

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

REPORT OF: Director of Environment

TO: West/Central Area Committee

5/9/2013

WARDS: Castle, Market, Newham

**DEVOLVED DECISION-MAKING AND DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS:
SECOND ROUND SHORT-LISTING FOR WEST/CENTRAL AREA**

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The second round of devolved decision-making will enable the Area Committee to identify its next priorities for developer contributions funding from the refreshed list of local projects ideas for new or improved local facilities. The second round priorities will be taken forward (project appraisal and delivery) from spring 2014 once the first round priority projects have been completed.

1.2 This report summarises the feedback from the recent consultation, which has informed the refresh of the local project ideas list (see Appendix B). It also puts the project ideas in the context of the devolved developer contributions funding available for the West/Central Area. It is envisaged that the second round selection process may take two reports to the area committee:

- a. this report (particularly the analysis in section 5) will help to whittle down the current list of local ideas to a short-list of around eight;
- b. a further report in November 2013 will help the Area Committee to prioritise around four of these short-listed projects.

That said, there is some flexibility for the Area Committee to adapt these arrangements to fit local circumstances.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 To short-list the project ideas that the Area Committee would wish to consider in more detail as part of a follow-up report.

- 2.2 To consider whether there are any project ideas that the Area Committee would wish to prioritise now (without more details in a follow-up report), subject to project appraisal (as appropriate).
- 2.3 To consider whether any project ideas on the West/Central Area list should be referred to the relevant scrutiny committee (as a strategic project idea) or to another area committee (possibly for joint funding).
- 2.4 To note other comments and suggestions (not eligible for developer contributions funding) made as part of the recent consultation.

3. CONTEXT

- 3.1 Background information can be found in Appendix A. This includes:
 - a. a round-up of projects in the West/Central Area funded from developer contributions in recent years;
 - b. an overview of the first round of devolved decision-making in 2012/13 and the local and strategic projects prioritised so far;
 - c. a summary of the process for the second round that was considered by the Environment Scrutiny Committee last June.

An update on progress being made in delivering these projects was included in the area newsletters last July. For more details, see the Developer Contributions web page (www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106).

- 3.2 Ahead of the second round, the council has recently invited comments and updates on project ideas that were suggested but not prioritised last year, as well as welcoming any fresh ideas. Over 25 replies were received from the West/Central area. These are summarised in Appendix B and an update (including any comments received after the publication of this report) will be provided at the meeting. Other suggestions, which would not seem to be eligible for the existing devolved developer contributions funding from the city council, are summarised in Appendix C.
- 3.3 The West/Central Area list of project ideas has now been refreshed to take account of the consultation feedback. There is now a list of 40 project ideas to consider (meaning that the numbering has changed since the list in the July newsletter). Five fresh ideas have been added, while a few have been taken off the list (eg, Lammas Land table tennis tables has been taken off because that has now happened and energy efficiency proposals for Jesus Green pool are already on the strategic project ideas list).

4. AVAILABILITY OF DEVOLVED DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

- 4.1 Short-listing and priority-setting needs to be set firmly in the context of the levels of developer contributions available for devolved decision-making. The project ideas identified as priorities have to be affordable within the funding already received (in the appropriate contribution types) and not yet allocated to other projects. This issue was raised in the consultation feedback (see point N, Appendix C).
- 4.2 This is important because the task for the Area Committee is not just to identify a 'top 8' (or however many options it chooses to short-list), but also to recognise the varying levels of funding within the different categories and the amounts that different project ideas can cost. It has not been possible, at this stage, to produce cost estimates for all 40 ideas on the West/Central Area list, but these will be produced for the short-listed options to be covered in the November 2013 report. In the meantime, the following examples (intended as a rough guide) may be helpful.

Table 1: Examples of recent project costs by main contribution type

Community facilities	Grants for community centre refurbishment: £80k-£125k Grants for scout huts: £100k-£115k
Open spaces	Trim trails: around £30k each (can be half informal open space [IOS] & half outdoor sports contributions)
Play provision	Depending on their scale, improvements can range from £50k-£100k with, say, 30% for landscaping (informal open space). Recent schemes at Kings Hedges and Peverel Road play areas have cost £80k-£90k each
Outdoor sport	New tennis courts: £90k-£115k Multi-use games areas: £50k-£75k
Public art	Recent local public art projects (eg, memorial artwork) have cost around £45k-£70k.
Public realm	Public realm improvements on Fitzroy Street/Burleigh Street used around £70k of developer contributions. Smaller amounts can also be combined with Environmental Improvement Programme (EIP) funding.

- 4.3 Table 2, below, provides an updated analysis of the devolved developer contributions available to the West/Central Area Committee by type. It invites Members to consider how to distribute their short-listed options (and, ultimately, local priorities) across the contribution types. The reasons for this are as follows:

- a. Each area committee has been asked to set as many second round priorities as it has wards, plus an additional grant-funded priority (to be delivered by a local community group). This is in order to make sure that the overall programme of priority projects across the city is manageable and achievable.
- b. Officers would recommend that the projects prioritised by an area committee draw on a range of different contribution types in order to help make sure that contributions with expiry date conditions can be used on time. Further details can be found in Appendix E.
- c. At the same time, area committees may wish to defer using up all the funding available in particular contribution types in order to leave some for future priority-setting rounds or allow more to accrue so that more larger projects can be undertaken in future.

Table 2 Type	Devolved funding available	Number of ideas listed	How many might be prioritised?	How many could be short-listed?
Community facilities	£300k	6	Up to 2	Up to 3
Informal open space	£150k	13	Up to 2 (+ OSF funds)	Up to 3
Play provision	£75k	4	Up to 2 (+ IOS contributions)	Up to 3
Outdoor sport (OSF)	£225k	6	Up to 2	Up to 3
Indoor sport	£50k	0	0	0
Public art	<£10k	3	0	0
Public realm	£25k	8	Could added to an EIP scheme	0

Devolved contribution figures are rounded down to nearest £25,000

- 4.5 The advice in Table 2 to short-list “up to” three ideas for particular contribution types does not mean that this number is expected in each case. In total, the Area Committee is invited to arrive at a short-list of around eight project ideas.

5. SHORT-LISTING OPTIONS

5.1 The following overview of options under each contribution type draws on comments received from the recent consultation and officer notes in Appendix C. To help identify around eight short-listed options from the 40 project ideas, the Area Committee may wish to:

- a. package some smaller, related project ideas together in order to form larger proposals;
- b. prioritise now some project ideas that are 'ready to go'; and/or
- c. refer some project ideas currently on the West/Central Area list, but which have a wider impact, for consideration for city-wide funding or joint funding with other area committees.

Section 6 provides considers these possibilities in more detail.

5.2 Community facilities options (possibly short-list up to three)

1	<i>Upgrade kitchen/storage at St Augustine's Church Hall [Castle]:</i> Support from local community groups and a ward councillor. Mention of a possible request for further grant later on might be a problem if the Area Committee were to use most of its devolved community facilities funding in the second round.
2	<i>Take over Ferry House for community use [Market]:</i> Consultation feedback does not seem to support this proposal. When the current lease expires in August 2016, City Homes would wish for Ferry House to continue to be used for housing.
3	<i>Great St Mary's Church development [Market]:</i> The £50k grant is ready to go and could be prioritised now (see paragraph 6.3). Some questioned whether this should be considered as a strategic project idea (see paragraph 6.4) but the meeting space that would be provided could prove useful to local groups.
4	<i>Kitchen extension and lobby at St Mark's Church Hall [Newnham]:</i> The scope of the proposal depends on an on-going appeal on a tree decision (the outcome is expected later this autumn). This is reflected in the comments received. Support from local parishioners and ward councillors.
5	<i>Rebuild Newnham Croft scout hut [Newnham]:</i> A mix of views amongst the consultation replies. The current building is owned by the County Council: issues around the lease need clarifying.
6	<i>Develop Memory Café at Newnham Social Club [Newnham]:</i> This can be discounted - not eligible for developer contributions.

