

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

REPORT OF: Director of Environment

TO: East Area Committee 12/9/2013

WARDS: Abbey, Coleridge, Petersfield, Romsey

**DEVOLVED DECISION-MAKING AND DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS:
SECOND ROUND SHORT-LISTING FOR EAST AREA**

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The second round of devolved decision-making will help 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, about local project ideas and puts the proposals in the context of the devolved developer contributions available for the East Area.
- 1.3 It is envisaged that the second round process may take two reports, although there is some flexibility for the Area Committee to adapt the arrangements to fit local circumstances. This report (see section 5) will help to whittle down the current list of 36 local ideas to a short-list of around ten: it is a 'stepping stone' to help to focus on the ideas that really stand out at this stage. A further report on 28 November will help the Area Committee to prioritise around five short-listed projects.
- 1.4 The introduction of developer contributions devolved decision-making over the last year has been a period of transition in seeking ideas from local residents and community groups and assessing local needs. There will be further opportunities to develop this approach and the prospect of further priority-setting rounds to pick up emerging project ideas that need some further scoping.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 To short-list the project ideas that the Area Committee would wish to consider in more detail in the follow-up report in November 2013.
- 2.2 To consider whether there are any project ideas that the Area Committee would wish to prioritise now, subject to project appraisal.

- 2.3 To consider whether any project ideas on the East 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 East 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; and
 - c. a summary of the process for the second round that was considered by the Environment Scrutiny Committee last June. In particular, this highlights that second round priorities are not limited to those projects that could be delivered within 18 months. This will enable a wider choice of project ideas.

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 recently invited comments and updates on project ideas that were suggested by local residents and community groups last year, but not prioritised by the Area Committee in the first round. This exercise has also provided the opportunity for fresh ideas for projects to be suggested.
- 3.3 Over 30 responses (many covering a number of project ideas) have been received from the East Area - see Appendix B. An update on any comments received after publication of this report will be provided at the meeting. Other suggestions, which do not seem eligible for the existing devolved developer contributions funding, are summarised in Appendix C.
- 3.4 A number of other local residents have forwarded to the Developer Contributions consultation their responses on the draft Local Plan, particularly comments relating to Mill Road depot and the Howard Mallett Centre. As these proposal sites are still to be tested through the Local Plan process over the next two years, it would be premature for those sites to be considered for devolved developer contributions funding now. The on-going consultation on the draft Local Plan 2014 runs until 30 September 2013: for details, see www.cambridge.gov.uk/draft-local-plan-2014

- 3.5 The East Area list of project ideas has now been refreshed to take account of the consultation feedback. It now features 36 project ideas (the numbering has changed since the list in the July newsletter): 16 fresh ideas have been added, while a number of previous proposals have been taken off the list. In addition to ideas re: Mill Road depot and Howard Mallett Centre, the following are not included either:
- a. improvements to Coldhams Common (also known as Abbey Pool) play area, because they are already scheduled;
 - b. additional sports provision on school sites (a city-wide issue) can be funded by grant schemes, rather than developer contributions.

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 to be identified as priorities will have to be affordable within the unallocated funding already received in the appropriate contribution types.
- 4.2 The task for the Area Committee at this stage is not just to identify a 'top 10' (or however many ideas 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. More information on cost estimates will be compiled 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: £80k-£100k
Public art	Recent local public art projects (eg, memorial artwork) have cost around £45k-£70k
Public realm	Improvements on Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets used c.£70k. Smaller sums can also be combined with Environmental Improvement Programme (EIP) funding.

- 4.3 Table 2 provides an updated analysis of the devolved developer contributions available to the East Area. It also invites Members to consider how to distribute their short-listed options (and, ultimately, local priorities) across the contribution types.
- 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 D. Allocations already made to first round local priority projects and other on-going schemes means that there are currently no unallocated devolved contributions with expiry dates (for contracts to be put in place) before January 2016.
 - 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. Some of the project ideas on the East Area list are still at any early stage and need more time to be developed.

Table 2 Type	Devolved funding available	Number of ideas listed	How many might be prioritised?	How many might be short-listed?
Community facilities	£250,000	8	Up to 2	Up to 3
Informal open space	£150,000	9	Up to 2	Up to 3
Play provision	£50,000	5	Up to 1	Up to 2
Outdoor sport (OSF)	£150,000	2	Up to 1	Up to 2
Indoor sport	£75,000	0	0	0
Public art	£50,000	2	Up to 2	Up to 3 (see para 4.5)
Public realm	£75,000	10		

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

- 4.4 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 ten project ideas.
- 4.5 The feedback from the report to Area Committee last June, that it would be helpful to have demographic and mapping data for devolved decision-making, has not been forgotten. Given the need, first and foremost, to set short-listing in the context of the devolved developer contributions currently available, however, it has not been possible to compile that information yet. In the meantime, Section 10 features links to a range of useful maps on the city council’s website as well as to the county council’s Cambridgeshire Insight web pages (including the ward profiles on its Cambridgeshire Atlas).

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 B. Some of the 36 project ideas are more advanced than others: it has been useful to get an update on how proposals are developing and to get a flavour for which proposals attract interest. As an initial exercise, the Area Committee is asked to go through the list in order to discount those ideas that:
- a. would not be eligible for developer contributions funding
 - b. are not ready to be considered yet and/or
 - c. would not be feasible for some other reason (eg, insufficient devolved developer contributions for capital projects or revenue funding for maintenance and running costs).

Once this has been done, Section 6 provides further guidance for the Area Committee to arrive at its short-listed options.

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

1	Renovate Abbey Church as a community facility [Abbey]: The proposers seek around £250k (of a £500k project) and expect that the project could be delivered within 12-18 months of approval of funds. More details would be needed to assess the feasibility. If prioritised, it could use almost all the devolved community facilities contributions available.
2	Develop East Barnwell Community Centre, possibly with a community café [Abbey]: The county council seeks up to £250k for this potential £3 million development whilst also

	considering its own funding for community hub projects. If the current request was prioritised for devolved contributions, it would use almost all the available East Area community facility funding on its own unless, there is scope to reduce the scale.
3	Develop community meeting space at Barnwell Baptist Church [Abbey]: The church says it is not in a position to do anything significant on this development at this stage, but hopes that there might be funding available in due course.
4	Bring Leper Chapel back into use, with improved disability access and toilets [Abbey]: No comments received from original proposers yet. Community Development advises that the development of this listed building is a longer-term project.
5	Increase community meeting space through phase 2 of development of St Martin's Church centre [Coleridge]: This would be for the addition for a second floor to the west end of the centre. Proposals, cost estimates and likely timescales for delivery are not ready yet. The development has already been awarded £235k from the council for its first phase.
6	Expand meeting space and improve access at St Thomas' Hall, Ancaster Way [Coleridge]: An update from the church is awaited. Discussions on the proposals are on-going. Details re:land ownership, costs and likely timescales are still awaited).
7	NEW: 'Entertainments hub' for Mill Road [Romsey]: This suggestion highlights a need rather than a worked-up proposal.
8	NEW: Extension to Ross Street Community Centre [Romsey]: Up to £70k is sought for better toilets and kitchen facilities and to meet the need for extra childcare provision. Could be done in a year and improve the use of the centre.

