6.5 Procurement:** These issues will be covered in project appraisals for specific priority projects.

**6.6 Consultation and communication:** Many of the city-wide projects in this report have emerged through the Area workshops/consultations last autumn. Regular updates on project delivery progress on will be provided in reports to Area Committees, via the Developer Contributions web page and via emails to Area workshop participants. Consultation on the specific details of priority projects will take place as part of project appraisals, where this has not already happened.

**6.7 Community Safety:** Community safety considerations will be factored into the design of the new/improved facilities to be funded by developer contributions.

## 7. Background papers

The background papers used preparing this report are set out below.

The following documents can be found on the Council's [Developer Contributions](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106) web page (www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106).

- Planning Obligations Strategy
- Reports on devolved decision-making to the Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 12/1/12 and 28/6/12
- Reports to the area committees providing an update on devolved decision-making and developer contributions following the area workshops: West/Central (1/11/12); South Area (12/11/12); North Area (22/11/12) and East Area (29/11/12)
- List of on-going projects being funded by developer contributions.

The other documents referred to in this report are:

- The project appraisal for Logan's Meadow LNR extension was reported to the Environment Scrutiny Committee on 16/3/12. The one for the Upper River Cam Biodiversity Project was reported to the Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 25/3/12. These can be found via the [Committee meeting minutes and agendas](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/democracy) web page (www.cambridge.gov.uk/democracy).
- An equality impact assessment (EqIA) on devolved decision-making, dated December 2011, can be found on the [Equality Impact Assessments](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/eqia) web page (www.cambridge.gov.uk/eqia). This assessment is being reviewed and updated: once completed (by 11 January 2013), it will be posted on the same web page.

## 8. Appendices

- A. Developer contributions funding towards on-going projects
- B. Area committees' priorities for delivery by March 2014
- C. Updated analysis of available developer contributions
- D. Projects from the 'on hold' list of the Council's Capital Plan
- E. City-wide project ideas arising from Area workshops in autumn 2012

## 9. Inspection of papers

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

Author's Name: Tim Wetherfield, Urban Growth Project Manager  
Author's Phone Number: 01223 – 457313  
Author's Email: [tim.wetherfield@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:tim.wetherfield@cambridge.gov.uk)

# Developer contributions funding towards on-going projects

## Appendix A

	Ward	Ref.	Funding	Due
<b>NORTH AREA</b>				
Kings Hedges 'Pulley' play area	Kings Hedges	SC494	£50k-£99k	Spring 13
Vie public open space (adaptation to entrance following land transfer)	East Chesterton	SC469	£15k-49k	Spring 13
<b>EAST AREA</b>				
Abbey Pool play area facilities	Abbey	SC479	£50k-£99k	Spring 13
Coldham's Common LNR Extension	Abbey	SC456	£15k-£49k	Winter 12/13
Coleridge Recreation Ground	Coleridge	SC544	£250k-£299k	Spring 13
Flamsteed Road Scout Hut	Coleridge	PR026	£100k-£149k	Spring 13
King's Church community centre	Petersfield	PR026	£100k-£149k	Winter 12/13
Mill Road Cemetery Memorial public art	Petersfield	SC432	£50k-£99k	Winter 12/13
Petersfield & Flower Street play area improvements	Petersfield	SC496	Under £15k	Spring 13
Peverel Road play area	Abbey	SC497	£50k-£99k	Spring 13
St Martin's Church centre – phase 1	Coleridge	PR026	£100k-£149k	Winter 12/13
<b>SOUTH AREA</b>				
Cherry Hinton Hall: grounds improvements (phase 1)	Cherry Hinton	SC474	£15k-£49k	Spring 13
Southern Connections	Trumpington	SC548	£50k-£99k	Autumn 15
<b>WEST/CENTRAL AREA</b>				
Hobb's Pavilion	Market	SC512	£200k-£249k	Spring 13
Jesus Green play area	Market	SC492	£100k-£149k	Spring 13

Note: Some on-going projects are also being funded from other sources. Delivery timescales for the last part of the Pye's Pitch recreational facilities project (SC436) and the water play projects (para 5.1) are being clarified.