5.3 Open spaces (possibly short-list up to three)

7	Noticeboards, seating and nesting boxes for <i>Histon Road Recreation Ground [Castle]</i> : Supported by two local groups. Potential for linking this idea with others as part of a wider package (see paragraph 6.2).
8	<i>Trim trail at Histon Road Recreation Ground [Castle]</i> : Again, supported by two local groups and could be incorporate into a larger proposal. There are some questions around a potential loss of open space to be considered.
9	<i>Barbecue units in parks and open spaces in the Area</i> : A mix of views received about the need for these in different open spaces. Some questions have been raised about whether picnic benches with suitable surfaces for disposable barbecues might be a better idea than paving stones.
10	<i>Bandstand or performance area on Jesus Green [Market]</i> : No replies supporting a bandstand, just queries whether this should be a strategic project idea. A simpler idea might be to provide an electricity supply for the current paved area on Jesus Green.
11	<i>NEW: Open Spaces centre on Jesus Green or Midsummer Common [Market]</i> : Suggested by a local group. Needs to be considered as a strategic project idea alongside proposals for the development of the Rouse Ball Pavilion.
12	<i>Better signposting of footpath to Grantchester from Lammas Land car park [Newnham]</i> : Could be taken forward as a very low-cost option alongside the existing strategic priority project for Paradise Local Nature Reserve (see paragraph 6.3).
13	<i>Resurface Lammas Land car park & landscaping [Newnham]</i> : Mixed views in replies about whether this is a priority.
14	<i>LED lights on cycle path from Barton Road to Newnham Croft/Sheeps Green [Newnham]</i> : Local councillors have suggested that this proposal should be for lighting for the Driftway. Other replies have questioned the need for lights.
15	<i>Install lighting on cycle path across/in middle of Lammas Land [Newnham]</i> : A mix of views, some querying the need.
16	<i>Low-level lights along footpath from bridge over Bin Brook to Gough Way [Newnham]</i> : No replies from local residents or community groups came forward in support of this proposal in the recent consultation.

17	NEW: Widen the bridge over Bin Brook at Cobbetts Corner [Newnham]: Suggested by a local resident to reduce risks of collisions between pedestrians and cyclists. Some concerns raised, however, about the potential loss of important open space.
18	Trim trail around Cambridge Rugby Club for both club and public [Newnham]: Some interest amongst the consultation replies. Need clarity about whether this would be open to the public and whether the rugby club would contribute to the costs.
19	Trim trail at Lammas Land [Newnham]: Not a favourable reaction to this proposal in the replies received.

5.4 Play areas (possibly short-list up to three)

20	NEW: Add a climbing frame and other play equipment at Histon Road Recreation Ground [Castle]: Suggested by a resident, this could be provided at low cost in the short-term.
21	NEW: Add a rope pulley at Lammas Land [Newnham]: Raised by a local group. Could provide this at low cost in the short-term.
22	New play area for Wilberforce/Adams Clerk Maxwell Roads [Newnham]: Whilst there seems to be local support, a specific location still has not been found. Enhancing existing local play area provision could be an alternative approach.
23	Improve Cockcroft Place play area [Newnham]: A local community group and ward councillors are in favour, but getting land owner consent could be a key factor here.

5.5. Sports facilities (possibly short-list up to three)

24	Sport facilities needed in the Area, especially for teenagers: The lack of specific suggestions is note-worthy given the £225k of devolved outdoor sports funding available (of which £190k has to be contractually committed within four years). There is still time, but the Area Committee will want to make sure it can be used in time locally, rather than it being clawed back for city-wide uses.
25	New multi-use games area somewhere in the Area: No specific locations have been proposed in the recent consultation. Officers suggest installing a MUGA next to Lammas Land tennis courts (using developer contributions) and refurbishing the tennis courts (using maintenance monies) at the same time.

26	Resurface Lammas Land tennis court and add basketball hoops [Newnham]: Resurfacing not eligible for developer contributions, as it is a maintenance issue. Local Members have questioned need for hoops.
27	Tennis court and basketball hoops at Histon Road Rec [Castle]: Two local groups would prefer hard surface sports facilities on future developments nearby, rather than reducing open space here. Will be public tennis courts at NIAB site anyway
28	Learner pool at Sheeps Green [Newnham]: A lack of clarity about what was behind the original idea has prompted a number of guesses/suggestions in the recent consultation. Local Members say it seems fine as it is.
29	Floodlights for multi-use games area at Newnham Croft School [Newnham]: Consultation replies queried the need and usage. Would need more information about the MUGA and community access.

5.6 Public art (not enough devolved contributions to short-list projects)

30	Living willow sculptures at Nineteen Acre Field [Castle]: On part of the University's growth site, already covered that S106 agreement. Probably not appropriate to consider this idea here.
31	Ascension Churchyard: public art & discreet signage [Castle]: Supported by a residents' association, but would require Facility permission from the church authorities.
32	Midsummer Common: public art in new orchard [Market]: Could not be afforded at this stage.

5.7 Public realm (not enough devolved contributions to short-list projects but it could supplement EIP funding)

33	More benches on streets & by bus stops across Area: Three replies in support of this proposal. Officers question the eligibility for public realm contributions and suggest that Environmental Improvement Programme funding would be more appropriate.
34	Tree planting on streets in the Area: Three local community groups have supported this proposal. The key issue seems to be not just the capital cost of providing the trees within the limited amount of public realm contributions available, but how the tree maintenance costs will be met.

35	<i>New noticeboards around Windsor/ Richmond/Oxford Roads [Castle]:</i> Support from two local community groups, but this would not be eligible for developer contributions. Environmental Improvement Programme funding would be more appropriate.
36	<i>Supplement the County Council's public realm project for Oxford Road [Castle]:</i> Support from two local community groups, but officers suggest it is too early to consider the proposal. The County Council project won't come forward until it receives funding (2015 at the earliest).
37	<i>Improve pedestrian/cyclist access to Cutter Ferry bridge [Market]:</i> Proposal was not clear. No clarification/support received via the recent consultation.
38	<i>Fisher Square / Passage [Market]:</i> Proposal was not clear. No clarification/support received via the recent consultation.
39	<i>Grantchester Meadows car park [Newnham]:</i> This is a maintenance issues – not eligible for developer contributions. Two consultation replies queried the proposal.
40	<i>Seating for/improvements to corner of Coton Footpath [Newnham]:</i> New suggestion by a Residents' Association. Officers suggest a future round of Environmental Improvement Programme funding would be a more appropriate.

6. TAKING STOCK

- 6.1 Having looked at the 40 project ideas, the Area Committee may wish to consider the following steps before responding to the recommendations in Section 2.
- 6.2 One of the learning points from the first round has been that smaller, related ideas could, perhaps, be packaged together to form more significant proposals. For example, Table 3 highlights those ideas which related to particular locations.