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

9	Improve lighting in parks to extend use in autumn/winter months [Abbey]: There are both pros and cons for this idea, as well as practical implementation and running cost issues.
10	Increase biodiversity at Ditton Meadows local nature reserve [Abbey]: The University owns this land and already manages it to protect the natural environment and wildlife.
11	NEW: Outdoor gym/trim trail by Howard Road/Dudley Road play area [Abbey]: Could be taken forward, possibly as a combined proposal with [21].

12	New open space at St Martin's Church by opening garden for community use [Coleridge]: Probably not an open space so not eligible for devolved informal open space contributions.
13	NEW: Opportunity for open space on Perowne Street [Petersfield]: The land could be acquired by the council, but management/maintenance costs not eligible for developer contributions: not viable unless revenue funding could be found.
14	Improved access to Mill Road cemetery [Petersfield]: Not eligible for developer contributions funding.
15	NEW: Update the seat and provide paving at Mill Road end of Cavendish Road [Romsey]: Local support for it. Already adopted as an Environmental Improvement Programme (EIP) project, but needs £8k of informal open space contributions. A further £30k of public art contributions would enable public art to commemorate railway workers. Suggest that the Area Committee prioritises this now.
16	NEW: Outdoor gyms in Romsey [Romsey]: Could be done, possibly linked to [24] / [25].
17	Buy land for new informal open space in 'Empire' streets [Romsey]: Same comments as [13].
18	NEW: Create community garden at corner of Brookfields and Perne Road [Romsey]: Same comments as [13].
19	NEW: Toilets and disabled access for allotments at Vinery Road and Burnside [Romsey]: Not eligible for devolved developer contributions.

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

20	Improve Ditton Fields play area for toddlers/pre-schoolers [Abbey]: Ward councillors support. Now the trim trail is coming forward, could it be the right time to improve the play area too?
21	Improve Howard Road/Dudley Road play area [Abbey]: Ward councillors support. Given the low play value, an improvement could be linked to the provision of a trim trail [11].
22	Improve Bath House play area [Petersfield]: Has attracted local community support. Some proposals already designed.
23	Improve play provision for over-5s (like at Trumpington Rec Ground) [Romsey]: Not clear what is being suggested where. There was a big investment in Romsey Rec a few years ago.

24	Improve Coldham's Lane play area [Romsey]: Two local Members have, separately, expressed their support for more play equipment for older children. Could be linked to the proposal for outdoor gym equipment/trim trail.
----	---

5.5. **Sports facilities** (possibly short-list up to one here - note potential use of outdoor sports contributions for trim trails under [11] and [16])

25	NEW: Replacement of a multi-use games area at East Barnwell Community Centre [Abbey]: There are a number of questions about this proposal. Doubts about this phase 2 suggestion should not count against the phase 1 proposals [2].
----	--

5.6 **Public art and public realm** (possibly short-list up to three)

26	NEW: Development of a public art project for Mill Road Winter Fair [Petersfield/Romsey]: Could be eligible. Would need to know more about the proposal.
27	NEW: Art 'chain' along Mill Road [Petersfield / Romsey]: Not affordable within devolved public art funding currently available. The proposals for public art under [15] would be a good start.
28	Better access for disabled people and elderly people (eg, pavements, dropped kerbs, signage) [Area-wide]: This is a county council highways issue, not one for city council devolved developer contributions.
29	NEW: Improve Cherry Hinton Road streetscape [Coleridge]: Could be funded by public realm contributions but would probably use up/exceed all the available devolved funding.
30	NEW: Traffic calming for Mill Road by open spaces [Petersfield]: Same comments as [28].
31	NEW: Landscaping around the front of the Bath House [Petersfield ward]: Would need to be clear what is needed, likely cost and how much local support there would be for it.
32	NEW: Mill Road would benefit from more public benches [Petersfield / Romsey]: EIP funding would be more appropriate than using devolved developer contributions for this.
33	NEW: Improve public realm along the length of Mill Road [Petersfield / Romsey]: This would cost £3-4 million: East Area has around £75k of devolved public realm contributions. A more specific scheme [like 35] would be more manageable.

34	Improve Mill Road with new entrance archways at both ends and better pavements [Petersfield/Romsey]: Same comments as [28].
35	Create town square (quality paving/seating/public art) by Mill Road Co-op/St Philip's Church [Romsey]: Strong local support for the Town Square proposal from local residents and St Philip's Church. Already being considered for EIP funding, but if the East Area Committee were to agree to prioritise this now for devolved public realm contributions (up to £60,000) this would ease pressures on the EIP.
36	Improve public realm from Coldham's Lane bridge to Sainsbury's (better paving, tree-planting) [Romsey]: Likely to go forward without developer contributions funding as a joint project with the county council.

6. TAKING STOCK

- 6.1 Having filtered the list of 36 projects, there are a number of other issues that the Area Committee may wish to consider.
- 6.2 Some smaller, related project ideas could be packaged together in order to form larger proposals, helping the area committee to get more out of the number of short-listed options and priorities it has been asked to identify. Section 5 has already highlighted the following connections between smaller project ideas.
- Howard Road/Dudley Road Play area: [11], [21]
 - Coldhams Lane play area: [16], [24]
 - Bath House: [22], [31]
- 6.3 Some project ideas that are 'ready to go' could be prioritised now. Section 5 has highlighted this possibility in connection with the Mill Road/Cavendish Road project [15] and the Romsey Town Square project [35]. Whilst the Romsey Town Square project would count as one of its five second round priorities, the same would not apply to the Mill Road/Cavendish Road proposal because the public realm component of this potential scheme has largely been designed.
- 6.4 Given that a number of project ideas in some categories (eg, community facilities) are still at an early stage, the Area Committee may wish to identify some short-listed options now, but decide to revisit some of the project ideas at a future meeting, by which time more information on proposals may have become available from some groups and organisations seeking grant-funding.

- 6.5 The Area Committee may also wish to refer some project ideas currently on the Area list to the city-wide list, or seek joint funding from another area. This was alluded to in the update from those proposing the renovation of Abbey Church as a community centre [1]. Are there any other ideas on the refreshed list to which this might also apply?
- 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. A number of respondents from East Area have voiced support for turning the lakes south of Coldhams Lane into a country park or nature reserve, creating a green corridor from Cherry Hinton Hall to Newmarket Road and improving arterial road streetscapes.

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 (probably from spring 2014), 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 new and improved local facilities, funded from developer contributions, are making.

9. APPENDICES

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

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

- East Area newsletter, July 2013
- Devolved decision-making reports to East Area Committee on 29/11/2012 and 6/6/2013
- Report to Environment Scrutiny Committee, 11/6/2013

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

For the county council's Cambridgeshire Insight web pages see www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/business/research/Social+Classification.htm

The city council's Maps web page (www.cambridge.gov.uk/maps) provides links to a range of maps, including locations of community centres, sports centres and parks and playgrounds.