## Area committees' priorities for delivery by March 2014

Priority project	Contribution	Estimate
<b>NORTH AREA</b>		
Community meeting space at Sikh community centre	Community facilities	£50k
Formalise BMX track next to Brown's Field Community Centre	Informal open space	£30k
Improve Nun's Way skate park		£65k
<b>EAST AREA</b>		
Increase biodiversity at Stourbridge Common	Informal open space	£15k
Improve access to Abbey paddling pools from Coldham's Common		£10k
Install adult gym equipment next to Ditton Fields play area	Formal open space (OS)	£30k
<b>SOUTH AREA</b>		
Conversion of Hanover Court/Princess Court laundry into community meeting space	Community facilities	£100k
Trim Trail/outdoor fitness equipment at Nightingale Ave Rec	Informal open space	£30k
Improve skate park at Cherry Hinton Rec.		£65k
Cherry Hinton Community Centre - stage 1 (at Cherry Hinton library)	Community facilities	£9k
<b>WEST/CENTRAL AREA</b>		
Benches in parks and open spaces	Informal open space	£30k
Access improvements to Midsummer Common community orchard		£20k
Public art element of improvements to the entrances at Histon Road Rec.	Public art	Up to £50k
Community meeting space at Centre 33	Community facilities	£12k

- Priorities are subject to project appraisal and identification of funding for running and maintenance costs.
- In addition to their three priorities, the South and West/Central Area Committees each prioritised an additional community grant (shaded grey) which would be straightforward to finalise.
- Cherry Hinton councillors identified play area improvements (up to £50k) and 5-a-side goals (up to £7.5k) at Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground as their 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> priorities. These will be delivered in the medium term.

## Updated analysis of available developer contributions

This latest analysis was produced in mid-December 2012. Since the provisional analysis of devolved developer contributions (as at September 2012), which was included in the reports to the area committees in November 2012, officers have taken account of:

- a. developer contributions income received in the last three months; and
- b. regular reviews of spending/allocation of contributions to projects.

Allocations have been made for the priority projects for delivery by March 2014 that were identified by the Area Committees last November: these are subject to project appraisal and identification of sufficient funding for running and maintenance costs. Tables 1 & 2 show the 'before' and 'after' positions.

**Table 1: Before Area priority setting for 2013/14**

<i>Rounded down to nearest £25,000</i>	North	East	South	West/ Central	City- Wide
Community facilities	£200,000	£125,000	£225,000	£300,000	£325,000
Informal OS	£75,000	£175,000	£275,000	£150,000	£275,000
Outdoor Sports	£0	£100,000	£150,000	£150,000	£250,000
Indoor Sports	£10,000	£25,000	£15,000	£25,000	£25,000
Play provision	£10,000	£20,000	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000
Public Art	£0	£50,000	£5,000	£50,000	£150,000
Public Realm	£0	£75,000	£0	£25,000	£100,000

**Table 2: After Area priority setting for 2013/14**

<i>Rounded down to nearest £25,000</i>	North	East	South	West/ Central
Community facilities	£150,000	£125,000	£100,000	£275,000
Informal OS	£0	£150,000	£175,000	£100,000
Outdoor Sports	£0	£75,000	£150,000	£150,000
Indoor Sports	£10,000	£25,000	£15,000	£25,000
Play provision	£10,000	£20,000	£75,000	£75,000
Public Art	£0	£50,000	£5,000	£0
Public Realm	£0	£75,000	£0	£25,000

In addition, under South Area, £50,000 play provision contributions and £7,500 formal open space contributions are assigned to 2014/15.