Table 3	Mentioned in these project ideas
Histon Road Rec	7, 8, 20, 27
Jesus Green	10, 11
Midsummer Common	11, 32
Lammas Land	12, 15, 19, 21, 25, 26
Sheeps Green/Coe Fen	9, 14, 28
Bin Brook	16, 17

- 6.3 As mentioned in section 5, a £50,000 community facilities grant for the development of Great St Mary's Church [3] is ready to go. In addition, the sign-posting of the footpath to Grantchester [12] could be incorporated into the first round strategic priority project at Paradise Local Nature Reserve, using around £5,000 of devolved informal open space contributions. Would the Area Committee wish to prioritise either or both of these projects now? (separate from the Area's number of second round priorities).
- 6.4 The consultation feedback highlighted a concern that, in this Area, project ideas to serve essentially a local community are in direct competition for funding with seemingly more prestigious proposals in the city centre which would serve residents from across Cambridge (eg, [3] and [9]). It has been suggested that such projects be moved to the city-wide project list instead. Members are invited to comment.
- 6.5 There have also been suggestions that, where proposed projects straddle two areas or could benefit residents from both, the other area committee could be asked to provide devolved funding too. This has been mentioned in the case of ideas for an upgraded kitchen and storage at St Augustine's Hall [1] and for LED lights on the Driftway from Barton Road to Lammas Land car park and to the bridge [14]. If one or both of these options is short-listed by this Area Committee, officers would explore the joint funding possibilities with the relevant other area committees. (See also point A in Appendix C.)
- 6.6 The Environment and Community Services Scrutiny Committees will consider short-listing options for second round strategic/city-wide project ideas at their meetings on 8 and 10 October respectively. This will include the proposal to prioritise the use of city-wide public realm contributions for lighting for Parker's Piece.

7. IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 **Financial implications:** The importance of ensuring that local priorities are affordable within the devolved contributions available has already been stated. Once the Area Committee has identified its local priorities, these will then undergo project appraisal, which will include consideration of any related running or maintenance costs.
- 7.2 **Staffing implications:** Appendix A also has explained the need to set priorities in the context of the available staffing capacity, in order to deliver priority projects across all four areas, as well as strategic priorities. Following this report, the next steps will be for officers to compile cost estimates and other available information in order to produce brief profiles on the short-listed options, to be reported to the

Area Committee in November. Given the need to ensure that officers can continue their focus on the delivery of first round projects, it is unlikely that there will be capacity available for further detailed research into proposals until after local priorities have been identified.

- 7.3 Equality and environmental impact assessments and community safety implications will be addressed for prioritised projects as part of the project appraisal process. If the compilation of profiles for the short-listed options highlights any particular issues, these will be reported in the report to the Area Committee in November.

8. CONCLUSIONS

We would like to thank all those who took the time to put forward their views in the recent Developer Contributions consultation. The introduction of devolved decision-making has involved a learning curve for everyone. The experience of implementing the first round has enabled officers to sharpen their approach and process for the second round. It is also encouraging that a number of consultation replies have expressed appreciation for the first round local priority projects and the positive difference that these are going to make.

9. APPENDICES

- A. Developer contributions devolved decision-making: background
- B. Overview of consultation feedback
- C. Summary of other comments from the consultation feedback
- D. Specific conditions and expiry dates relating to developer contributions devolved to West/Central Area

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following papers on devolved decision-making and developer contributions were used in the preparation of this report.

- West/Central Area newsletter, July 2013
- Devolved decision-making reports to West/Central Area Committee on 1/11/2012 and 24/4/13
- Report to Environment Scrutiny Committee, 11/6/13

This and other background information can be found on the Council's Developer Contributions web page (www.cambridge.gov.uk/S106).

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

Developer contributions devolved decision-making: background

1. **What are developer contributions?:** When approving planning applications, the council can require property developers to pay towards the costs of new/improved local amenities to offset the impact of development. they are used to create or improve a range of community and sports facilities, parks and open spaces, play areas and public art.
2. **How have developer contributions been used?:** Examples include:

Projects in West/Central Area	Ward	Cost
Christ Pieces: play area refurbishment	Market	Under £25k
Fisher Square environmental scheme	Market	£25k-£50k
Fitzroy Street/Burleigh Street public realm	Market	£50k-£75k
Histon Road Rec: play area refurbishment	Castle	£50k-£75k
Hobbs Pavilion	Market	£225-£250k
Jesus Green skate park	Market	£50k-£75k
Jesus Green tennis courts	Market	£100k-£125k
Lammas Land: play area equipment	Newnham	Under £25k
Sheeps Green Canoe Clubhouse extension	Newnham	£100k-£125k
Snowy Farr Artwork Commission	Market	£50k-£75k

3. **How does devolved decision-making work?:** To give local communities more say, the council has devolved to its area committees decision-making over how some developer contributions are used.
 - a. It applies to the following off-site contribution types: community facilities, informal open space; provision for children and teenagers (for play area improvements); indoor sports facilities; outdoor sports facilities (formerly, formal open space); public art and public realm;
 - b. The funding devolved to an area committee is be based on all contributions from minor planning applications determined by the area committee or by officers under delegated powers and 50% of contributions from major applications from the area determined by the council’s Planning Committee. (The other half is held in a city-wide fund for strategic projects benefiting residents of more than one area: decisions on its use remain with the relevant Executive Councillor following reports to the relevant scrutiny committees).
 - c. The relevant Executive Councillor has 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.

4. What are the main ground rules for devolved decision-making?:

A project can only be taken forward where:

- a. there is sufficient developer contributions funding already available in the relevant contribution type (contributions have to be used in line with the intended purposes agreed in the relevant legal agreement);
- b. there is sufficient officer capacity to take forward the development, appraisal, procurement and delivery of projects;
- c. it is agreed as a priority by the Area Committee (whilst officers may provide advice on the feasibility of project ideas at an earlier stage, it cannot be assumed that these ideas will be funded until decisions have been made by the appropriate committee/councillors).

The council's Constitution requires all projects above £15,000 to be appraised. This happens after the setting of project priorities. Area priorities estimated to be above £75,000 are reported to, and decided by, the relevant area committee. Those under £75,000 are reported to the area chair and vice chair and opposition spokes for sign-off.

5. What preparations were made for devolved decision-making?:

Consultations took place in each area of the city in early autumn 2012 to assess needs for new/improved local facilities for 2012-15. The West/Central Area workshop generated over 80 project ideas. Recurring themes included needs in this area for:

- a. play areas and informal sport provision (eg, basketball hoops), particularly for older children and teenagers;
- b. more benches in parks and on streets, not least for older people.
- c. sports facilities (eg, tennis courts) and new trim trails;
- d. community facilities (including upgrades to existing church halls);

6. What happened in the first round of devolved decision-making?:

All project ideas from the West/Central Area consultation were reported to the Area Committee on 1 November 2012. Four first round local priorities were identified for delivery in the short term:

West/Central Area local priorities	£
Benches in parks and open spaces	£30,000
Improve access to Midsummer Common community orchard	£20,000
Improve entrances at Histon Road Rec. (including public art)	£50,000
Community meeting space at Centre 33	£12,000

In addition, the strategic/city-wide first round priorities (for delivery in the short-medium term), agreed by the relevant Executive Councillors last January, included these projects in the West/Central Area:

- Logan's Meadow Local Nature Reserve extension
- Paradise Local Nature Reserve
- Drainage of Jesus Green
- Public art on Parker's Piece
- Rouse Ball Pavilion.

The first round priority projects are being taken forward alongside schemes agreed prior to devolved decision-making (eg, improvements to Jesus Green play area). An update on progress was included in the West/Central Area newsletter in July 2012.

In addition, the development of the Rouse Ball Pavilion on Jesus Green was part-funded from city-wide developer contributions in the first round (as a starting point for seeking external funding). This project is envisaged for delivery in the longer term.

7. How have project ideas from last autumn been updated/refreshed?

Local people have been invited to give their comments on existing/not yet prioritised project ideas as well as putting forward new proposals. The opportunity was highlighted in the July 2013 area newsletters, which were sent to those who attended last autumn's workshops as well as local residents' associations and other community groups. It has also been publicised via the council's website and Twitter. All replies made before the area committees in September/October will be fed back to the relevant area committee. A 23 August 'deadline' was set to enable feedback summaries to be included in the committee reports.