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:

East Area: completed projects since 2007	Ward	£106 funding
Abbey Phase 3: affordable housing	Abbey	£300k-£325k
Abbey Sports Centre: changing accommodation refurbishment	Abbey	£300k
Galfrid Way: affordable housing	Abbey	£325k-£350k
Kelsey Kerridge Sports Centre: new climbing wall	Petersfield	£75k-£100k
King's Church community centre	Petersfield	£100k
Petersfield & Flower Street play area improvements	Petersfield	<£15k plus other funding
Peverel Road play area	Abbey	£75k-£100k
Riverside: cycle conflict reduction and environmental improvement scheme	Abbey	£200k-£225k + other funds
Romsey Rec: play & recreation facilities	Romsey	£275k-£300k
Squeaky Gate Studios	Petersfield	£25k-£50k
St Matthew's Street play area improvement	Petersfield	£100k-£125k
St Martin's Church centre: phase 1	Coleridge	£100k-£125k
St Philip's Church Community Centre	Romsey	£100k-£125k
The Junction redevelopment programme	Coleridge	£125k-£150k
Thorpe Way Rec Ground refurbishment	Abbey	£225k-£250k

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 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 are enough developer contributions already available in the relevant contribution type (contributions have to be used in line with the intended purposes agreed in the related legal agreements);

The parameters of how the different contribution types can be used are set out in the council's Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document. It is not possible to make transfers between contribution types. That said, some projects can make use of more than one contribution type. 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'/'formal open space' contributions if it provides meeting rooms that can be used by the wider community.

- 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 East Area workshop generated over 50 project ideas. Recurring themes included needs in this area for:

- a. more community facilities and meeting space;
- b. improvements to play areas;
- c. improvements to streetscapes and public realm;
- d. better access for people in wheelchairs and people with pushchairs;
- e. more open space (where possible, as part of new developments) and improvements to existing open spaces.

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

All project ideas from the East Area consultation were reported to the Area Committee on 29 November 2012. Three first round local priorities were identified at that time (for delivery in Spring 2014) with the fourth added last June (for delivery in late 2014).

Increase biodiversity at Stourbridge Common	£15k
Improve access to Abbey paddling pool from Coldham's Common	£10k
Install adult gym equipment next to Ditton Fields play area	£30k
St Thomas' Square play area improvement (delivery in late 2014)	£50k

The strategic first round priorities (for delivery in the short-medium term), agreed by Executive Councillors last January, included the refurbishment of the Cherry Trees Centre (Petersfield ward). An update on progress was included in the East Area newsletter in July 2013. The first round priority projects are being taken forward alongside the following schemes agreed prior to devolved decision-making:

Stanesfield road scout hut	£100k
Abbey Pool play area facilities	£75k-£100k
Abbey paddling pool water play	£175k-£200k
Coldham's Common LNR Extension (awaiting feedback on proposed revisions to scheme)	£25k-£50k
Coleridge Recreation Ground	£275k-£300k
Coleridge paddling pool – water play project	£125k-£150k
Flamsteed Road Scout Hut	£100k-£125k
Mill Road Cemetery Memorial public art	£50k-£75k
St Martin's Church centre: phases 1 and 1b	£225k-£250k

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, as set out in paragraph 1.3 of the main report. Each area committee may wish to adapt this approach (eg, 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 they 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, appraised and delivered from April 2014 onwards, once first round priority projects have been completed.

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

Overview of consultation feedback

1	Renovate Abbey Church as a community facility	Abbey ward
---	--	-------------------

Consultation feedback:

TE: The project is still progressing, although slowly recently. We estimate that the project will cost approximately £500k. We are not sure what the upper limit of council provision is, but would like to request around £250k from the council. There are other funds available for general renovation of churches and refund of VAT for renovation of churches. Timescales are very dependent on getting an indication of available funding, but we would expect it to take around 12-18 months between approval of funds and completion of the work. We can see that the Abbey Church is a somewhat unique site in an area undergoing significant development but lacking in community facilities. I hope that the East Area committee (and potentially the neighbouring area committee) is able to support us in developing the provision in this area.

VT: We would like plans for this to go ahead.

KJ: Good idea – any possible access from Beche Road? Could serve Riverside community lacking community facilities.

Provisional officer notes: Awaiting outline proposal. Would need to be clear what services the facility would provide, how this would meet local need and how its running costs would be funded. Would also need to check assumptions about delivery timescales given the likely needs facing the project for further fund-raising, planning permission and any Faculty that might be needed from church authorities. The current request of £250k from the council would use up pretty much all the devolved developer contributions available.

2	Develop East Barnwell Community Centre, possibly with a community café	Abbey ward
---	---	-------------------

Consultation feedback:

HH, Community Hub Project, County Council: The county council's community hub project seeks a contribution of £250k to fund the development of community facilities within the proposed East Barnwell community hub as phase 1 of the development. See also [25] which covers second phase proposals (for which £200k of sports funding is also being requested), for a fit-for-purpose sport facility on the current MUGA site (indoor or outdoor, dependent on budget). The overall costs of this proposal are estimated to be over £3 million.

The overall Community Hub initiative aims to create flexible spaces where residents can access facilities, information and advice provided by organisations who share the same local customer base. This particular proposal would be to renovate and extend existing buildings to improve community facilities within East Barnwell, including community halls, meeting rooms for hire and a community café. The hub would aim to accommodate community centre users (existing and future), See Saw playgroup (to address shortfall in local childcare provision), Barnwell Road library, youth centre / youth space and provide a potential local base for the Children and Young People's Service. Decisions on county council funding for the Community Hub initiative overall are expected in this autumn, with a decision on the programme by the end of the year.

VT: Would like this. The area needs a community centre and a post office.

KJ: Area badly needs new community facilities. This is an excellent idea.

Provisional officer notes: The county council owns the centre. On-going discussions continue. Further information on the preferred option, likely timing and costs is awaited. A request for £250k would use up the lion's share of the East Area's devolved community facilities funding. Officers will want to explore alternative options that might enable support for a wider range of community facilities in the Area in future. The revenue funding implications of the refurbished community centre would also need to be understood more fully. The key features of the proposed scheme have developed over time: some possible features mentioned previously have not been emphasised in the recent update from the county council.

3	Develop community meeting space at Barnwell Baptist Church	Abbey ward
----------	---	-------------------

Consultation feedback:

Barnwell Baptist Church: The Baptist Church and East Barnwell Community Centre are both in need of improvements. Barnwell Baptist Church is keen to see a development but we are not in a position at this stage to do anything significant. Helping improve the facilities for the short-medium term is really helpful. We do hope that there may still be funding available down the line when Barnwell does need the money for a re-build!

VT: We would like these plans to go ahead.

KJ: Good idea again.