## Notes

1. Sums above £25,000 are rounded down to the nearest £25,000. Sums below £25,000 are rounded down to the nearest £5,000.
2. The outdoor sports contribution type includes available contributions that previously accrued to its predecessor, formal open space.
3. In addition to the amounts shown in Table 2, there is around £115,000 for specific projects stipulated in Section 106 agreements, around £80,000 of which is for a city-wide youth venue.
4. The financial implications of the recommended strategic projects, if approved, are addressed in paragraph 6.1a of this report.
5. Of the £275,000 city-wide informal open space contributions, over £150,000 relates to Section 106 agreements made since July 2006: this can be used to fund those aspects of projects related to habitat creation.
6. Two public art contributions are due to expire within the next 18 months. These relate to:
  - around £71,000 from Market ward (West/Central area) which has to be spent by June 2014 and
  - around £17,500 from Abbey ward (East area), which has to be contractually committed by March 2014.

This is addressed in paragraph 4.6 D and recommendation 2.2a.

# Projects from the 'on hold' list of the Council's Capital Plan

	Project	Comments
i.	Logan's Meadow Local Nature Reserve extension	A project appraisal for £188,000 (subject to resources being available) was approved following report to the Environment Scrutiny Committee in March 2010.
ii.	Upper River Cam Biodiversity Project  See paragraphs 4.6 A and B	<p>A project appraisal for £118,000 of works at Paradise local nature reserve and Sheep's Green/Coe Fen was approved by the Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation in March 2010 (subject to resources being available). The overall cost of this scheme is now estimated as £130,000.</p> <p>Subsequent checks to ensure compliance with Section 106 conditions and the Council's Planning Obligations Strategy SPD highlighted that only informal open space contributions from agreements entered into after July 2006 would be eligible for the habitat creation elements of the projects. As a result, the projects have been placed on the 'on hold' while sufficient funding could be identified.</p>
iii.	Cherry Hinton Hall grounds improvements	The costs of the second phase of the ground improvements are estimated as being £982,000, with £582,000 being bid for from the Heritage lottery Fund. Following an approved project appraisal in January 2012 (reported to this Committee), £400,000 of developer contributions has already been allocated to this project.
iv.	Pavilion refurbishment at Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground	This project (£228,000) is not being considered for city-wide funding as it primarily benefits South Area residents. Although not specified in the Section 106 agreement, the presumption has been that this project could, in due course, be funded from developer contributions relating to the Bell School development.

## City-wide project ideas arising from Area workshops in autumn 2012

Appendix E

#	Project idea	Idea from	Timescale	Need?	Other comments
<b>COMMUNITY FACILITIES</b>					
1	Extend St Andrew's Hall	North Area	Short term	Yes	See paragraph 4.6 G
2	Renovate Abbey Church as community facility	East Area	Medium term	Yes	Very early days in the development of this project idea.
3	Improvements to Cherry Trees Centre (Age UK)	East Area	Short term	Yes	See paragraph 4.6 H
4	Permanent base for 'Make Do & Mend' charity	East Area	Medium term	Yes	Unlikely to meet requirements of S106 funding
5	Centre at St Paul's Phase 3	South Area	Short term	Yes	See paragraph 4.6 I
6	Great St Mary's Church development	West/ Central	Medium term	To be clarified	Primarily a project to improve the existing church. Limited dedicated 'community' use that could meet S106 funding requirements
<b>INFORMAL OPEN SPACE</b>					
7	Green corridor: Newmarket Road to Cherry Hinton Hall	East Area	Medium to long term	Yes	Needs feasibility work, clarify land ownership & consents and engineering solution designs.
8	Turn Coleridge lakes into a country park/nature reserve	South Area	Medium to long term	No	Land not in Council ownership. Would need owner consent, mitigation of significant health & safety issues and discussions/engagement with partners.
9	Improve pathways on Jesus Green and Midsummer Common	West/ Central Area	Short to medium term	Yes	May be funding links with County Council. Some additional funding allocated in Environmental Improvement Programme.
10	Drainage of Jesus Green	West/Central	Short term	Yes	See paragraph 4.6 C