8. How will the second round work?:

A two-stage process is envisaged:

- short-listing local project ideas (from the updated/refreshed lists set out in section 5 and Appendix C) for further consideration and
- setting local priorities based on the further information compiled for the short-listed options (for West/Central Area on 14/11/13)

That said, each area committee may wish to adapt this approach: for example, by identifying some project priorities in September/October without the need for short-listing.

Strategic project ideas will be considered in a similar way, with decisions by the relevant Executive Councillor following reports to:

	Committee dates
Environment Scrutiny (relating to open space, play areas, public art & public realm contributions)	Short-list: 08/10/13 Prioritise:14/01/14
Community Services Scrutiny (for community facilities and outdoor/indoor sports contributions)	Short-list: 10/10/13 Prioritise: 16/01/14

9. Are there any other guidelines for the second round?:

- a. No short-term time limits are being set for the project ideas that can be considered, allowing area committees to identify projects for medium and long-term delivery. Target timescales for project delivery will be set for individual priority projects when the proposals are appraised.
- b. To keep the delivery of second round priorities manageable, each area committee is asked to set as many local priorities as it has wards, plus the option of another project grant-funded from developer contributions. It is up to each area committee to consider how to distribute its short-listed options and final list of priorities across its wards. The number of options on the short-list could be double this.
- c. Second round priority projects are likely to be developed and delivered from April 2014 onwards, once first round priority projects have been completed.

10. Summary of the suggested second round process

Stage	What it considers	Outcome
Short-listing	Top-level summary of all relevant, eligible ideas. Area committees may have around 30-40 project ideas each	The West/Central Area Committee is asked to identify a short-list of around 8 project ideas.
Priority setting	High-level profiles of short-listed options prepared by officers for the November 2013 report	The West/Central Area Committee is asked to identify 4 priorities (at least one of them being grant-funded).
Project Appraisal	Detailed proposals for individual prioritised projects (probably from spring 2014)	Appraisal approved so that project procurement and delivery can follow

For more information, please see the **Developer Contributions web page** at www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106.

Overview of consultation feedback

1	Upgrade kitchen/storage at St Augustine's Church Hall	Castle ward
---	---	-------------

Consultation feedback:

Windsor, Richmond & Oxford Roads Residents' Associations and Friends of Histon Road Recreation Ground: The Hall hosts almost 30 regular local community groups, a large number of one-off events, and is hired for children's parties & other occasional activities. In practice the Hall acts as the local community centre in the absence of other similar facilities.

There are plans to extend the capacity of the Hall, improve the kitchen and toilet facilities, and provide a new and welcoming face to the entrance, possibly incorporating a drop-in café. These proposals are designed to cater for a proven demand for community space and to enable the Hall to offer facilities to the new community on Darwin Green. An architect has been appointed to help design the changes and to discuss these with local community groups to ensure that their needs are fully met.

The cost, should all the work be carried out, is estimated at about £250,000. This is beyond the reach of the church itself and fund raising will be needed. Without help from the Area Committee's developer contribution fund, it is very unlikely that the work will be able to go ahead. A contribution of £100 000 is requested towards the costs associated with upgrading the kitchen, toilet and storage facilities, and opening up the Hall for a drop-in café or equivalent. All the work would need to be carried out in the summer of 2014 in order to minimise disruption to Hall users. An additional contribution in 2014/15 might be needed but other sources of funding are being actively explored, including an effective fund raising campaign.

Councillor comment:

Councillor Tucker: At a recent Area Committee, I was against the reduction of the grant to St Augustine's, and to Castle in general, and moved that the grant be increased particularly in view of the fact that residents from Arbury (North Area) benefit from such activities at St Augustine's. This should be taken into account when considering these proposals as a positive benefit to a wider area and therefor potential of a cross area budget allowance.

Provisional officer comments: Community Development has been in discussions with St Augustine's Church representative. The church has appointed an architect and is exploring funding sources. There would probably be a capital grant bid of £50,000 to £75,000 and the church would like to have it completed by August 2014, although depending on funding stream they may do building work in phases.

The suggestion that further funding might be needed requires further exploration. This could be a problem if the Area Committee were to allocate most of its community facilities funds in the second round.

2	Take over Ferry House for community use (eg, environmental centre, parent & toddler group)	Market ward
----------	---	--------------------

Consultation feedback: Not specifically mentioned in feedback, although see the suggestion for the Open Spaces centre [11].

Councillor comment:

Cllr Rosenstiel: This is a much-needed council house. Why not continue as social rented housing?

Provisional officer notes: Ferry House is a Housing Revenue Account property and it is on a lease to Cyrenians ending August 2016. Current planning regulations do not allow for change of use of domestic properties to other categories. When the lease expires, we would wish for Ferry House to continue to be used for housing.

3	Great St Mary's Church development	Market ward
----------	---	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

Great St. Mary's Church: We very much wish to proceed with our application for £50k for a capital grant (community facilities contributions). Supplementary information will be with you shortly.

Windsor, Richmond and Oxford Road Residents' Associations and Friends of Histon Road Recreation Ground: Should this be seen as a city-wide scheme? (see also paragraph 6.4 of the main report).

Provisional officer notes: Community Development has been in discussion with the Vicar and a representative from Great St Mary's Church. This project is ready to proceed, with a £50k grant towards their large refurbishment which will provide some community space, which could prove useful to local groups for meetings and small activities. The wider scheme has started and so this could be a very quick win. The capital grant application form has already been completed.

The previous Executive Councillor (for Community Development and Health) considered this proposal for city-wide funding but then referred it to the West/Central Area. The Head of Community Development canvassed West/Central Area Committee members in January 2013 about bringing this scheme forward. In the absence of a view to the contrary, the West/Central Area Committee chair at the time asked that this item should

be brought back to the Area Committee for consideration as part of the second priority-setting round. Ideally, it would be helpful if this proposal did not have to be referred back to the Community Services Committee.

4	Kitchen Extension and Lobby at St Mark's Church Hall	Newnham ward
---	---	---------------------

Consultation feedback:

Newnham Croft Conservation Group: We are concerned that the plans for this seem to entail removal of a mature tree and permission for this has been refused (rightly we think).

St Mark's Parochial Church Council: Firstly we consider that "Kitchen Extension and Lobby at St Marks Church Hall" is a more appropriate description of this proposal. Preliminary plans have been prepared by our architect, covering two alternatives- a "kitchen extension and lobby" or solely the kitchen extension.

The "kitchen extension and lobby" option will require removal of a robinia tree. However this will require permission from the Cambridge Tree Officers. This has been rejected and we have gone to Appeal. Once a decision has been made with respect to the tree appeal, we will go ahead with a cost estimate by a professional quantity surveyor.

We remain keen on the "kitchen extension and lobby" option, as the lobby, possibly larger than presently proposed, could provide a small meeting place for elderly people at selected times, with coffee etc, and would have internet/computer use. The "kitchen only" option is clearly the most important to enable the hall to extend its present community use.

In addition to the response from St Mark's PCC, seven replies in support of the proposals have been received from the vicar and parishioners. Here are some key extracts from the replies:

MG, Vicar of St Mark's: We may well, as a church, be sharing in the Cambridge Churches Homelessness Project over the winter (in liaison with the City Council and other agencies) and providing accommodation for up to 10 rough sleepers once a week, with an evening meal. Because of the state of the kitchen, our hot food offer will necessarily be more limited than we should like. Should the project continue into another winter, and St Mark's continue to take part, this will be another use of the kitchen to benefit the wider community which would benefit hugely from an extension and improved facilities.

AJ: This is the only community centre in Newnham. We provide well-used facilities for all age groups from toddlers to the frail elderly. Our kitchen is just too small for the work we do and we would like to expand our work.