Provisional officer notes: A small grant of £3,500 already agreed for improvements to the community kitchen. Awaiting plans for major improvements. Possibly a longer term project.

4	Bring Leper Chapel back into use, with improved disability access and toilets	Abbey ward
----------	--	-------------------

Consultation feedback: No comments yet from original proposers.

AL: This has my vote for needed amenities.

KJ: Leper Chapel would really benefit from water supply/toilets for events and, in time, disabled access.

Provisional officer notes: Potential long-term project. Leper Chapel is already in use, but could be better utilised if improvement works took place. Timeframe depends on funding and desired improvement works. Please note that this is a listed building.

5	Increase community meeting space through phase 2 of development of St Martin's Church centre	Coleridge ward
----------	---	-----------------------

Consultation feedback:

St Martin's Church: We continue to seek funding to allow this to happen. As well as increasing capacity it also has a significant potential to increase flexibility. However, we are unable to find a source of funding which will provide the significant lump sum needed to enable the addition of a second floor to the West end. It is not feasible to break this down into small phases: it does have to be completed as a single element of work.

Provisional officer notes: £235k already awarded for Phase 1a (complete) and Phase 1b (due for completion by end of 2013). Will continue to liaise with the church over its phase 2 community centre plans.

6	Expand meeting space and improve access at St Thomas' Hall, Ancaster Way	Coleridge ward
----------	---	-----------------------

Consultation feedback:

KJ: Good position for community facility in that area so improvements would be welcome (by allotment site borders existing centre).

Provisional officer notes: Have met stakeholders to discuss possible grant. Awaiting outcome of their next committee meeting. Timeframe depends on land ownership issue, funding & desired improvement works.

7	NEW: 'Entertainments hub' for Mill Road	Romsey ward
----------	--	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

EJ: Mill Road and Romsey needs an 'entertainments hub' to provide a range of table, board, card type games for all age ranges from 18 upwards.

No loud obtrusive sound or lighting needed. Just gentle background music from a multitude of worldwide sources. A place where all ages from all backgrounds, religions and cultures living in the Mill Road area, can meet and mingle. Parking provided for bicycles only.

Provisional officer notes: This needs to be set in the context of existing community facilities in the locality, not least those recently grant-funded.

8	NEW: Extension to Ross Street Community Centre	Romsey ward
----------	---	--------------------

There are issues around access to toilets and kitchen facilities when all rooms at the centre are in use: this restricts flexibility of the centre. County council data shows strong demand for more childcare space in the area

Provisional officer notes: Plans are being worked up for a small extension to the main entrance to provide additional toilets, kitchenette and enlarged childcare space. Negotiations underway with childcare provider but depends upon increased space. Extension would improve the flexibility and use of the centre and help to achieve increased income and improved viability. Aim would be to complete the extension by end of August 2014 (subject to planning and building control approvals). Indicative costs are £50 to £70k. Supported in principle by Exec Councillor and Labour Spokes.

9	Improve lighting in parks to extend use in autumn/winter months	Abbey ward
----------	--	-------------------

Consultation feedback:

KJ: Restrict new lighting to just main thoroughfares – already too much night pollution in cities.

Provisional officer notes: Lighting may be seen by some as improving park use and safety, but by others as extending use after dark, which could result in anti-social behaviour. Any installation would require planning application and, possibly, Section 38 approval. A revenue neutral option would need to be sought.

10	Increase biodiversity at Ditton Meadows local nature reserve	Abbey ward
-----------	---	-------------------

Consultation feedback:

KJ: Biodiversity improvements welcomed – wildlife corridors so useful for many species especially if species that otherwise have to cross busy roads, like hedgehogs and small mammals.

Provisional officer notes: This is not a local nature reserve, but University-owned land that is already managed (in good condition) to protect the natural environment and wildlife. Half this land is not in the city and would not be eligible for devolved developer contributions. It is also worth noting that biodiversity improvements at Stourbridge Common are being taken forward as a first round local priority project.

11	NEW: Outdoor gym/trim trail at Howard Road/Dudley Road	Abbey ward
----	---	-------------------

Consultation feedback: Not raised by consultation but in response to councillor comments under [21].

Provisional officer notes: A trim trail or outdoor gym could be provided, funded from informal open space and outdoor sports contributions. Would need to be clear which site was being proposed in order to assess any particular implications.

12	New open space at St Martin's Church by opening up garden for community use	Coleridge ward
----	--	-----------------------

Consultation feedback:

St. Martin's Church: We have included the potential use of the garden with our premises hire charges listing in conjunction with the lounge (ie, the garden is available for public hire when booked with the lounge but only at evenings and weekends when the Centre is not using the Lounge). The principle obstacle to further use of the garden is the lack of separate access to the garden. Currently, it is only via the Centre and there does not appear to be any easy alternative. We are also unclear as to what facility is required or appropriate.

KJ: Would welcome.

Provisional officer notes: Not an open space and would therefore not be eligible for devolved informal open space developer contributions.

13	NEW: Opportunity for open space on Perowne Street	Petersfield ward
----	--	-------------------------

Consultation feedback:

FG: There are derelict buildings on Perowne Street close to the junction with Mill Road. The site is small, about 20-25 metres long and backs onto Ditchburn Place. It is an eyesore and there have never been any plans of its development. A local resident has suggested that this site be purchased and turned into a small pocket park. It already contains a number of trees that could be preserved.

Provisional officer notes: It is possible that this privately owned land could be compulsorily purchased. Note, however, that any exploratory costs that did not lead to acquisition could not be funded from developer contributions. The maintenance and management of a new open spaces would also present long-term revenue implications.

14	Improved access to Mill Road cemetery	Petersfield ward
-----------	--	-------------------------

Consultation feedback: *KJ:* Would welcome.

Provisional officer notes: Sounds like a maintenance and repair issue rather than one that could be funded from developer contributions. Faculty approval for churches authorities would also be needed.

15	NEW: Update the seat & provide paving at the Mill Road end of Cavendish Road	Romsey ward
-----------	---	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

DB: This may also be a good place to provide a substantial street art to commemorate the railway workers who lived in and around the area.

AS: The small patch of land at the junction of Cavendish & Mill Roads needs renovating. only ever seems to attract yet more street drinkers.

Provisional officer notes: This project is already adopted on the EIP (£15k EIP funding assigned). The public realm improvements are already largely designed, but it needs a further £8k. In addition, the proposals for public art to mark railway workers (which is also mentioned under [35] (not least by CS/AS) could also be incorporated into this scheme here, where there may be more room. In order to tie in with decisions on the Environmental Improvement Programme at the 12 September meeting, it is suggested that the East Area Committee prioritises now £8k of 'informal open space' and £30k 'public art' contributions.

16	NEW: Outdoor gyms in Romsey	Romsey ward
-----------	------------------------------------	--------------------

Consultation feedback: Suggestion made by DB.

Provisional officer notes: This could be feasible, funded from informal open space & outdoor sports contributions. Would need to be clear which site was being proposed in order to assess any particular implications.

