

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

REPORT OF: Director of Environment

TO: North Area Committee

3/10/2013

WARDS: Arbury, East Chesterton, King's Hedges, West Chesterton

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

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Developer contributions are payments received to help address the impact of development. 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.
- 1.2 This report summarises the feedback from the recent consultation, about local project ideas and provides an update on the devolved contributions available for the North Area. Whilst devolved funding is limited for some contribution types, and the Area Committee will need to make some difficult choices, there are still opportunities (particularly in relation to community facilities) to make a significant difference in the North Area. Options to seek support from city-wide funding to help address local needs are also considered.
- 1.3 It is envisaged that the second round process may take two reports: this one helps to whittle down the current list of 40 local ideas to a short-list of up to ten. Next February, the Area Committee will be asked to prioritise up to/around five projects from these short-listed options. The second round priorities will be taken forward from spring 2014, once the first round priority projects have been completed.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 To short-list the project ideas to be considered in more detail in the priority-setting report in February 2014 (Section 5 refers).
- 2.2 To identify any local issues with strategic implications that need to be brought to the attention of the Executive Councillors for Public Places and Community Well-being as appropriate (paragraphs 5.9a refers)
- 2.3 To identify any North Area project ideas that need to be considered for city-wide developer contributions funding (paragraph 5.9b refers).

3. CONTEXT

- 3.1 Background information can be found in Appendix A. This includes:
- a round-up of projects in the North Area funded from developer contributions in recent years;
 - an overview of the first round of devolved decision-making in 2012/13 and the local and strategic projects prioritised so far; and
 - a summary of the process for the second round, which was considered by the Environment Scrutiny Committee last June.
- 3.2 Ahead of the second round, the council has 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. In the North Area, 15 responses (many covering a number of project ideas) have been received: see Appendix B. An update on any comments received after publication of this report will be provided at the meeting. The refreshed list of project ideas is considered in Section 5.

4. AVAILABILITY OF DEVOLVED DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

See also paragraph 5.9 and Appendix A (paragraph 6)

- 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. To be identified as priorities, project ideas must be affordable within the unallocated funding already received in the appropriate contribution types.
- 4.2 Here is an update of the developer contributions devolved to North Area. Last July's Developer Contributions newsletter already highlighted a lack of devolved funding for public realm improvements and limited amounts for informal open space, indoor sports and public art.

Table 1: Availability of devolved contributions

Contribution types		£	Contribution types		£
A	Community facilities	£200k	D	Outdoor sports	£50k
B	Informal open space	£0	E	Indoor sports	<£25k
C	Play provision	<£25k	F	Public art	<£10k
<i>Rounded down to nearest £25k</i>			G	Public realm	£0

- 4.3 The £200k or so of devolved community facilities funding represents a considerable opportunity to address local needs, albeit that there will still be some difficult decisions over priorities. The return of £50k

to this devolved category follows the Area Committee's decision last August not to proceed with the former first round priority project for community meeting space at the Sikh Gurdwara.

- 4.4 There are no longer any devolved informal open space contributions for the North Area following allocation of the previously available funding (around £15k) for landscaping of play area improvements at Chestnut Grove (agreed by the Area Committee last August).
- 4.5 The amount of devolved contributions for outdoor sports has risen following the reassignment of funding previously allocated to Pye's Pitch recreation facilities. Whilst the football pitch and access improvement components of that project have been completed, the agreed project funding proved insufficient to develop the changing room facilities there, as had been intended. See [31] in Appendix B.

5. SHORT-LISTING OPTIONS

- 5.1 The North Area list of project ideas has been refreshed in the light of the recent consultation (see Table 2). As an initial filter, proposals that are ineligible for developer contributions or would far exceed the devolved funding available or have been withdrawn from the second round are marked with a ✖ (see Appendix B for more details).
 - a. Albeit not currently affordable, project ideas [15]–[24] and [34]–[35] have been kept on the list in case more (even £10k–£15k more) informal open space, play provision & public art contributions become available in the next four months before the priority-setting report.
- 5.2 The initial filtering brings the list down from 40 to 28 project ideas (see pages 7-9). Before then, this section looks at how to go about the short-listing, how many ideas the Committee may wish to short-list and how to ease the pressure on the devolved funding available.
- 5.3 The number of short-listed options and project priorities per area committee needs to take account not only of the devolved developer contributions but also the staffing capacity available to deliver priority projects across all four areas as well as strategic/ city-wide priorities. For the second round, each area committee is being asked to set as many second priorities as it has wards, plus an additional grant-funded priority (to be delivered by a local community group). The

Key to contribution types in Table 2:

A = community facilities; B = informal open space; C = play area provision for children & teenagers; D = outdoor sports facilities/formal open space; E = indoor sports facilities; F = public art; G = public realm