AS: The hall is a valuable resource for Newnham residents and those from farther afield. It hosts a variety of classes in the day and in the evenings. A bigger kitchen would be of great benefit but so too would be improved toilet facilities including those for disabled people and people with babies.

CW: The hall and its kitchen are used for a wide variety of purposes (eg, classes, painting sessions, bridge afternoons, yoga, Brownies and toddler groups, quite apart from parish events). There are, however, severe restrictions on what can be achieved, owing to the very constrained facilities in the small, very narrow and inadequate kitchen. With more kitchen space and better equipment there, the community centre would be able to offer greater services and opportunities for the whole of the local community, such as providing hot meals to the elderly and cooking activities for younger people, like Brownies and youth groups. It would also mean that the hall could be let out for birthday parties, wedding receptions, charity events, and to groups wanting to organize a whole day event, including catering, on Saturdays, when the hall is currently not much used. It would be possible to achieve a wider community outreach to many more people in Cambridge, and not only those in the Newnham area. This would cater very constructively for all ages, with keep-fit classes and social gatherings such as tea parties. Given the poor standard of the present facilities, it is surprising that the community centre is used as much as it is. Helpers have coped so far, because there has been no alternative. Our centre compares unfavourably with kitchen facilities at nearby village halls.

HM & MM: Although the kitchen area is manageable for providing tea/coffee, it is difficult to cater for bigger occasions. It is hard for more than two people to work comfortably in the kitchen area and there are hardly any work surfaces to put things on. An extension to the lobby area would give proper storage for equipment and a more hospitable entrance area.

DH & SH: The extension provides for an enlarged kitchen. We wish to register our strong support for this proposal: to enable meals (in addition to coffee/tea as now) to be served in the Centre; and to provide a more varied and flexible service to the community at large.

SC: The community centre has 2 halls, a larger and a smaller, and both are in use most of the week and at the weekend. It is difficult if the kitchen is in use for serving drinks for one group (such as the mothers and little ones at the Toddler morning in the large hall), and those in the other room would like to make drinks. Hot meals will have to be prepared and cooked elsewhere and then brought into the community centre. Once we have been able to extend and enlarge the kitchen it would be safe and so much better to be able to do this on site.

Councillor comment: Top priority - scheme ready to go subject to permissions (*Cllr Reid on behalf of Newnham councillors*)

Provisional officer notes: Community Development has been in communication with representatives from St Mark's Church for some time. We do not have details re:costs or time frame, as it will depend on what works they are able to proceed with. Given that the tree appeal process can take eight weeks, it is understood that the outcome should be known by the West/Central Area Committee's meeting in November 2013.

5	Rebuild Newnham Croft scout hut	Newnham ward
----------	--	---------------------

Consultation feedback:

RD: Newnham scouts have progressed their ideas. We (as their architects) are working on initial design ideas in September/October. Therefore we hope we will very shortly to be in a position to be considered for funding.

Newnham Croft Conservation Group: We would prefer refurbishment - the hut is in keeping as it is.

Councillor comment:

Cllr Reid on behalf of Newnham councillors: To be investigated.

Provisional officer notes: Community Development has been in communication with Newnham Scout Hut for some time. The scout hut is a county council building. Community Development has approached the county council re:lease conditions, to clarify the length of the lease and also any issues around the building being used for wider community use. We have not been given any information re:cost or timeframe for delivery.

6	Develop Memory Café at Newnham Social Club	Newnham ward
----------	---	---------------------

Consultation feedback: There has been no recent consultation feedback on this project idea first raised in the autumn 2012 exercise.

Councillor comment: No knowledge of this (*Cllr Reid, for Newnham cllrs*)

Provisional officer notes: This is not a developer contributions capital grant project. Not eligible. This is a private members club.

7	Noticeboards, nesting boxes and seating for Histon Road Recreation Ground	Castle ward
8	Trim trail at Histon Road Recreation Ground	Castle ward

Consultation feedback:

Windsor, Richmond and Oxford Roads Residents' Associations and Friends of Histon Road Recreation Ground: Funding from last year's

developer contributions pot has been secured to improve the entrances and install a new table tennis table, which is proving very popular. In order to build on these improvements and widen the appeal of the site: 3 or 4 additional benches and a similar number of nesting boxes would be very welcome, as would the construction of a trim trail and associated exercise equipment in order to encourage further adult participation. We should like to see these measures form part of a forward plan for the Recreation Ground agreed with the Friends.

Provisional officer notes: Project ideas 7 and 8 combined could be a feasible project idea, under £75k and possibly deliverable in the short-term. At the same time, there is already a lot of equipment on the site and there is a question whether introducing a trim trail might constitute a loss of open space and potential conflicts of use. Members may wish to consider whether a trim trail at another park in the Area might be more appropriate.

9	Barbecue units in parks & open spaces	Across the Area
---	---------------------------------------	-----------------

Consultation feedback:

Friends of Midsummer Common: One or two picnic tables and/or fixed barbecues at Midsummer Common have been suggested for the future, but we have not agreed exactly where we would like to see these: we need to wait until we see the impact of the new benches.

Newnham Croft Conservation Group: The Sheeps Green BBQ is overkill and little used - many people actually think it is part of the water filtration system for the pool! Other places have designated BBQ areas with simple paving slabs approx 30 x 50 set in the grass. These seem to work very well for disposable BBQs and are not obtrusive - some of these in the Sheeps Green area would be welcome.

Windsor, Richmond and Oxford Roads Residents' Associations and Friends of Histon Rd Recreation Ground: Not a priority for Histon Road Recreation Ground.

Nineteen Acre Field Residents' Association: 19 Acre Field was one of the sites identified during last year's consultation, although it's not explicitly mentioned in the recent newsletter.

Provisional officer notes: Low cost, but need to be clear about the need for more barbecue units, and how they impact of other park users and wider objectives for the parks. Could look at providing adapted benches with a suitable surface for disposable barbecues that would help to avoid burn marks on grass. Nineteen Acre Field forms part of the (North West Cambridge) University growth site, which is covered by separate planning obligations.

10	Bandstand or performance area on Jesus Green	Market ward
----	---	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

Windsor, Richmond and Oxford Roads Residents' Associations and Friends of Histon Road Recreation Ground: Should this be viewed as a city-wide scheme?: Jesus Green is used by people from across the city.

Provisional officer notes: A bandstand could cost around £80k. There is already a paved performance area (around 6 metres in diameter) on Jesus Green. It is not used much now because it lacks an electricity supply. Making a power supply connection would be a good addition and could be done for under £5,000. This could be part of a strategic project idea.

11	NEW: Open Spaces Centre on Jesus Green or Midsummer Common	Market ward
----	---	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

Friends of Midsummer Common: We would be very interested in the imaginative idea of having an 'open spaces' centre on either Midsummer Common or Jesus Green with a part-time greens warden and space to develop projects and a small cafe, if one of the houses became available. (We recently organised a 'bat hunt' on the Common with the local Wildlife Trust and there is a growing interest in wildlife on the Common.

Provisional officer notes: Would need to be considered in the context of the proposals for the development of the Rouse Ball Pavilion. The new proposal needs to be moved to the list of projects for city-wide funding.

12	Better signposting of footpath to Grantchester from Lammas Land car park	Newnham ward
----	---	---------------------

Consultation feedback (for W10):

Newnham Croft Conservation Group: Would this be through the Nature Reserve to Grantchester Meadows Road? A SMALL sign on the existing post at the entrance might be useful.

Councillor comment:

Cllr Reid on behalf of Newnham councillors: Not a top priority – if needed only one sign at car park, very small spend.

Provisional officer notes: Wayfinder signs along the path could be undertaken for around £5,000 as part of the (already programmed) first round strategic priority works at Paradise Local Nature Reserve.