17	Buy land for new informal open space in 'Empire' streets	Romsey ward
-----------	---	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

DB: Buying land for an informal space towards the bottom end of Mill Road seems a good idea. It could form a meeting place for Romsey residents.

KJ: Welcome if room – perhaps annexe former unwanted/unused Hollands garage site on Mill Road between Brookfields Hospital and the new mosque. Would make fantastic urban green space or woodland. Could involve local groups like Romsey Garden Club and Cambridge Transition. Perhaps a community orchard.

Provisional officer notes: Same comments as 13.

18	NEW: Create community garden at the corner of Brookfields and Perne Road	Romsey ward
-----------	---	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

IdW: At the corner of Brookfields and Perne Road, opposite the Brooke Pub, there is a strip of land that looks uncared for. It would be nice to tidy this bit of land up, remove fencing on Perne Road, erect suitable rear fencing, establish or maintain garden, possibly a bench. Cambridge cycling campaign is keen to see the entry of Brookfields to Burnside look more welcoming for cyclists as it is an important cycle route to Cherry Hinton and perhaps tidying up this area could contribute to this concept.

Provisional officer notes: Same comments as 13.

19	NEW: Toilets and disabled access for allotments at Vinery Road and Burnside	Romsey ward
-----------	--	--------------------

Consultation feedback: Suggested by *PH*.

Provisional officer notes: This would not qualify for devolved developer contributions. Public conveniences were provided using developer contributions funding at Romsey Recreation Ground, Vinery Road in 2012.

20	Improve Ditton Fields play area for toddlers/ pre-school children	Abbey ward
21	Improve Howard Road/Dudley Road play area	Abbey ward

Councillor comment:

Cllr Johnson: Ditton Fields is an area scores poorly in the Cambridge index of relative deprivation. It requires additional attention in providing appropriate facilities to help address the comparative disadvantage faced. The Ditton Fields recreation ground is well used but residents and families with young children have said that it lacks appropriate play equipment, particularly for those under five. Addressing this need would provide a real boost to the local community, and address a disparity the area has compared to other parts of Abbey and East Cambridge.

Both schemes: Data shows the number of children in Abbey is high compared to other East Area wards: a demand for appropriate play exists.

Howard/Dudley Road: The recreation ground is again very popular. The green space is often a place for community events during the summer months and the play equipment is used all year round. Residents have also given their support to improved play. The Dudley Road area (encompassing Ekin Road and parts of Howard Road) score poorly in indexing so the community need for good-quality, modern equipment to address disadvantage and meet the demand (as reflected in county council data) that also exists.

Cllr Hart: Abbey Councillors fully endorse Cllr Johnson’s response. I would add that at the East Area Committee when the first tranche of projects were decided, my view was that a decision should be made on Ditton Fields under 5’s provision once the consultation on Ditton Fields Trim Trail had been completed so the two projects could complement each other.

Provisional officer notes for [20]: There are opportunities for improvement here. The issue is going to be what is affordable within the current levels of devolved funding (which includes the city-wide supplementary contributions). Even with informal open space contributions for landscaping, there is probably only enough to fund one play area improvement out of the five suggested.

Provisional officer notes for [21]: As notes for [20], but would add that Howard Road/Dudley Road play area rates ‘low’ in play value and is in need of renovation. Other activities such outdoor gym equipment or a basketball ball hoop could be considered here.

22	Improve Bath House play area	Petersfield ward
-----------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------

Consultation feedback:

GB, Lifecraft: Our charity has accommodation in the Bath House adjacent to the play area. The play area is run down at present. Lifecraft wishes to see it upgraded to provide an attractive garden with seating and new play equipment for the local community in the area around Mill Road and Gwydir Street and for Lifecraft’s members. We believe that renovating the play area will increase its use by the local community and our members as a place to relax and for children to play. Although we have employed a garden designer to provide ideas and a plan, we will be consulting some of the local community groups. We would also, ideally, wish the members of our Gardening Club to have the opportunity to assist with maintaining the new garden. We, therefore, hope that this project will be given priority.

AS: This playground is so hazardous I believe it should be closed or renovated with immediate effect. My two year old loves playgrounds and I reluctantly take her there. We’re faced with human faeces, vomit, broken glass and crumbling, dangerous brickwork. Myself and a local mum have to stand over sick/glass to make sure our children don’t wander into danger.

JG: I would like to put forward the tidying up and greening of the neglected play area adjacent to the Bath House, Gwydir Street [JG]

AL: This has my vote for needed amenities [AL]

Provisional officer notes: A scheme has been designed and costed. If this proposal were to be short-listed, further discussions on the existing designs would be useful. The notes under [20] also apply here.

23	Improve play provision for over-5s in Romsey (as at Trumpington Rec Ground)	Romsey ward
----	---	-------------

Consultation feedback: DB: Any improvement to play areas, including outdoor gyms (see [16]), are always going to be welcome.

Provisional officer notes: Need to be clear which specific play area(s) are being proposed here. Almost £300k was invested in recreation and play improvements at Romsey Rec Ground only a few years ago. The reference to the play equipment at Trumpington Recreation Ground probably relates to solar-powered electronic play. The higher replacement fund costs associated with this equipment (not from developer contributions) need to be taken account. See [20].

24	Improve Coldhams Lane play area	Romsey ward
----	---------------------------------	-------------

Consultation feedback:

AB: Improvements & landscaping should match those proposed for Abbey Pool play area, with imaginative materials sympathetic to the surroundings of the common rather than the very metallic structures there now.

DB: The potential improvements here seem very appropriate.

Councillor comments:

Cllr Moghadas: I would like Coldhams Lane playground to be refurbished to a high standard with play provision for older children as well as the under fives. There have been significant house builds in this area of Romsey yet little evidence of the S106 money generated benefitting this part of the community. The planning application for a housing estate in Cromwell Road, having been rejected on the grounds of concern regarding the open space provision in the plan, was passed by the inspectorate citing the proximity of Coldhams Common. If Coldhams Common is to increase its usage as play space the need for a quality children's play area is needed. It is a fairly unsightly, uninviting play space as it stands at present!

Cllr Smart: I have always felt that the play area on the Coldham's Lane edge of Coldham's Common is a good place for play equipment for the older children as there are only a few houses nearby. I would like a review of the equipment there and consider whether we can provide more. It is

difficult to see where else equipment for the older children can be placed in Romsey except there and on the Rec - which was redone a few years ago

Provisional officer notes: See notes under [20]. Could be linked to the suggestion of outdoor gym equipment/trim trails in Romsey.

25	NEW: Replacement of a multi-use games area at East Barnwell Community Centre	Abbey ward
-----------	---	-------------------

Consultation feedback:

HH, Community Hub Project, County Council: East Barnwell Community Centre seeks a contribution of £200k to fund the re-provision of an multi use games area A multi-use games area is currently situated at the rear of the site, however it is not fit for purpose as the surface is non-porous and subsequently slippery when wet, and is too small to be used for competitive sports such as 5-a-side and netball.