Table 2: Project ideas and contribution types needed		Types	
1	Area needs a meeting place/village hall.	A	
2	Improve Bermuda Flats community room	A	
3	East Chesterton needs community facilities	A	
4	Provide drop-in centre for young in Hawkins Road area	A	
5	New community space at Sikh Gurdwara	A	✘
6	More community rooms at Buchan Street Centre	A	
7	Revamp and extend Nun's Way pavilion	A, D	
8	Community rooms at Milton Road Library redevelopment	A	
9	More green open space needed	B	✘
10	Provide informal shelters on recreation grounds	B	
11	Reconfigure Chesterton Recreation Ground	B	✘
12	Trim trail at Chesterton Recreation Ground	B, D	
13	Trim trail at Alexandra Gardens	B, D	
14	Drain Pye's Pitch (also known as Logan's Meadow)	B	✘
15	Improve Alexandra Gardens play area	C, B	
16	Improve Blanford Walk play area	C, B	
17	Improve Discovery Way play area	C, B	
18	Improve Hawkins Road play area	C, B	
19	Improve Lawrence Way play area	C, B	
20	Improve Beales Way play area	C, B	
21	Improve Woodhead Drive play area	C, B	
22	More play area provision, especially for teens	C, B	
23	New play area by Perse Way flats	C, B	
24	Improve/finish the play area at Bramblefields LNR	C	
25	Facilities for sports not catered for	D	
26	More cricket provision at Pye's Pitch/Logan's Meadow	D	
27	Provide tennis courts in Area (say, Chesterton Rec)	D	
28	Improve lighting for Meadows all-weather pitch	D	
29	Tennis courts at North Cambridge Academy/Nun's Way	D	
30	Rebuild sports pavilion on Chesterton Rec	D, A	✘
31	Changing rooms for pitches at Pye's Pitch	D	✘
32	Upgrade lighting for Nuns Way MUGA	D	
33	Turn Jedburgh Court toilets into pool changing rooms	D	✘
34	Support Chesterton Community Heritage Project	F	
35	New village sign for East Chesterton	F	
36	Improve public realm by Carlton Way shops	G	✘
37	Public realm at Scotland Rd/Green End Rd junction	G	✘
38	Improve public realm at Arbury Court	G	✘
39	Improve public realm at Mitcham's Corner	G	✘
40	More trees along Chesterton Road	G	✘

number of short-listed options could be double this amount. Therefore, the North Area is invited to identify ten short-listed options from which it can choose five priorities.

- 5.4 Looking at the contribution types that the remaining 28 project ideas could draw on most, Table 3 suggests how many in each category the Area Committee might short-list and prioritise (see paragraph 5.1a in relation to informal open space and public art contributions).

Table 3 Main contribution type	How many ideas?	Possible short-list	Possible no. priorities
Community facilities	7	Up to 4	Up to 3
Informal open space	3	Up to 2	Up to 1*
Play provision	10	Up to 3	Up to 1*
Outdoor sports	6	Up to 2	Up to 1
Public art	2	Up to 1	Up to 1*

- 5.5 The Area Committee will also need to bear in mind that:
- pavilions (eg, project idea [7]) can use outdoor sports as well as community facilities contributions;
 - trim trails ([12] and [13]) can use outdoor sports as well as informal open space contributions (or instead of, if outdoor gym equipment is provided without the trail); and
 - improvements to play areas ([15] – [24]) can use informal open space as well as play provision contributions.
- 5.6 Officers would recommend that area committees' choice of short-listed options (and ultimately, priorities) should draw on a range of different contribution types in order to help ensure that contributions with expiry date conditions can be used on time. See Appendix C.
- a. Allocations made to existing prioritised/approved projects mean there are currently no unallocated devolved contributions with expiry dates (for contracts to be put in place) before spring 2015.
 - b. Particular attention is drawn to the £1.5k play contribution (to be contractually committed by April 2015) as it may well be easier to allocate more quickly the £60.5k community facilities contribution (which has to be contractually committed by June 2015).
- 5.7 The advice in Table 3 to short-list up to 'x' in particular categories does not mean that this number is expected in each case. The Area Committee is invited to short-list up to ten ideas in total. It may, however, wish to short-list fewer ideas and defer using funding available in certain contribution types for future priority-setting rounds: this would allow more to accrue so that larger project ideas

(which may not be ready to consider yet) could be undertaken in future. At the heart of this is the question of whether to pursue some options now because they could be taken forward or to wait until other ideas (possibly higher priorities) could be considered in later rounds of devolved decision-making. There is a balance to be struck here between taking a long-term view and making sure that developer contributions with expiry dates can be used on time.

- 5.8 From the outset of devolved decision-making, officers have been mindful of the Area Committee's concerns about the lower levels of devolved funding available to North Area compared to other areas.
- a. The issue has been highlighted in reports both to this Area Committee (November 2012) and Community Services Scrutiny Committee (January 2013), which have also put this in the context of the higher levels of need and deprivation in the North Area.
 - b. Over the last year, more contributions from the North Area have been freed up for local use through reviews of existing developer contribution allocations and by securing £47.5k of supplementary city-wide play provision contributions last January.
- 5.9 Now these opportunities to optimise devolved funding have been taken, the main options are as follows.
- a. To request that the Executive Councillor for Public Places returns to the North Area those informal open spaces contributions from local major developments in its four wards which have been assigned to the city-wide fund. There are around £15k of provisional informal open spaces allocations from the North Area to strategic, first round priority projects that could be replaced by the same amount of unallocated city-wide funds from other areas.
 - b. To request that, in considering priorities for the use of sports facilities contributions in the city-wide fund, the Executive Councillor for Community Well-being takes accounts of (and makes some appropriate allocations for) the local needs of the Area Committees where these needs cannot be afforded from the devolved funding available. It is understood that the short-listing of strategic sports proposals is likely to be deferred until next March so that these can be considered in the context of the proposed Sports Strategy for 2014-17, which is due to be reported to the Community Services Scrutiny Committee at that time.
- 5.10 Table 4 outlines the remaining 28 project ideas, including estimates of possible costs and delivery timescales. See Appendix B for more comments. The Area Committee is asked to go through the ideas in the table, category by category, to identify which proposals could be ruled out and which ones it finds particularly interesting.