13	Resurface Lammas Land car park and enhance landscaping around entrance	Newnham ward
----	---	---------------------

Consultation feedback:

MG: The urgent need at this car park is for long-term surfacing work to get rid of potholes and mud in car park and the approach to it (from where the tarmac surfacing on Grantchester Meadows residential road ends).

Newnham Croft Conservation Group: Not a priority. Removing the signs from the footpath would enhance the landscape considerably!

Councillor comment:

Cllr Reid on behalf of Newnham councillors: Not a top priority.

Provisional officer notes: Some elements (eg, perimeter fencing, landscaping, planting, habitat management) could be funded from S106 contributions. Others could be delivered from Repairs & Renewals funding.

14	LED lights on cycle path from Barton Road to Newnham Croft/Sheeps Green	Newnham ward
----	--	---------------------

Consultation feedback:

Newnham Croft Conservation Group) Not sure why this is needed - it is already well-lit.

JS: If this is on or beside Lammas Land, Sheep's Green or Coe Fen, I would prefer it not to have lights. They are wild areas and must be left this way, especially if the locals wish to argue against future development of adjoining areas such as on the Hilton by Doubletree Hotel's garden.

Councillor comment:

Cllr Reid for Newnham councillors: Suggest this should be 'LED lights on Driftway from Barton Road to Lammas Land car park and to bridge': continuation to be considered by SAC please'. Top priority for investigation.

Provisional officer notes: Project ideas 14, 15 and 16 might be brought together to form a single lighting project with a number of parts?

15	Install lighting on cycle path across/in middle of Lammas Land	Newnham ward
----	---	---------------------

Consultation feedback:

Newnham Croft Conservation Group: NO - not appropriate in this location.

JS: I would prefer not to have lights on Lammas Land. It is perfectly easy to walk or cycle round the perimeter of the park at night, where it is well lit, rather than risk crossing it.

Councillor comment:

Cllr Reid for Newnham councillors: To be investigated.

16	Low-level lights along footpath from bridge over Bin Brook to Gough Way	Newnham ward
----	--	---------------------

Consultation feedback: No comments received.

Councillor comment:

Cllr Reid for Newnham councillors: To be investigated.

17	NEW: Widen the bridge over Bin Brook at Cobbetts Corner	Newnham ward
----	--	---------------------

Consultation feedback:

ML: Triple (at least) the width of the bridge over Bin Brook at Cobbetts Corner and the routing of all traffic along Burrell's Walk over the widened bridge to the traffic lights on Grange Road. The rationale for these proposals is that there is a steadily increasing amount of traffic along Burrell's Walk and collisions regularly occur at the bridge (capable of only single file when cyclists are using it) and at the corner on the path down to the bridge. Pedestrians and slower cyclists travelling west along Burrell's Walk have to cross the path of cyclists continuing along the Walk towards the entrance of the Real Tennis Club. Routing all over the bridge would eliminate this risk and also reduce the amount of jay walker crossing of Grange Road.

Provisional officer notes: Would have concerns about any reduction in the size of this important open space.

18	Trim trail around Cambridge Rugby Club for both club and public	Newnham ward
----	--	---------------------

Consultation feedback:

Newnham Croft Conservation Group: Seems a good idea here.

Councillor comment:

Cllr Reid on behalf of Newnham councillors: Need more information.

Provisional officer notes: Could be provided for around £30,000 in the short-term. Could make use of some outdoor sports as well as informal open space contributions. That said, there are some queries about whether the trim trail would have public access or whether it would become just a new training facility for the club membership. If it did go forward, the rugby club would need to contribute to the purchase and installation costs.

19	Trim trail at Lammas Land	Newnham ward
----	---------------------------	--------------

Consultation feedback:

Newnham Croft Conservation Group: NO - not appropriate in this location.

Councillor comment:

Cllr Reid on behalf of Newnham councillors: Not a priority.

Provisional officer notes: Could be provided for around £30,000 in the short-term. Could make use of some outdoor sports as well as informal open space contributions.

20	Add a climbing frame & other equipment at Histon Road Recreation Ground	Castle ward
----	---	-------------

Consultation feedback:

MG[2]: Additional facilities at Histon Rec would be good (the new Kompany climbing frame at the Pulley play area at Kings Hedges is a success, as well as the blue infinity climbing frame at Lammas Land).

Provisional officer notes: Could provide some new equipment within the existing play area footprint for less than £20k for short-term delivery.

21	Add a rope pulley at Lammas Land	Newnham ward
----	----------------------------------	--------------

Consultation feedback:

Newnham Croft Conservation Group: A rope pulley would be a good addition to the play equipment on Lammas Land and could be sited alongside the stream.

Provisional officer notes: This could be cost up to £20,000 and could be delivered in the short-term.

22	New play area around Wilberforce Road/Adams Road/ Clerk Maxwell Road	Newnham ward
----	--	--------------

Consultation feedback: *Newnham Croft Conservation Group:* Yes!

Councillor comment:

Cllr Reid on behalf of Newnham councillors: No site found?

Provisional officer notes: Finding a site has always been the key challenge. Alternatively, existing provision in the ward could be enhanced. Also worth noting that Penarth Place is being improved with Repairs and Renewals funding.

23	Improve Cockcroft Place play area	Newnham ward
-----------	--	---------------------

Consultation feedback: *Newnham Croft Conservation Group: Yes*

Councillor comment:

Cllr Reid on behalf of Newnham councillors: Top priority to come up with a scheme with residents.

Provisional officer notes: The ownership of the land on which the play area is located, and the need to secure land owner consent for any improvements, is going to be an important issue here.

24	Sport facilities needed, especially for teenagers	Within Area
-----------	--	--------------------

Consultation feedback: Only comments relate to sports facilities for Castle ward (see [27] below and point A in Appendix C).

Provisional officer notes: Need more ideas about facilities needed and proposed locations.

25	Multi-use games area	Somewhere in Area
-----------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

Consultation feedback: No specific response or proposed location.

Provisional officer notes: Would suggest location next to Lammas tennis court and refurbish tennis court at the same time (NB need to address tree roots). Could install high quality wooden provision similar to games court at Nightingale Avenue Rec. Ground

26	Resurface Lammas Land tennis court and add basketball hoops	Newnham ward
-----------	--	---------------------

Consultation feedback: *Newnham Croft Conservation Group: OK.*

Councillor comment:

Cllr Reid on behalf of Newnham councillors: Hoops questionable. Resurfacing is a maintenance issue.

Provisional officer notes: Yes, resurfacing is a maintenance issue

27	Tennis court and basketball hoops at Histon Road Recreation Ground	Castle ward
-----------	---	--------------------

Windsor, Richmond and Oxford Roads Residents' Associations and the Friends of Histon Road Recreation Ground: Rather than building hard surface sports and other recreational opportunities (indoor and outdoor) on

the existing Recreational Ground – which would result in a loss of green space - we would suggest that such facilities might be incorporated on one or both of the new sites (Willowcroft and Histon Road [Squash Club]), funded from future developer contributions.

Provisional officer notes: Varying local support. Concern about take up of green space. Would need planning permission. Could cost around £90,000 and be delivered in the medium-term. There will be tennis court provision at the NIAB site between Huntingdon and Histon Roads, which will be open to the public.

28	Learner pool at Sheeps Green	Newnham ward
-----------	-------------------------------------	---------------------

Consultation feedback:

Newnham Croft Conservation Group: What is needed here? We feel the council's 'improvements' have reduced use as the pool is now out of sight and many people do not know of its existence.

JG: Solar panels at the learner pool on Sheep's Green would be good - warm water is important for children who are learning to swim.