Provisional officer notes: This new suggestion relates to the proposed second phase of the East Barnwell Community Centre community centre (see [2] above). Any consideration of city council devolved developer contributions would need clear indication of:

- a. how was the existing MUGA funded?
- b. if the county council seeks to demolish it, should it not fund the replacement?
- c. what are the views of young people regarding the actual need for tarmac multi games court?
- d. what is the likelihood of planning permission given proximity to houses?
- e. who would own the new one and be responsible for repairs and maintenance?

Since the existing MUGA was built around 15 years ago, a new open access, floodlit, all-weather pitch has been created at Abbey adjacent to children's play area. There is also the possibility of a MUGA at the Wing development too. The request by the county council for £200k seems very high given that MUGAs elsewhere in the city have cost around £80k-100k.

26	NEW: Development of a public art project for Mill Road Winter Fair	Petersfield / Romsey wards
-----------	---	-----------------------------------

Consultation feedback:

CL: Development of a public art project for Mill Road Winter Fair – this could be a more ephemeral project like a light or sound installation. Again we can involve local community groups and art spaces in the development of a more detailed proposal. CL, Mill Road].

Provisional officer notes: A temporary installation like this could be eligible for public art developer contributions, provided that it could leave some sort of legacy. Would need to know more.

27	NEW: Art ‘chain’ along Mill Road	Petersfield / Romsey wards
----	---	-----------------------------------

Consultation feedback:

SJ: I would like to see an art “chain”/walk along Mill Road – various works of art along Mill Road at different intervals and on both sides of the bridge – perhaps celebrating the history of the area (eg railway worker outside the Co-op, a mother and baby outside the old maternity hospital, foundry worker or similar near the location of one of the old foundries, people queuing to use the old bath house, etc. These works of arts need not all be statues, we could have a variety of different media – eg pebble pictures in the pavement (in places where they won’t be dug up), tile pictures on walls, etc. We already have the bathers outside the swimming pool so this could be the starting point. It need not all be done at the same time, this could be planned forward so that S106 money can be allocated to various items in the future so that the collection along Mill Road is added to over the next few years. This would ensure that money is spent in both Romsey and Petersfield, and many of the people from the other EAC wards come to Mill Road as well so that they would also get the benefit.

Oblique Arts: We would like to declare an interest in developing creative ideas around the delivery of on-street improvements to the environment of Mill Road using funding from developer contributions. We are a small arts charity with around 20 creative members who have a range of skills including sculpture, public installation and project management. We are well connected with other creative organizations in the area and supported in terms of funding by the city and county councils. This support has allowed us to deliver arts projects with diverse and exciting outcomes. We work with communities and address environmental concerns within a unique socially engaged artistic practice. Please see our website for full details at www.obliquearts.co.uk. We would wish to access the fund in order to allow for the development of ideas that build upon Mill Road’s reputation within Cambridge. Using the following headings we would like to investigate the possibility of providing areas of unique creative inspiration for the street that may transform it into a living street gallery with striking art works, artistic interventions and engaging street furniture.

EJ: I'd like to mention an idea to add to the atmosphere of Mill Road and particularly Romsey. Linking in to the history of Romsey Town through the strategic placement of 'wall paintings' on pine ends of buildings in the immediate area (the traces of previous wall advertising paintings can still be seen here), each depicting an historical scene from , say Victorian

Romsey as a 'Railway Town', would enhance the significance of this area and make it much more interesting to visit, in my opinion. Some of these scenes could perhaps be made in the form of mosaics similar to ones found in areas of Spain and Italy. All of these scenes, wall paintings and mosaics, could be the work of local artists and/or artisans. Visitors to the area could be issued with fliers giving a brief history of the area and invited to find various scenes from clues provided?

Councillor comment:

Councillor Saunders: (in response to SJ's comments): I'm very drawn to the idea of a number of works along the length of Mill Road on a historical theme. This could easily be informed by the History Project as it develops. I like the suggestion of using differing media (rather than just freestanding sculpture), e.g. the shadow of a queue waiting at the Bathhouse.

Provisional officer notes: To do something up and down Mill Road would cost more than the £50k devolved funding available. A sensible approach would be to start with incorporating railway worker public art proposal into Mill Road/Cavendish Road project [15].

28	Better access for disabled and elderly people (eg, pavements, dropped kerbs, signage)	Area-wide
----	--	------------------

Consultation feedback: No comments received so far, but expect to receive comments from the Disability Panel in early September.

Provisional officer notes: This is a county council highways issues, not one for city council devolved developer contributions.

29	NEW: Improve Cherry Hinton Road streetscape	Coleridge ward
----	--	-----------------------

Provisional officer notes: This idea was suggested at the South Area workshop last autumn. On one stretch of footpath along Cherry Hinton Road, there is tarmac rather than paving stones, with no pavement or greenery. Whilst this could be funded from public realm developer contributions, it could cost in the region of £50k-£100k (East Area has around £75k of evolved public realm funding available).

30	NEW: Traffic calming for Mill Road by open spaces	Petersfield ward
----	--	-------------------------

Consultation feedback:

CdB: The open spaces for the community at Petersfield, Mill Road Cemetery and Ditchburn Place would be greatly improved however if traffic along the portions of Mill Road which border those open spaces was

slightly calmed. The three open spaces would benefit from raised sections of road built out of quality materials (eg, as at Station Road/Tenison Road).

Provisional officer notes: Traffic calming sounds like a county council highways issue, not one for city council devolved developer contributions.

31	NEW: Landscaping around the front of the Bath House	Petersfield ward
----	--	-------------------------

Consultation feedback: Suggested by AS.

Provisional officer notes: Would need to be clear what is needed, how much it could cost and how much local support this would attract.

32	NEW: Mill Road would benefit from more public benches.	Petersfield / Romsey wards
----	---	-----------------------------------

Consultation feedback: Suggested by HC.

Provisional officer notes: This would not really be the best use of public realm developer contributions, which is more intended to create a public asset. This proposal could be considered for a future round of EIP funding.

33	NEW: Improve public realm along the length of Mill Road	Petersfield / Romsey wards
----	--	-----------------------------------

Consultation feedback:

EJ: Improve the brightness of the area. Make it much more interesting for visitors to the City to want to include Mill Road, particularly the Romsey section, in their 'places to see' itinerary, with conspicuous signage to lead them directly to Mill Road from the City centre. Drab lamp posts, drab public seats, drab waste bins, poor quality pavements (unfit for bearing repeated, heavy traffic parking), drab public areas! The whole place urgently needs a 'facelift'.

Provisional officer notes: To do all of Mill Road would cost around £3-4 million. The proposed town square [35] would be a good starting point which could be afforded within current devolved public realm contributions.

34	Improve Mill Road with new entrance archways at both ends and better pavements	Petersfield/ Romsey wards
----	---	--------------------------------------

Consultation feedback:

DB: I find the suggestion of some sort of Archway for Mill Road somewhat bemusing. Most people entering this area know where they are and why they are there. I do not favour such a project whilst there are more pressing needs elsewhere.