Table 4: Assessment of project ideas

Provisional cost estimates

See key on page 9

No.	Ward	Project ideas	CF	IOS	Play	OSF	Delivery	Commentary
COMMUNITY FACILITIES (consider short-listing up to 4; pavilion refurbishments could need outdoor sports funding too)								
1	Area	Area needs a meeting place/village hall	-	-	-	-	-	Too broad. More specific ideas have been added (eg, 3, 6 & 7)
2	A	Improve Bermuda Flats community room	-	-	-	-	-	No follow-up info received. Can't use S106 funds for maintenance
3	EC	East Chesterton needs community facilities	?	-	-	-	Short-term	Methodist Church proposals may be £150k-£200k. Could give a grant towards costs.
4	KH	Provide drop-in centre for young in Hawkins Road area	-	-	-	-	-	No follow-up info received. Suggest this be discounted
6	KH	More community rooms at Buchan Street Centre	Up to £100k	-	-	-	Short-term	Would be dedicated childcare & community meeting space
7	KH	Revamp and extend Nun's Way pavilion	?	-	-	?	Await details	Pavilion refurbishments can cost £60k-£100k. Need to know more about the purpose behind proposals.
8	WC	Community rooms at Milton Road Library redevelopment	£75k	-	-	-	Await details	Local support. Await County Council funding decision
INFORMAL OPEN SPACE [IOS] (consider short-listing up to 2; remember play areas may need some funding too)								
10	Area	Provide informal shelters on recreation grounds	-	£12k each	-	-	-	Query affordability. Consider anti-social behaviour risks
12	EC	Trim trail at Chesterton Rec	-	£10k	-	£10k	Short-term	If not enough IOS contributions, outdoor gym equipment could be funded from outdoor sports funds
13	A	Trim trail at Alexandra Gardens	-	£5k	-	£5k		

No.	Ward	Project ideas	Provisional estimates				Delivery	Commentary
			CF	IOS	Play	OSF		
PLAY PROVISION (consider short-listing up to 3; improvements could need informal open space funding too)								
15	A	Play area improvements at: Alexandra Gardens	-	£15k	£35k	-	Short-term, subject to funding availability	Having prioritised Chestnut Grove, there aren't enough devolved play/IOS contributions left to consider the other options yet. The Committee may wish to short-list one or more of these (possibly with a smaller budget) just in case more funding becomes available before February.
16	A	Blanford Walk	-	-	-	-		
17	EC	Discovery Way	-	£5k	£50k	-		
18	KH	Hawkins Road	-	£2k	£23k	-		
19	KH	Lawrence Way	-	£5k	£25k	-		
20	KH	Beales Way	-	£15k	£35k	-		
21	WC	Woodhead Drive	-	£5k	£25k	-		
22	Area	More play area provision, especially for teens	-	-	£15k	-	Short-term	To avoid the need for IOS funds, could install equipment (possibly for teenagers) at a play area without need for landscaping.
23	A	New play area by Perse Way flats	-	£5k	£25k	-	Short-term	Local concerns about current lack of local provision, backed by ward councillor calls for simple/traditional equipment. A range of options could be worked up to fit levels of funding that may become available by February.
24	EC	Improve the play area at Bramblefields LNR	-	-	Repair not eligible	-	-	Play area was completely refurbished 4 years ago. Issues raised relate to maintenance.

No.	Ward	Project ideas	Provisional estimates					Commentary
			CF	IOS	Play	OSF	Delivery	
SPORTS FACILITIES (consider short-listing up to 2; see paragraph 5.9b)								
25	Area	Facilities for sports not catered for	-	-	-	-	-	Still not clear what is needed. No follow-up information received.
26	Area	More cricket provision at Pye's Pitch (also known as Logan's Meadow)	-	-	-	£30k	Short term	Could be done once flood issue sorted. Given existing local provision, is more really needed?
27	Area	Provide tennis courts in North Area (say, Chesterton Rec or Pye's Pitch/Logan's Meadow)	-	-	-	£90k	Medium term	Tennis provision needed in area. Not currently affordable. Need to find suitable site.
29	KH	Tennis courts: N Cambridge Academy/Nun's Way	-	-	-	£25k	Short-term	Proposal merits further study; still some questions.
28	A	Improve lighting for: Meadows MUGA	-	-	-	£35k	Medium term	Flood-lighting could impact on residents. Likely to require planning permission
32	KH	Nuns Way MUGA	-	-	-	£35k		
PUBLIC ART (consider short-listing up to 1)								
34	EC	Support Chesterton Community Heritage Project	-	-	-	-	-	No follow-up received. Not clear whether eligible for S106 funds.
35	EC	New village sign for East Chesterton	-	-	-	£20k?	Short-term	Depends on whether more public art funds received before Feb '14

Key: Wards: A = Arbury; EC = East Chesterton; KH = King's Hedges; WC = West Chesterton; Area = within/across North Area. Types: CF = Community facilities; IOS = Informal open space; Play = provision for children & teens; OSF = outdoor sports facilities. The 'delivery' column includes rough estimates on when project ideas could be delivered (short-term by October '15, medium-term by April '17 and long-term beyond April 17).

6. IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Financial implications: The importance of ensuring that local priorities are affordable within the devolved contributions available has already been stated in Section 4 and Appendix A. 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.
- 6.2 Staffing implications: The need to set priorities in the context of the available staffing capacity has also been explained in paragraph 5.3 and Appendix A. Following this report, the next steps will be for officers to refine cost estimates and compile other available information on the short-listed options. It is proposed to report back to the Area Committee on 6 February 2014: there would not be enough time to produce these profiles for the next meeting on 21 November in view of other workloads. 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.
- 6.3 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 next February.

7. CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1 Having considered the assessment of project ideas in Table 4, it is hoped that, in line with the recommendations in Section 2, the Area Committee will be able to:
- a. identify which proposals it would wish to short-list. For the avoidance of doubt, it is important to clarify that these short-listed options are not guaranteed funding. The North Area Committee's priority-setting is due to take place next February.
 - b. highlight particular issues and project ideas that it would wish to refer to the relevant Executive Councillors and scrutiny committees. Please see the suggestions in paragraph 5.9. These would be reported back to the Environment and/or Community Services Scrutiny Committee, as appropriate, at their meetings on 8 and 10 October respectively.
- 7.2 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. 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.