JS: Not sure what was requested, but wonder if it was relining. The interior looks cracked and somewhat dirty despite being painted most years.

Councillor comment: Cllr Reid: Seems fine to ward councillors.

Provisional officer notes: The “improvement” was an insurance requirement to have a security rated fence around the perimeter to restrict unauthorised usage out of hours. Consider investment of informal open space contributions to improve landscaping and planting to open up the views into the pool area. Low cost and could be delivered in the short-term.

29	Floodlights for existing multi-use games area at Newnham Croft School	Newnham ward
-----------	--	---------------------

Consultation feedback:

Newnham Croft Conservation Group: Why? This is a primary school. The games area is not used in the evening. It seems unnecessary & obtrusive.

Councillor comment: *Cllr Reid on behalf of Newnham councillors:* Need more info. Query usage and light pollution.

Provisional officer notes: We would need more information on the remaining lifespan of the MUGA and the public access availability out of school hours. It would require community use agreement to secure additional public access. It could cost around £50,000 of outdoor sports contributions and be delivered in the medium-term.

30	Living willow sculptures at Nineteen Acre Field	Castle ward
----	--	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

Nineteen Acre Field Residents' Association: The 19 Acre Field falls within the University's North West Cambridge development, and has recently been the subject of an outline planning application. NAFRA takes the view that no suggestions and ideas from the wider public should be pursued or be considered independently of the main development and that all such ideas should be notified to us via the usual networks. As the part of the project relating to the 19 Acre Field is at a relatively early stage of thinking in terms of detailed design, the notion that ideas such as these should be given any prominence in advance of the worked up design and plan for the site as a whole seems undesirable. We also note that the S106 agreement for the North West Cambridge development already includes a significant "public art" component.

Provisional officer notes: This was included on the list of project ideas simply because it was raised during last autumn's West/Central Area workshop. No problem about taking it off the list now.

31	Ascension Churchyard: public art based on school project and discreet signage to churchyard	Castle ward
----	--	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

Nineteen Acre Field Residents' Association: This is actually a cemetery. We are supportive - but again the public art component is something that would need to be discussed with the church authorities. Better signage to the cemetery is desirable, not least because this is probably the second most important historic space in Castle Ward (after the Castle Mound).

Provisional officer notes: This low-cost project could take time given the need for Faculty permission from church authorities. The signage could be funded from informal open space contributions.

32	Midsummer Common: public art in new orchard, possibly statue of a cow	Market ward
----	--	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

Friends of Midsummer Common: If there is funding for art work within the community then a statue in the orchard might work well.

Provisional officer notes: There are insufficient devolved public art contributions for this idea.

33	More benches on streets & by bus stops across Area	Area-wide
-----------	---	------------------

Consultation feedback:

Newnham Croft Conservation Group: Yes. On Lammas Land.

North Newnham Residents' Association: Need better bins and benches with better & more thoughtful design suitable for a Heritage City. There is nowhere to sit in the Market Square. Improve the market fountain.

JS: At some of the sites (eg, Barton Road bus stop) you have already provided benches. A number of other places were mentioned last year: (1) between Newnham Croft and the Mill Pond (on the Lammas Land footpath); (2) near bus stops; (3) along the river; (4) Queens' Road [both sides]; (5) Grange Road and (6) Barton Road.

Provisional officer notes:

- a. There are questions around the suitability of benches on streets for public realm developer contributions (not really the intended purpose).
- b. Requests for benches on Lammas Land (and other city council-owned land) can be picked up by the current (non-S106) capital project for bench improvements across the city. The refurbishment of existing benches can also use Repairs and Renewals funding.
- c. Benches on Grange Road and Burrells Walk are due to be provided as part of the current Environmental Improvement Programme (EIP). Other proposals for benches on land owned by the county council or privately could also be considered for EIP funding in due course.
- d. It may be more appropriate for the Market fountain to be considered for city-wide public realm contributions, although it is worth noting that there are competing calls for the use of that funding

34	Tree planting on streets	Area-wide
-----------	---------------------------------	------------------

Consultation feedback:

Newnham Croft Conservation Group: Yes. Newnham has lost so many trees in recent years. The three fire hydrant locations in Eltisle Avenue are to be demarcated and planting small trees would have environmental benefits and be welcomed by residents.

JG: Landscaping with tree-planting would be great at the junction of Selwyn/Grantchester Roads where the one-way system was implemented in a very basic/environmentally unattractive way. The way it has been done in the Kite area is much better would be more appropriate in this location.

Windsor, Richmond and Oxford Roads Residents' Associations and the Friends of Histon Road Recreation Ground: The greening of local streets is widely recognised as an important contribution to residents' experience of the public realm, and there is strong support for the planting of appropriate species of trees, shrubs and flower beds as stand-alone measures or as part of a wider streetscape improvement scheme.

Provisional officer notes: The capital costs would need to be within the public realm devolved contributions available. The bigger issues will be agreement with the county council and whether (unlikely) the developer contributions can be used to provide the county with the significant commuted sums for maintenance that will be requested (£504 per tree).

35	New noticeboards by footpaths around Windsor/Richmond/Oxford Roads	Castle ward
-----------	---	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

Windsor, Richmond and Oxford Roads Residents' Associations and the Friends of Histon Road Recreation Ground: There is a clear demand for public notice boards in this area. Extensive fly posting on fencing alongside various footpaths is a strong indicator of that demand. We have identified possible sites and have been awaiting the City Council to come back to us since last year, when it was suggested that funding was more appropriate from the Environmental Improvement Programme budget. Either way, there has been no discernible movement on this proposal over the year, and it is important that this is resolved one way or another. We felt that the cost estimates advanced by the council at the meeting a year ago were excessive and suggest there may be ways of reducing these in discussion with community groups.

Provisional officer notes: EIP funding would be more appropriate. Would not be eligible for developer contributions funding. Would be happy to discuss with community groups.

36	Supplement the County Council's project for Oxford Road with further public realm improvements	Castle ward
-----------	---	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

Windsor, Richmond and Oxford Roads Residents' Associations and the Friends of Histon Road Recreation Ground: (Following general support for tree-planting [34]) An opportunity to trial this could arise from the proposed additional traffic mitigation measures on the Oxford/Windsor Rd link (funded by the University and carried out by the County Council). Should the £150 000 already committed to these measures be insufficient to

complete the preferred scheme, a contribution could be made from the Area Committee. Should that not be needed, there are other candidates locally and we would consult the community on the possible phasing of such work on 2 or 3 other sites depending on the resources available. We are conscious that the £25,000 currently available to West/Central Area for this sort of work would limit what might be possible in 2014.

Provisional officer notes: This is really an issue for the medium term. The County Council's S106 funding for the public realm project is not due from the North West Cambridge development until 2015 at earliest)

37	Improve pedestrian/cyclist access to Cutter Ferry bridge	Market ward
-----------	---	--------------------

Consultation feedback: No written replies received so far. Not clear what was proposed.

Provisional officer notes: EIP funding would be more appropriate.

38	Fisher Square / Passage	Market ward
-----------	--------------------------------	--------------------

Consultation feedback: No comments received so far

Provisional officer notes: Hasn't been clear what the idea was about.

39	Grantchester Meadows car park	Newnham ward
-----------	--------------------------------------	---------------------

Consultation feedback:

Newnham Croft Conservation Group: WHAT is proposed here and by whom? This is NOT a car park and we are very concerned about the creeping urbanisation of this area.

JS: Perhaps whoever put this on the list wants the pot holes filled in. I don't mind them as it slows down the cars making it safer for pedestrians.