KJ: Like this idea a lot. Perhaps combine with outdoor community notice boards – still none in Romsey/Petersfield. [*KJ*].

Provisional officer notes: This is a county council highways issue, not one for city council devolved developer contributions.

35	Create town square by Mill Road Co-op/ St Philip's Church	Romsey ward
----	--	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

AB: Our proposal at last year's East Area Workshop was to make the area on Mill Road from Catherine St to Thoday Street a focus for Romsey 'High Street'. It has the biggest footfall, is central, is linked to the other side of the road by the pedestrian crossing, and includes the Co-op, the pharmacy, the cash machine and St Philip's church plus new community café.

The church is the most attractive building in that stretch of Mill Road, the brick work has been restored beautifully, and the Papworth Cafe serves a recognised social purpose. The restored brick work is now a visual highlight of the streetscape, but it sits in a neglected area. Integrating the Church into a matching quality public environment would enhance the new Conservation Area and send a clear message that Romsey was not a poor relation to the city centre. St Philip's received public grants for this project, so doing something to the surrounding area would be a continuation.

We suggested a scheme that enhanced and mellowed the area. Not something that looks like any other inner city regeneration scheme (eg Burleigh St, with metallic litter bins and unattractive paving). Let's try to do something more like Kings Parade - why not? We have the lamp posts and this is a Conservation Area now!

Improvements:

1. Quality paving: York slabs;
2. New wooden seating.
3. Re-arranging bike racks
4. Tree planting or some other sort of planting to mellow the environment.
5. Public art (related to railway heritage? A steam train?)

Comment:

1. It could be an opportunity to work jointly with the Co-op (who own the frontage) and with St Philips.
2. It could be a prelude to eventually creating a shared space stretching to the other side of the road at this spot, which would 'punctuate Mill Road' and slow down traffic.
3. It might need to be done in conjunction with looking at ways of ensuring the seating is not monopolised by steetlife drinkers/beggars as is often the case at present (not be a reason for not improving the seating).

MC: As a member of St Philip's Church Centre Management Committee, I support the proposal for S106 funding for improvements to the area of Mill Road outside the Co-op and next to St Philip's which has been proposed as a 'high street' or town square'. Having spent much time and money (including some S106 contributions) improving St Philip's over the last 3 years, we would be delighted to see a matching improvement to the related streetscape. The details would need to be the subject of further discussion with relevant stakeholders, but anything which improved the paving, seating, bike racks, planting and public art in a way which was appropriate for the context and done in a high quality way, would get the support of local residents and church members. The vicar of St Philip's and I would be happy to discuss this further in any group set up to take it forward.

CS/AS: We would like to add our support to the idea of a memorial to Romsey's railway workers and their families as part of this project. Having lived in Romsey for many decades, we (father and son of an extended railway family) appreciate (along with relatives, neighbours and friends) its history and in particular the part the railway played with its residents. Romsey Town was, historically, home to numerous railway workers and their families whose comradeship helped build an early sense of community within the locality. Sadly, many of these workers have now passed away, leaving only memories within the few that remain and Romsey no longer the railway family 'hub' that it once was. We fear that, if something is not done soon to record, on a permanent basis within the landscape of Romsey itself, a part of life which played such a significant role in the formation of Romsey Town, the influence and importance of the railway will only be visible to those that read history books. We therefore seek support for the Mill Road Town Square project and for the proposal to have, incorporated within it, a suitable and appropriate memorial to the railway workers and their families of Romsey Town (suggest ideas to be formulated in conjunction with local residents and other interested parties). (CS is a retired engine driver of 46 years' service and resident of Romsey for 65 years).

DB: Romsey has a busy and eclectic mix of people from a number of nationalities and age groups that are often found in our section of Mill Road. Therefore it would seem appropriate to provide one or more meeting points and the idea of a town square involving quality paving, seating and perhaps a notice board outside the Co-op is positive.

KJ: Excellent idea, if room [KJ]

Provisional officer notes: This project idea, along with [15] for Mill Road/Cavendish Road are both proposed for EIP funding, being reported separately to the East Area Committee's 12 September meeting. Given that the EIP is heavily over-subscribed, there is an opportunity to fund it from public realm devolved developer contributions instead and ease some

of the pressure on EIP funding decisions. The overall Town Square project could cost in the region of £60,000. Whilst the Co-op is being asked to fund a significant proportion, it would be helpful if the East Area Committee could agree to prioritise up to £60,000 of devolved contributions now.

Local residents' suggestions for public art to mark the railway heritage is proposed to form part of project at Mill Road/Cavendish Road [15].

36	Improve public realm from Coldham's Lane bridge to Sainsbury's (better paving, tree-planting)	Romsey ward
----	--	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

KJ: Support. Current poor area for pedestrians and cyclist approaching the big roundabout. Improve road crossing across Coldham's Lane to side entrance (petrol station) – currently many motorists don't stop at 'optional' crossing and some only stop if you are half way across! I often avoid this crossing now and use pelican crossing on other side. Danger for children going to school from Abbey to Coleridge/Netherhall twice a day. Perhaps some measures to slow cars coming around the big roundabout – come round far too fast – seem many near misses, accidents and cars mounting bank by Horizon community centre.

DB: The potential improvements to the Coldhams Lane with better paving and tree planting all seem very appropriate.

AL: This has my vote for needed amenities [AL]

Provisional officer notes: This is likely to go forward without developer contributions funding. The county council is keen to take this forward using maintenance funding. There are opportunities for joint working here. Significant more work is required to establish feasible budget. £11.5k of existing East Area EIP funding (£11.5k) has been reserved for this.

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.

Petersfield ward:

- A. *HL*: Add 'portholes' at different heights in the Mill Road Bridge so that adults and children can watch the trains go by. The idea had a lot of support at a recent brainstorm held outside Hot Numbers. The bridge is surely due for a new look soon.

Councillor Marchant-Daisley: That sounds a lovely idea. I shall ask the relevant council officer to look at consultation, funding and timing.

Officer note: Unfortunately, this could not be taken forward. Network Rail has stringent standards when it comes to overline highway bridges, particularly over electrified lines. One of their key design standard requirements is for the parapets not have any apertures and for them to prevent through visibility. Electrified lines an even higher parapet height. These standards have been formulated to reduce the risk of unsafe activity, but it is unfortunate that this spoils the potential enjoyment for other law abiding citizens.

- B. *AS*: It would be great if the Bath House could be reverted to its original use. It could be run by a private operator and could include a spa, restaurant/café (obviously using the snooker club land/building too). Lifecraft should still have space in the new complex. (this would all tie in nicely with the proposal for a farmers' market in the car park). Barking Bathhouse is a good example of how this could work.

Not eligible for developer contributions funding.

- C. *AS*: Opening of Chisholm Way and the possible use of old building to rear of next door house could really help the space. In the meantime the council could experiment with a small (good/healthy) pop-up cafe to show what could be done.