8. APPENDICES

- A. Developer contributions devolved decision-making: background
- B. Summary of consultation feedback
- C. Further details on developer contributions devolved to North Area

9. BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

- Developer Contributions newsletter for North Area, July 2013
- Devolved decision-making reports to North Area Committee on 22/11/2012, 16/5/2013 and 1/8/2013
- Report to Environment Scrutiny Committee, 11/6/2013
- Report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee, 17/1/2013

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

Also:

- Responses from North Area to the recent Developer Contributions 'refresh' consultation, summer 2013.
- 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. The parameters for 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 or fund one type of facility from an unrelated category. That said, some projects can make use of more than one contribution type (see the examples given under paragraph 5.5 of the main report).
2. **How have developer contributions been used?:** Examples include:

Completed projects since 2007	Ward	S106 funds
Arbury Community Centre: equipment/improvements	KH	£150k-£175k
Arbury Community Centre: small hall	KH	£75k-£100k
Browns Field Youth & Community Centre	EC	£75k-£100k
Cameron Road: affordable housing	KH	£125k-£150k
Chesterton Community College floodlit Astroturf pitch	WC	£50k-£75k
Elmfield Close: affordable housing	EC	£575k-£600k
Fallowfield: affordable housing	EC	£100k-£125k
Green End Road play area improvement	EC	£100k-£150k
Histon Road Cemetery landscaping	A	£25k-£50k
Kings Hedges Learner Pool	KH	£275k-£300k
Kings Hedges 'Pulley' play area	KH	£75k-£100k
Logan's Meadow Swift Tower	EC	£25k-50k
Pye's Pitch recreational facilities	EC	£25k-£50k
Ramsden Square Rec. refurbishment	KH	£50k-£75k
Simons House: affordable housing	A	£700k-£725k

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 S106 agreements);
- b. there is sufficient officer capacity to take forward the development, appraisal, procurement and delivery of projects;
- c. it is formally agreed as a priority by the Area Committee or Executive Councillor (as appropriate) and included on the Capital Plan.


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

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

Area consultations took place in early autumn 2012 to assess needs for new/improved local facilities for 2012-15. All project ideas from the North Area were reported to the Area Committee on 22 November 2012.

6. How does North Area fare for devolved developer contributions?

The North Area has tended to have lower levels of devolved funding, compared to other areas. This reflects lower levels of development in the north of the city in the past. The pie chart illustrates this point by showing the distribution of informal open space contributions received over the last two years (September '11-'13) across the four areas, not including the city fringes growth sites.



An initial analysis suggests a likely increase in the levels of developer contributions in the coming years. Legal (S106) agreements have been completed for over 40 developments in the North Area since the start of 2011 (more than in either of the South or West/Central areas). Even if only two thirds of these developments were actually built, indications are that this could bring in over £275,000 of devolved funding for the North Area. The amounts received would continue to vary between contribution types (still without the prospect of public realm contributions). The amount and timing of the payments will depend on whether/when development commences. Payments are likely to be spread out over a number of years.

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

All project ideas from the North Area consultation were reported to the Area Committee in November 2012. Three first round local priorities were identified then (for delivery in Spring 2014). This included support for proposals for community meeting space at the Sikh Gurdwara, but the Area Committee withdrew this offer last August after the proposals changed (see [5] in Appendix B for more details). A further first round priority, for a play area improvement, was added last August (for delivery in late 2014) following the provision of supplementary funding for North Area from city-wide contributions (in views of its lower levels of devolved funding). The current, first round priorities, which are being taken forward, are:

Formalise BMX track next to Brown's Field Community Centre	£30k
Improve Nun's Way skate park	£65k
Improve Chestnut Grove play area (for delivery in late 2014)	£50k

The strategic first round priorities (for short-medium term delivery), agreed by Executive Councillors last January, included two projects in North Area: the Logan's Meadow Local Nature Reserve extension and the extension of St Andrew's Hall. An update on progress was included in the North Area newsletter in July 2013.

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

Local people have been invited to comment on existing project ideas as well as putting forward new proposals. The opportunity was highlighted in the Developer Contributions newsletter in July, which was sent to those who attended last autumn's workshops as well as local residents' associations and other community groups. It was also publicised via the council's website and Twitter. An initial 23/8/13 'deadline' was set to enable feedback summaries to be included in the committee reports, although the time for providing comments was extended.

9. How will the second round work?:

- a. A two-stage approach is envisaged, with short-listing and priority-setting reports, but there is some flexibility for area committees to adapt the arrangements to fit local circumstances. For example, the West/Central and East Area Committees have prioritised a few project ideas straightaway (without short-listing) in order to make links with other funding/project delivery opportunities at the same time and/or where there is a possibility to 'kill two birds with one stone' and where this does not divert attention from the delivery the first round priority projects. The same sort of opportunities do not seem to present themselves for North Area.
- b. Strategic project ideas will be reported to the relevant scrutiny committee, with decisions by the Executive Councillors for Public Places and Community Well-being, as appropriate.

	Meeting
Environment Scrutiny (for open space, play areas, public art & public realm contributions)	08/10/13
Community Services Scrutiny (for community facilities and outdoor/indoor sports contributions)	10/10/13

- 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.
- d. Further rounds of devolved decision-making, and a refresh of the 3-year assessment of needs & local ideas are envisaged in future.