#	Project idea	Idea from	Timescale	Need?	Other comments
11	Cambridge Open Air Theatre	West/ Central Area	Medium term	Possible	Open air theatre included in options for Cherry Hinton Hall masterplan. Uncertainty as to how/whether this will proceed.
12	Meet any funding shortfall for Cherry Hinton ground improvements if lottery funding not secured	South Area	Medium term	Partly	Will need to see how the bid for lottery funding fares. See also reference to the 'on hold' project in Appendix C. This project would also involve play contributions.
<b>INDOOR SPORTS</b>					
13	Indoor urban sports facility	East Area	Medium term	Yes (but not climbing wall)	Uncertainty over deliverability as proposal is reliant on identification of a suitable venue and service provider, and an appropriate business proposition. Indoor climbing is provided for at Kelsey Kerridge Sports Centre.
14	Ice rink	West/ Central & East Areas	Long term	Yes	Officers continue to work with Cambridge Leisure and Ice Centre to identify a suitable site, which is proving challenging. This is one of a number of barriers to moving the project forward; others include the identification of an appropriate commercial partner and an acceptable business proposition.
15	Create a velodrome	North Area	Long term	Possibly	Unaffordable within the available contributions at the city council (Manchester Velodrome cost £24m). Any regional scheme would require national governing body (British Cycling) support, multiple funding partners and a suitable site.

#	Project idea	Idea from	Timescale	Need?	Other comments
16	Develop a professional cycling track	South Area	Medium term	Possibly	See 15, unless the aim for is for more outside BMX/cyclo-cross provision (needs clarifying)
<b>OUTDOOR SPORTS</b>					
17	3G pitch at Cambridge Rugby Club	West/ Central Area	Medium term	Possible	To be financially justifiable and viable, it would need to be floodlit & permit wide range of community use.
18	Upgrade changing facilities at Cambridge Rugby Club	West/ Central Area	Medium term	Unlikely	Need to ascertain additionality regarding wider community benefit.
19	Jesus Green (Rouse Ball) Pavilion	West/ Central Area	Longer term	Yes	See paragraph 4.6 J
20	Initiatives to extend season at Jesus Green pool	West/ Central Area	Short to medium term	Yes	This is being addressed via the specification for the new Leisure Management contract. Contractors are asked to identify how use of the pool could be further developed and the use extended to include more unheated use (eg, for triathlon, outdoor endurance swimming). Items such as thermal pool liners and covers are also being considered to offer assistance with water temperature retention.
<b>PUBLIC ART</b>					
21	Far East POW Memorial (public art)	East Area	Medium term	No	Reliant on identifying an appropriate location. Would need to consult and commission an artist.

#	Project idea	Idea from	Timescale	Need?	Other comments
22	Public art to mark 150 <sup>th</sup> anniversary of the city's role in formulating rules of Association Football and the 400 <sup>th</sup> anniversary of the city's acquisition of Parker's Piece	South Area	Short term	Yes	See paragraph 4.6 D. Would need to consult and commission an artist.
<b>PUBLIC REALM</b>					
23	Riverside public realm improvements: next phase	East Area	Medium term	Yes	Would need to design and procure. A workshop consultee has highlighted the need to consider this project idea in the context of other proposals relating to the river.
24	Improve arterial road streetscape	East Area	Medium term	Yes	Timescales for deliverability depend on the nature and scale of the scheme (to be developed).

The 'need' column is based on an officer assessment of whether there is a strategic need for the proposed projects.

Through the reports to the Area Committees in November 2012, officers undertook to report to this committee two other proposals which are not eligible for City Council developer contributions funding:

- Create a cycleway from the Guided Busway in the north to Addenbrooke's Hospital in the south (also known as the Chisholm Trail). This was raised by both the East and North Area workshop consultations. This is a transport-related issue, which will be raised with colleagues at the County Council.
- There were also requests via the West/Central and South Area consultations for the Council to contribute to the costs of open spaces outside Cambridge (eg, at Coton and Wandlebury) that are used by city residents. This is not eligible for city council developer contributions funding, which has to be used within the city.