Not eligible for developer contributions funding.

Petersfield and Romsey wards:

- D. *NH, Disability Panel*: In Florence, Italy, 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 pedestrians. No, not even cyclists. A day for walking; a day for children; a day for the dis-abled, a day for the more elderly; a day when pedestrians may move as they should, freely and un-threatened by any vehicles at all! Such a scheme can be easily implemented and cheap with supervisory costs being the principal outlay together with signs.

- E. *HC*: I wholeheartedly support any motion to reduce the number of vehicles using Mill Road. In my view traffic is the single largest nuisance issue the community has to deal with on a daily basis. Public space should be available for the enjoyment of all. Motor vehicles make this impossible. This isn't a problem specific to Mill Road of course, it's something we need to address as a society, but I believe Mill Road can lead the way in showing how much a community can benefit by reducing motor traffic. Pedestrianising Mill Road one day a week would be a start. I also support the idea to reduce the speed limit or introduce traffic calming measures.

Not eligible for developer contributions funding.

Romsey ward:

- F. *AS*: There are a number of places along Mill Road that are currently uncared for and are attracting anti-social behaviour. The Co-op area is one example. Any changes must be accompanied by (sensitive) policing that makes it clear that anti-social behaviour is unacceptable. If you want to attract others including children/families into these public spaces, there needs to be both an overhaul and some kind of monitoring/policing. At times Mill Road feels blighted through a lack of care for both its public spaces and people.
- G. *DB*: The car park on Great Eastern Street (the Mill Road end) has been taken over by street drinkers who are living there. The swing at the nearby play area was burnt out six months ago and the play area is now hardly used, given the safety concerns of local parents and children.
- H. *AS*: The play area below the railway bridge between Mill Road and Great Eastern Street is another playground suffering from extreme neglect. The last time I went there, the swing had been burnt and it now it just seems to be a haven for drinkers. It's actually a really nice green spot when you're down there, and could be transformed into something really pleasant.

The senior Anti-Social Behaviour Officer has been in touch with DB and let him know what has been done so far and what will be done (letter drop, street surgery etc). The ASB Team will update him.

- I. *KJ*: Could we have measures that reduce the amount of litter blowing into Cherry Hinton Brook from Sainsburys and the recycling area near Coldhams Lane?
- J. *IdW*: Cherry Hinton brook running from Burnside to Sainsbury's: The brook forms part of a wild-life corridor yet the section running from the corner of Brookfields and Burnside to Sainsbury's becomes increasingly neglected as you approach Sainsbury's. Around Sainsbury's, there is lots of litter. People have spoken to Sainsbury's about clearing up the litter. They say they cannot manage / collect litter that falls into the brook for health and safety reasons. Also along the back of the play park that is on Brooks road, local children are frequently seen throwing rubbish and things they find lying about in the park into the brook that backs onto the park (e.g. litter, discarded shopping trolleys). A suggestion is to place clear signage along the brook explaining its significance (an example can be found at the end of Burnside near the allotments) - but these signs cost money. The Friends of Cherry Hinton brook can advise about signage as I believe they were involved in the signage from Burnside to Cherry Hinton Hall.
- K. *KJ*: Could we have labels on some street trees (as in botanic gardens) – with such a variety in the area?
- L. *KJ*: Could we have a sensory/winter garden in Romsey Rec and Coleridge Rec.
- M. *CL*: We're currently talking to the Co-Op about a community art project which would involve painting the hoardings that they own along one section of Mill Road (near the new mosque site). At the moment, that part of Mill Road looks really run down and could do with sprucing up. I'm setting up a project group involving interested community members and local art space Cambridge Art Salon. A bit of funding may help us make more of the project and pay artists that get involved.

Officer note: Sounds like painting temporary hoardings, which would not be the best use of developer contributions.

- N. *CL*: Development of local community event 'Romsey Art Festival'. Piloted this year, Romsey Art Festival is running from the 3rd-17th August and the opening day proved popular. I would like to see this event get bigger and better next year and wondered whether a public art project could be undertaken as part of next year's event. I don't really have more detail on this idea, except I know that we could potentially involve all local art spaces in a partner project (a number of local galleries meet up on a monthly basis to discuss the development of Mill Road's arts and cultural offer).

Public Art developer contributions cannot pay for the event itself, but not clear on whether this is the request or not?

- O. *HC*: Is there scope for developer contributions to be used for funding community activities / temporary constructions/artworks / community research workshops and other activities? Since the beginning of the year I've been running a community art project looking at public space in East Cambridge, the Map Project. The webpage for the project is here if you'd like to find out more (links through to a blog and social media with more info): <http://plings.com/themapproject/>. The Map Project has just been part of the first ever Romsey Art festival which is set to become an annual event in Cambridge cultural life. Community is at the heart of how both the Map Project and the Romsey Art Festival aim to work. Both are inclusive projects in which the social benefits to participants and the wider community are at least as important as tangible outcomes.

Officer note: Whilst public art developer contributions can be used for temporary artworks which leave a legacy, developer contributions cannot be used operational costs and research.

General:

- P. *HC*: It is worth investing in getting more local people engaged in the process of developing proposals for how to use the s106 money. Certain groups and individuals are far more active than others. How might wider participation in s106 consultations be achieved?

Officer note: The Council's approach to devolved decision-making and engaging local people is developing. The suggestions HC has raised sound really interesting. Need to make sure that the overall approach can be carried out within the available staffing capacity, whilst also keeping the focus on delivering priority projects for new/improved local facilities.

- Q. *KJ*: Good to have seen so many new play area schemes in recent years and in the pipeline. KJ

Specific conditions and expiry dates relating to developer contributions devolved to East Area

In general, most developer contributions collected by the council are for the provision or improvement of, or better access, to facilities in Cambridge related to particular developer contribution types. In some in Section 106 agreements, more specific conditions have been set. Here are examples of specific conditions relating to contributions devolved to the East Area.

Community Facilities contributions

- £500 to be contractually committed by January 2016
- £10,000 to be contractually committed by July 2017
- £8,500 to be contractually committed by February 2021
- £9,500 to be contractually committed by October 2022

Informal Open Space contributions

- £3,500 to be contractually committed by October 2022
- £5,500 to be contractually committed by November 2022
- £500 to be contractually committed by January 2023

Outdoor Sports Facilities / Formal Open Space contributions

- £5,500 to be contractually committed by February 2021
- £3,000 to be contractually committed by October 2022
- £5,500 to be contractually committed by November 2022
- £500 to be contractually committed by January 2023

Indoor Sports Facilities contributions

- £3,500 to be contractually committed by October 2022
- £6,500 to be contractually committed by November 2022
- £1,000 to be contractually committed by January 2023

Provision for Children & Teenagers (play area) contributions

- £3,000 to be contractually committed by October 2022
- £6,500 to be contractually committed by January 2023

Public art contributions

- £10,000 to be contractually committed by October 2022

Public realm contributions

- £89,500 to be contractually committed by July 2017

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