10 Are there any other guidelines for the second round?:

- a. To make sure that the overall programme of priority projects across the city is manageable and achievable, each area committee has been asked to set as many second round priorities as it has wards, plus the option of another project grant-funded from developer contributions (to be delivered by a local community group).
- b. Different area committees will have different experiences of the short-listing process. For those having difficulty in bringing their short-lists down to 8-10 project ideas, one of the lessons learnt from the first round process is that some smaller, related project ideas could be packaged together in order to form larger proposals.
- c. 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.

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

Summary of consultation feedback

1	Area needs a meeting place/village hall.	Within the Area
---	---	------------------------

Consultation feedback:

Councillor Brierley: Would be good to have a community dance hall, with daily dance events. Could be expansion of Arbury Centre, Meadows Centre, Nuns Way or another centre or a completely new facility.

Officer notes: Since the general project idea was included in last July's Developer Contributions newsletter, more specific proposals ([3], [6] & [7]) have been added to the refreshed list. Cllr Brierley's suggestion about how existing/proposed new community facilities could be used is noted.

2	Improve Bermuda Flats community room	Arbury
---	---	---------------

Consultation feedback: None.

Officer notes: No update. Understand that this room is not well utilised. Have has not been approached by anyone to pursue this idea further. Developer contributions could not be used to fund a maintenance project.

3	East Chesterton needs community facilities	East Chesterton
---	---	------------------------

CB: Improvements to the community facilities at the Methodist Church have several times been mentioned but never appear to make it into programmes. The Methodists are keen and St George's also have ideas. There has been a concentration of money towards the St Andrew's area though the other parts of East Chesterton have high rates of deprivation.

Chesterton Methodist Church: Intend to develop the premises further to be available to community groups and to serve the locality, especially those in situations of need. We are currently exploring the possibility of the site being used as a new distribution centre for the Cambridge City Foodbank. The proposals include:

- rearranging, renewing and improving toilets and utilities;
- replacing the kitchen to ensure it complies with appropriate standards;
- renewing the main entrance to improve security and meet good practice in respect of safeguarding children and vulnerable adults;
- provision of induction loops and other disability access measures; and
- replacing/improving ceilings, roof security, flooring, windows, heating and lighting, as well as redecoration

At this stage we anticipate a scheme of works completed by December 2014, costing at least £150,000.

Officer notes: Initial thoughts are that this would be a good project providing community facilities in a relatively deprived area of East Chesterton. Developer contributions could be awarded through a capital grant for the 'community facility' elements of the scheme. Any award would be subject to the church obtaining planning permission and completing the council's Capital Grant Agreement to protect wider community access. Further discussions would be needed to establish more information about design, the amount of grant required from the council and how the church would raise any remaining funding and the timeline for delivery.

4	Provide drop-in centre for young people in Hawkins Road area	King's Hedges
----------	---	----------------------

Consultation feedback: None.

Officer notes: No information received since last autumn's workshop. Nuns Way Pavilion has recently been handed over to Kings Hedges Neighbourhood Partnership to manage and they have ideas around activities for young people.

5	Sikh Gurdwara – new community building	King's Hedges
----------	---	----------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.3)

Officer notes: The Sikh community has changed their plans due to the high demand for the Gurdwara from Sikhs across the county. They now wish to build a stand-alone community centre within the car park at the rear of the Gurdwara. This would need around £100k to proceed. Therefore, the North Area Committee last August withdrew its earlier offer of a £50k grant and asked the Sikh community to return with their amended plans so they could be considered alongside other proposals.

The Head of Community Development met members of Cambridge Sikh Society in early September. Following a review of the current position, the Management Committee re-affirmed their support for a new community facility but recognised that they need more time to develop their plans with their community, seek detailed prices from contractors and seek donations from their community so that they have the total budget in place, should they be awarded a capital grant of £100k. Therefore, they ask that North Area Committee postpone their consideration of a grant at this time. They would like their project to be reconsidered in a future round of prioritisation for funding next year when the above work has been carried out.

6	Additional Community rooms at Buchan Street Neighbourhood Centre to create: a) larger dedicated childcare space b) additional meeting room for local groups	King's Hedges
----------	--	----------------------

Officer notes: The Area Committee supported this idea last August and asked for the proposal to come forward. Plans are being worked up but very initial estimates for the additional meeting room (b) are around £100k. Subject to planning and building control permissions and local consultation, the aim would be to complete both elements by the end of August 2014. It would be a project for council delivery rather than grant-funding.

- a. Officers are working up plans and negotiating with the county council for funding for dedicated childcare space. This would provide an additional, purpose-built room and would help to meet a huge demand in the local area, generate some income for the centre and potentially provide some additional community space at weekends.
- b. The additional meeting room will provide more flexibility for the centre and more space for local groups. However, it would require funding from developer contributions.

7	Revamp and extend Nun’s Way pavilion including a community café and toilets	King’s Hedges
----------	--	----------------------

Consultation feedback:

AS, Chair, King’s Hedges Neighbourhood Partnership: Nuns Way pavilion could benefit the local community more if it could be expanded to provide a wider range of facilities. Since last autumn’s workshop, the KHNP has taken over the management of the building. Two local football teams use this facility and ChYpPS use it twice a week plus occasionally for special events. TCHC are renting space for a year to provide training, support and work placements for NEETS. The partnership is also beginning to attract several occasional users, including Romsey Mill who are looking to do some outreach work and Arbury Community Church who are carrying out some youth work. If sufficient capital money from developers could be released, the expansion of the pavilion would turn it into a valuable community resource. Given its location, a more strategic approach should be made concerning local play areas and Nuns Way pavilion could become a real community hub and complement the existing play area/half pipe etc by being able to provide toilet facilities, a community cafe etc.

Officer notes: Not yet clear what sort of refurbishment/extension is being proposed – this will dictate what contribution types would be needed. The consultation feedback suggests an emphasis on the development of the community facility, with changing rooms/outdoor sports a secondary consideration. There are also question marks as to whether an upgraded pavilion could also support or fund a café. KHNP have ambitious and exciting plans. However, given that KHNP have only just taken over the running of the Pavilion under an SLA with the council, it may be appropriate to delay any decision to extend the building for a little while.