Councillor comment:

Cllr Reid on behalf of Newnham councillors: In hand with Project Delivery and Environment Manager

Provisional officer notes: Surfacing is proposed: this is really a maintenance issue, not eligible for developer contributions. Land ownership issues need to be resolved before this could be taken forward

40	NEW: Seating for/improvements to the corner of Coton Footpath	Newnham ward
----	--	---------------------

Consultation feedback:

North Newnham Residents' Association: Corner of Coton Footpath. This is becoming a meeting point for walkers, runners as well as crossroads to West Cambridge. It could do with some thoughtful design for better seating designed that enhances the area. At moment, it's a dull corner based on an engineer's cycle/pedestrian route solution with no thought of rural edge in a conservation area. It needs a discussion but perhaps we can test if this pot of funding could assist.

Provisional officer notes: This could be more appropriate for consideration for a future round of EIP funding. Land ownership issue would also need to be taken into account.

Summary of other comments from the Developer Contributions consultation feedback

This feedback has been passed on to relevant officers. Initial responses available at the time of report publication are shown in boxes.

Castle ward:

- A. *Windsor, Richmond & Oxford Roads Residents' Associations and Friends of Histon Road Rec. Ground:* The provision of sports and recreational facilities (and general community facilities) in Castle is below average, especially for young people. Although development on the University NW site will help, it is uncertain how far the new facilities there will be accessible to residents in this area. The best opportunity to rectify the shortage might come from the proposed residential development of the Willowcroft and Histon Road (Squash Club) sites (identified in the draft Local Plan). There is scope here to include suitable facilities funded from new developer contributions: we should like to emphasise this opportunity. As both sites lie in Arbury, any such proposal will need the involvement/support of North Area councillors. Given the limited number of sites available locally for permanent facilities for sports & meetings, we should like these ideas taken forward as a joint exercise when development eventually takes place.

Market ward:

- B. *Friends of Midsummer Common:* Our priority currently is to get the paths and path edges much better maintained. I am not sure whether developers' money is available for this, but it is an on-going problem.
- C. *MJ:* A couple of years back, we put in a proposal for a Darwin sculpture in Christ's Lane in lieu of the proposed wall of words.

Understand this has been addressed in a specific S106 agreement).

Newnham ward:

- D. *ML:* Parking controls for Adams Road: From before 8 am to late evening, Adams Road is effectively a single lane road that is not wide enough for delivery vans, coaches, emergency vehicles, and refuse trucks, to overtake cyclists safely. Also, during the summer months significant numbers of coaches and double deck buses use Adams Road to access the University Sports Centre. Throughout the year, there are difficulties for vehicles travelling opposite directions to pass because of the lack of passing places. As a result of the blockages and dangers, children on cycles now normally ride along the pavements, often with their parents. This is illegal and a hazard for the child cyclists and residents when driving out of their properties.

Being addressed via the Environmental Improvement Programme

- E. *ML*: The hedges in Adams Road need to be cut back to the property curtilages so that there is adequate pavement width available for wheelchairs, prams, buggies and people with open umbrellas, and the pavements renovated for safe walking. Moreover, some hedges contain briars and in the poor light in the autumn and winter, these are a safety hazard. These improvements are needed to encourage foot traffic (including runners) to use the pavement rather than the roadway - as they do now. Council action is necessary because, in spite of repeated exhortation of residents over the last decade, hedges have been allowed to grow so that in some places the available pavement is well less than a metre.
- F. *ML*: A hedge on Queens' Road also needs to be cut back to the property curtilage. This is a hawthorn hedge that was planted a few years ago with only a few centimetres away from the site boundary. The space between the curtilage and the edge of the pavement is unusually narrow and a spreading sharp-thorned hedge spreading across the limited space is a health hazard.

One of the ward councillors has contacted the ranger for Newnham to look at the issues raised about over-grown hedges.

- G. *MR*: The (mainly) willow trees on Lammas Land and Coe Fen should be tidied up, with fallen branches being removed. I appreciate that some new trees have been planted in recent years and perhaps this work could be extended.
- H. *North Newnham Residents' Association*: Garrett Hostel Lane and the Backs gets heavy usage and not enough maintenance. (NNRA)
- I. *North Newnham RA*: Improvements to Public Realm. Remove redundant or unnecessary poles & signage that blights paths & roads and public realm. We can provide a schedule for North Newnham.

Public realm S106 contributions need to be used to create an asset.

- J. *North Newnham RA*: Need elegant bins designed for edge of Queens Green (not wheelie bins in the centre chained to grotty benches). This grade two listed park and gateway for tourists is in a shocking state.

Forwarded to managers co-ordinating current bin replacement project.

- K. *North Newnham RA*: We have received no answer to repeated queries about the lights now installed at Grantchester Meadows car park.
- L. *JS*: The new benches are much appreciated, but the one by Barton Road bus stop, overlooking Lammas Land, is so low that I wonder if it is of any use to the elderly or those without good quadriceps.

General:

- M. *NH, Disability Panel:* In Florence, every summer one weekend a month is a pedestrian weekend and all vehicles are excluded from the central area. Now, I understand, Bristol does a similar thing. I want to propose that we adopt a similar scheme in Cambridge and close both Mill Road and the Central Area (already restricted) and leave it to pedestrians only (not even cyclists). A day for walking; for children; for the dis-abled; for the more elderly; a day when pedestrians may move as they should, freely and unthreatened by any vehicles at all! Such a scheme can be easily implemented and cheap with supervisory costs being the principal outlay together with signs.
- N. *Windsor, Richmond and Oxford Roads Residents' Association with the Friends of Histon Road Recreation Ground:* Whilst it is helpful to have some idea of the sums available for the different types of scheme, we hope that there will be some flexibility to transfer funding between categories where the demand warrants it and where projects are ready to be implemented rather than where they are simply aspirations.

Developer contributions have to be used in line with the purposes and categories for which they have been collected. It is not possible to make transfers between contribution types. The parameters of how the different contribution types can be used is set out in the council's Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (see the Developer Contributions web page). That said, the use of contributions can be more nuanced than the broad category headings used in the recent area newsletters may have conveyed. For example:

- a. Improvements to play areas can draw on 'informal open space' as well as 'provision for children and teenagers' contributions, where landscaping of the play area is involved.
- b. Sports pavilions can draw on 'community facilities' as well as 'outdoor sports provision' and 'formal open space' contributions if it provides meeting rooms that can be used by the wider community.

- O. *JS:* For once I would like to say how privileged I think we are with the facilities we have in this area. And I would like to campaign for other areas – especially those with a less affluent population – to have the same facilities that we have at Lammas Land (ie, a large area of open park, a paddling pool, good play equipment, toilets, a kiosk selling ice creams and drinks, and free parking).

Specific conditions and expiry dates relating to developer contributions devolved to West/Central Area

In general, most developer contributions collected by the city council are for the provision or improvement of, or better access, to facilities in Cambridge related to particular developer contribution types. In some cases, more specific conditions have been set in certain Section 106 agreements. Here are examples of specific conditions relating to contributions devolved to the West/Central Area (including expiry dates in the next five years).

Community Facilities contributions

- £4,000 to be contractually committed by July 2015
- £2,500 to be contractually committed by March 2017
- £89,000 to be contractually committed by May 2017

Outdoor Sports Facilities / Formal Open Space contributions

- £65,000 to be contractually committed by May 2017
- £128,500 to be contractually committed by November 2017

Provision for Children & Teenagers (play area) contributions

- £2,500 to be contractually committed by December 2016
- £1,500 to be contractually committed by March 2017
- £44,000 to be contractually committed by October 2017
- £4,500 to be contractually committed by November 2017
- £1,500 for projects within 1.5km of a development in Newnham

Public realm contributions

- £9,500 to be contractually committed by July 2015
- £21,500 to be contractually committed by May 2019

Figures rounded to the nearest £500. The list does not include contributions allocated to existing projects/programmes.