8	Redevelopment of Milton Road Library to create new library space and community room with flats above.	West Chesterton
---	--	------------------------

Officer notes: Friends of Milton Road Library and Chesterton Residents Association are fully behind these proposals which are being led by the county council. The community room would be run by the Friends group. A County Cabinet decision in November on whether to proceed is awaited. Depending on viability, the scheme could need a capital funding contribution towards the community room (initial estimate for this is up to £75k. The County Council will need to advise on actual cost, timing etc.

9	More green open space needed, especially in West Chesterton & Arbury	Within Area
---	---	--------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.3).

Consultation feedback:

Councillor Brierley: Would like to see a community orchard or new forest area on one of the lesser used green spaces in the King's Hedges area.

Officer notes: Beyond the current lack of devolved contributions Area, the other main constraint on this idea is the availability of land for open space.

10	Provide informal shelters on recreation grounds for use by all ages	Within Area
----	--	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

Cllr Brierley: Would like there to be after dark play and a seating area with some general lights for safety and some coloured mood lighting. This would help to make better all year round use of our green spaces.

Officer notes: Even if devolved informal open space contributions were received in the next four months before the priority-setting report in February, it is unlikely that there would be enough funding for more than one or two shelters. There are also concerns about extending the hours of use of parks: there are limited resources available to respond to noise, littering and anti-social behaviour that this type of facility could attract.

11	Reconfigure Chesterton Recreation Ground (eg, swap location of pavilion & skate park, provide picnic tables)	East Chesterton
----	---	------------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.3).

Consultation feedback:

CB: I am not sure that changing the playground locations at a time of financial constraint is an effective use of limited funding. Whilst we need a

tennis court in the North, using this small green space for a tarmac court would not be right. I would want to be convinced that a grass one was worth giving up much needed informal green space for.

Officer notes: Beyond the fact that there is currently no devolved informal open space funding available, relocating facilities within the recreation ground would only qualify for developer contributions if it could be demonstrated that this would providing additional benefit/improvements. It is questionable whether this would provide value for money.

12	Trim trail at Chesterton Recreation Ground	East Chesterton
-----------	---	------------------------

Consultation feedback: None.

Officer notes: Would this be the best use of space given differing needs of park users? Chesterton Rec has a lot of organised activities already. Need to be mindful of mixed uses of the site (eg, active & passive recreation).

If devolved informal open space (IOS) funding became available by February, this could be fairly straightforward to deliver, along the lines of the first round priority projects at Nightingale Rec and Ditton Fields. If there are still not enough IOS contributions by then, some pieces of outdoor gym equipment could be provided from outdoor sports contributions, without being arranged in the form of a trail.

13	Trim trail at Alexandra Gardens	Arbury
-----------	--	---------------

Consultation feedback: None.

Officer notes: Could be installed around the perimeter. As [12], the same comments about affordability, deliverability & outdoor gym equipment apply

14	Drain Pye's Pitch (Logan's Meadow)	East Chesterton
-----------	---	------------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.3).

Officer notes: The cause of the flooding is still not known, in spite of suggestions from a consultee. Officers have arranged for the football pitches to be rotated to avoid the problem area and allow further

15	Improve Alexandra Gardens play area	Arbury
16	Improve Blanford Walk play area	Arbury
17	Improve Discovery Way play area	East Chesterton
18	Improve Hawkins Road play area	King's Hedges
19	Improve Lawrence Way play area	King's Hedges
20	Improve Beales Way play area	King's Hedges
21	Improve Woodhead Drive play area	King's Hedges

Officer notes: See the ‘virtual tour’ of these play areas, reported to the Area Committee on 1/8/13. One or more of the proposed improvements (or a smaller, lower cost version) could be short-listed in case more devolved funding becomes available in the next four months. Officers note concerns raised by West Chesterton councillors that Members had been informed that the equipment removed from Woodhead Drive would be replaced.

22	More play area provision, especially for older children and teenagers	Within Area
----	--	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

Councillor Brierley: For the older ones, how about some swing rings?

Officer notes: The provision of teenage play equipment for around £15k (such as swing rings) could be a useful option for making use of the existing devolved play provision contributions without the need for landscaping (ie, informal open space contributions). Different sites could be considered: this would need to be informed by the feedback from local consultation (probably at project appraisal stage).

23	New play area by Perse Way flats for both children & teenagers	Arbury
----	---	---------------

Consultation feedback:

MG: Your own website’s playgrounds map shows that there is a desert of facilities for children south of Arbury Road, west of Milton Road, east of Histon Road and north of Victoria Road. This represents a rather large part of Cambridge, and one where there is a rather high proportion of children. A new play area at Perse Way flats would be welcome.

LH: Everyone would benefit from the play park, including the five new homes built in the past couple of years. There are so many young local children that have nowhere local to play....There are parked cars everywhere. With the fast cars racing past, residents are in constant fear of a child being knocked down. The children would be able to benefit from the play area on their walk home from the nearby school. Don’t forget the amount of young families living in the flats of Perse Way / Harris Road / Cockerell Road that don’t have a garden for their children to play in. A new play area would give the children somewhere they can go and play safely. It would bring the community together. It would be money well spent and have plenty of use in a deprived area in desperate need of a play park!

The other play park proposals on the list are all requesting to be updated. At least they have a park for people to use. Around Perse Way / Cockerell Road and Ferrars Way area, we have nowhere for the children to play. The money would be a better investment in providing a new play area here.

Cllr Todd-Jones: This proposal is for a play area on the green space near the block of flats / beside the cul-de-sac end of Cockerell Road. The family that I'd been working with concerning this proposal were keen on a fairly simple, 'traditional' play area for young children (eg, swings, roundabout etc). Both the size of the site and the demand in terms of local families was very much in favour of younger children. However, (with the best of intentions) the proposal morphed into a relatively complex scheme, involving more technical, interactive equipment, that wasn't really what the demand appeared to be for. I don't think there is capacity / space for this 'technical' provision and the suggested use for teenagers. Obviously a more complex scheme is likely to be more expensive, less deliverable and, perhaps, less likely to be chosen compared to other schemes. The original request for a small-scale, simpler scheme may have a much greater chance of getting through at the next round.

Officer notes: Albeit that the Bateson Road play area has recently been added to the parks and playgrounds map, the current under-provision of play areas in this part of North Area is recognised.

24	Improve the play area at Bramblefields nature reserve	East Chesterton
----	---	-----------------

Consultation feedback:

JGR: We are excited about some of the proposed plans, especially improving play areas. I would like to ask whether it is possible to improve or even finish the play area in Bramblefields nature reserve. Last year they took away the swing that was very popular and have not replaced it.

Officer notes: This play area was completely refurbished with considerable investment four years ago. Officers are looking into the issue of the damaged swing, which was removed. The Area Committee may wish to defer proposals for further improvement until the outcome of the station development is known.

25	Facilities for sports not catered for (croquet & pitch & putt golf)	Within Area
----	---	-------------

Consultation feedback: None

Officer notes: Not enough information has been provided about what was being suggested and the level of need for extra provision. There would also be the issues of finding a suitable site and operational/maintenance costs. The North Area has a range of sports facilities, including Chesterton College, North Cambridge Academy, Cambridge Regional College and a variety of outdoor pitches. Recognise that tennis provision is currently lacking.

26	More cricket provision at Pye's Pitch	Within Area
----	--	--------------------

Consultation feedback:

CB: Proposals for cricket on Pye's Pitch were agreed through committee but never implemented.

Officer notes: The drainage issues at Pye's Pitch/Logan's Meadow has been a stumbling block. An artificial pitch could be installed once this is resolved (no contributions funding are currently allocated for this). With the existing nets & artificial cricket wicket at North Cambridge Academy and Chesterton playing fields due to become available for public use, there are still questions about whether further local cricket provision is needed.

27	Provide a tennis court in North Area, (possibly at Chesterton Rec or Pye's Pitch)	Within the Area
----	--	------------------------

Consultation feedback: See CB's concerns under [11] regarding the possibility of a tennis court at Chesterton Recreation Ground.

Officer notes: This proposal would need a suitable location to be found and planning permission. A tennis court at St Alban's Rec and/or Nun's Way would have merits, albeit that this doesn't address the deficit of provision in East Chesterton. A grass court would be an unsuitable surface: use would be restricted to summer and maintenance costs prohibitive.

- It is unlikely that Chesterton Rec would be able to accommodate a tennis court without reconfiguration of space at the recreation ground, but see the comments under [11] above.
- Previous advice from the Environment Agency has been against siting a tennis court on floodplain at Pye's Pitch/Logan's Meadow - fencing would hamper the flow of floodwater and drainage.

28	Improved lighting for Meadows Community Centre MUGA	King's Hedges
----	--	----------------------

Consultation feedback:

Cllr Brierley: This would enable it to be used after dark.

Officer notes: The current ambient lighting is designed for safety purposes. Improvements to the lighting would involve floodlights. This could impact on local residents and is likely to need planning permission.

29	Provide tennis courts at North Cambridge Academy/Nun's Way	Within the Area
----	---	------------------------

Consultation feedback:

Chair, Tennis 4 Cambridgeshire: There is very little public access to tennis in the north and north east of Cambridge. There are seven tennis courts

and all urgently need of resurfacing. We are helping to fund free (or very low cost) mini tennis at the Nuns Way MUGA – matching the funding by the North Area Committee. However, for progression, children need access to full size tennis courts. Our proposal for North Area S106 funding is:

- a. To resurface three tennis courts at the Manor Community College, and
- b. To construct two new tennis courts at Nuns Way recreation ground.

Both of the above venues are in the heart of areas which have amongst the highest levels of social and economic deprivation in the county.

Based on estimated costs recently at other projects we are involved in then the cost of this project, excluding VAT, will be:

1. Resurfacing three tennis courts at the Manor – £25k
2. Providing two new courts at Nuns Way – £50k

Total project cost £75k. We are asking for S106 funding to be allocated for one third of this (£25k). The remaining £50k to be raised as follows:

- £6k from Tennis4Cambridgeshire (to be confirmed)
- £10k from the County LTA Executive Committee (to be confirmed)
- £34k from Landfill tax grants.

We are fairly confident that Landfill Tax grants will be approved. If this proves not to be the case then we will meet with the city council to discuss options. The courts at both venues will be public courts. The long-term plan will be to have three courts at Nuns Way (two with floodlights). Phase two of this project will be to construct the extra court and provide floodlights.

Director, Sport Cambridge CIC: We are a not for profit community interest company set up to promote sport in the north of the city. We to support the proposal. Based on a recent free summer holiday programme we provided for children (funded mainly by the city council) it is clear there is a strong interest in tennis. This sport was quickly fully booked in our holiday programme. 24 children participated each day for 10 days over two weeks.

Tennis Development Manager, Lawn Tennis Association: I support the proposed building of two new tennis courts at Nun's Way Recreation ground and the resurfacing of three courts at Manor Community College. There is a good opportunity to develop the number of public courts available to grow tennis participation.

Officer notes: The need for tennis courts in North Area is recognised. An impressive case has been made, but there are still questions about (a) what type of courts are being proposed (see reservations under [27] about grass courts), (b) whether resurfacing works actually represent maintenance (not eligible for developer contributions funding), (c) the extent to which proposals for running and maintenance (and associated costs) have been agreed with relevant parties, and (d) whether it would be possible to fit two (or three) tennis courts on Nun's Way without an unacceptable loss of open space. Planning permission would be needed.

30	Rebuild/enlarge sports pavilion on Chesterton Rec Ground	East Chesterton
----	---	------------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.3).

Consultation feedback:

CB: To ensure joined-up thinking could the funding and plans for the S106 money from the City football ground also come into the equation. Some of us took a great deal of time last year ensuring that would all be used locally and actively avoid it going into the general City pot but it is still S106. Some £175k will go to the pavilion on Chesterton Rec, and £400k (from memory) go to create a new community pavilion and year-round access to Chesterton playing fields currently used solely by Chesterton Community College. So this proposal is redundant.

Officer notes: In view of the specific developer contributions that have been agreed, arising from the development of the Cambridge City football, these proposals would need to progress in parallel to devolved decision-making, after these developer contributions have been triggered and paid.

31	Convert store at 26th Cambridge Scout Hut into changing rooms for pitches at Pye's Pitch	East Chesterton
----	--	------------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.3).

Consultation feedback:

CB: The allocated developer money back has just been put back into the pot for changing rooms on Pye's Pitch on the basis that there were no proposals.

Officer notes: To clarify, developer contributions for outdoor sports have been returned as the funding previously allocated to the Pye's Pitch recreation facilities project were insufficient to develop this scheme as originally proposed. The scout hut conversion seems to be the only possible solution, but this is not viable at this time within the funds available.

32	Upgrade to lighting on Nuns Way multi-sports play area.	King's Hedges
----	--	----------------------

Consultation feedback:

Cllr Brierley: Two lights are still broken.

Provisional officer notes: The light repairs are a maintenance issue, not eligible for developer contributions. (The relevant manager has been notified). The current ambient lighting is designed for safety purposes.

Improvements to the lighting would involve floodlights. This could impact on local residents and is likely to need planning permission.

33	Turn Jedburgh Court toilets into changing rooms for swimming pool (to provide more privacy)	King's Hedges
-----------	--	----------------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.3)

Consultation feedback: None.

Officer notes: The idea came from the Asian Ladies swimming group who find current changing rooms cramped due to popularity of the current classes. This would involve converting the existing public WC block near the pool into new additional changing rooms with a link corridor between the two to the back of the pool. A public WC could be provided as single unit in the refurbishment with external 20p access similar to all other new public WC provision in the City.

This project idea would involve a large investment (approximately £175k), which is beyond the devolved sports funding available. Realistically, this idea is unlikely to come to fruition in the short-to-medium term due to cost. Officers will ask the new leisure contractor, GLL, to look at alternative solutions, such as increased storage space for pushchairs.

34	Chesterton Community Heritage Project, raising understanding of local history	East Chesterton
-----------	--	------------------------

Consultation feedback: None

Officer notes: No more information about this proposal has been forthcoming since it was suggested in the Area workshop last October. It is not clear whether it would be eligible for developer contributions funding.

35	New village sign for East Chesterton	East Chesterton
-----------	---	------------------------

Consultation feedback: Previously raised by CB, but not addressed during the recent consultation feedback.

Officer notes: There is less than £10k of devolved public art funding currently available, and this is unlikely to be enough. It could be considered once sufficient devolved contributions have accrued. Would need to know more about what specifically is planned and the proposed location (which may require county council highways approval).

36	Improve public realm by Carlton Way shops (eg, planting, lighting, benches)	Arbury
----	---	--------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.3): No devolved public realm contributions available.

Consultation feedback:

LH: The redevelopment outside the Carlton Way shops would make it brighter and more welcoming to use the shops.

37	Improve public realm at Scotland Road/Green End Road/High Street junction	East Chesterton
----	---	-----------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.3): No devolved public realm contributions available.

Consultation feedback: None.

38	Improve public realm at Arbury Court	King's Hedges
----	--------------------------------------	---------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.3): No devolved public realm contributions available.

Consultation feedback: None.

39	Improve public realm at Mitcham's Corner	West Chesterton
----	--	-----------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.3): No devolved public realm contributions available.

Consultation feedback: None.

Officer notes: Mitcham's Corner is addressed in policy 21 of Draft Local Plan 2014.

40	More trees along Chesterton Road	West Chesterton
----	----------------------------------	-----------------

DISCOUNTED THROUGH 'INITIAL FILTER' (see paragraph 3.3): No devolved public realm contributions available.

Consultation feedback:

WB: There used to be more trees along Chesterton Road in particular from Elizabeth Way to Victoria Avenue. In old photos the street looks really great. The ones with cast iron tree surrounds outside the old Co-op and empty Threshers have now gone. I know the council is trying to increase its tree cover in the city so it would be great to replace the missing ones.

Officer notes: Even if there were devolved contributions available, trees by the highway would require county council agreement. Would also need to be clear on how the maintenance costs (£504 per tree) would be funded.

Further details on developer contributions devolved to North Area

Specific conditions and expiry dates

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 in Section 106 agreements, more specific conditions have been set. Here are examples of specific conditions relating to contributions devolved to the North Area (including expiry dates in the next five years).

Community Facilities contributions

- £60,500 to be contractually committed by 04/06/2015
- £3,000 to be contractually committed by 06/11/2016

Indoor Sports Facilities contributions

- £1,500 to be contractually committed by 06/11/2016

Provision for Children & Teenagers (play area) contributions

- £1,500 to be contractually committed by 29/04/2015
- £1,500 to be contractually committed by 06/11/2016

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