

# Public Document Pack

Community Services Scrutiny Committee

CmSrv/1

Thursday, 8 October 2015

## COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

8 October 2015

2.30 - 6.40 pm

**Present:** Councillors Sinnott (Chair), Ratcliffe (Vice-Chair), Austin, Benstead, Bird, O'Connell, Reid and Sarris

Executive Councillor for Communities: Richard Johnson

Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places: Carina O'Reilly

### Council Officers:

Director of Customer and Community Services: Liz Bisset

Director of Environment: Simon Payne

Head of Communities, Arts and Recreation: Debbie Kaye

Community Funding and Development Manager: Jackie Hanson

Community, Sport & Recreation Manager: Ian Ross

Democratic Services Manager: Gary Clift

Neighbourhood Community Development Manager: Sally Roden

Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager: Alistair Wilson

Urban Design and Conservation Manager: Glen Richardson

Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield

Committee Manager: James Goddard

### Others Present:

Cambridge BID Chair: Ian Sandison

Cambridge BID Manager: Edward Quigley

River Manager: Jed Ramsey

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### 15/34/Comm Srvcs Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Baigent. Councillor Benstead was present as the Alternate.

### 15/35/Comm Srvcs Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
------	------	----------

Councillor O'Connell	15/38/Comm, 15/39/Comm & 15/44/Comm	Personal: Member of Trumpington Residents Association.
Councillor Johnson	15/38/Comm	Personal: Director of Clay Farm.
Councillor Reid	15/38/Comm	Personal: Director of Storeys Field.  Involved in Cambridge Retrofit.
Councillors Ratcliffe and Reid	15/44/Comm	Personal: Director of Cambridge Live.
Councillors Austin	15/45/Comm	Personal: Member of Cambridge Rowing Club.
Councillor O'Connell	15/45/Comm	Personal: Member of Cambridge Canoe Club.

### **15/36/Comm Srvcs Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 July 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **15/37/Comm Srvcs Public Questions**

Member of the public asked questions when report items were discussed later on the agenda.

### **Re-Ordering the Agenda**

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used her discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the agenda.

### **15/38/Comm Srvcs Strategic Review of Community Provision, and Management Arrangements for New Community Centres at Clay Farm and Storey's Field**

#### **Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report outlined the proposed approach for a strategic review of community provision to ensure resources are targeted to meet existing and future needs. The review would consider facilities provided by the Council and others, also the opportunity for collaboration and engagement with local people and other stakeholders. The report also considered requests by the outside bodies responsible for new community centres in growth sites for the City Council's involvement in management arrangements at Clay Farm and Storey's Field.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities**

- i. Agreed the approach to the review of community provision as outlined in sections 3.4 to 3.8 of the report.
- ii. Approved the proposed management arrangements for Storeys Field Community Centre insofar as they relate to Cambridge City Council and use of its resources.
- iii. Approved the proposed management arrangements for The Clay Farm Centre insofar as they relate to Cambridge City Council and use of its resources.
- iv. Delegated any further decisions in respect of Council commitments to implementation of (ii) and (iii) [above] to the Director of Customer and Community Services.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Head of Communities, Arts and Recreation. She tabled a paper setting out visitor numbers to all community centres.

Liberal Democrat Councillors made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Community Services Members would like to be appraised of sustainability issues as per other committees.
- ii. Requested the community centre sustainability review be reported back to Community Services.

- iii. Thanked Officers for attending Storeys Field community Centre meetings to provide advice and support.

In response to Members' questions about Community Centres the Head of Communities, Arts and Recreation; Community Funding & Development Manager and Neighbourhood Community Development Manager said the following:

- i. The City Council owned eight community/neighbourhood centres. Five of these are managed by the Council. Three of the small neighbourhood centres were directly managed by local groups. Service level agreements are in place for these and there are different information monitoring requirements as voluntary organisations do not have the resources to capture data in the same way as the Council.
- ii. Officers undertook to provide committee Members with total community centre visitor number information after the committee.

The Executive Councillor said that Officers were reviewing how centres met current and future needs to inform future direction of resources and investment. A data gathering exercise would be undertaken in the first phase, then councillors and community centre users would be consulted as part of the review. No decisions would be made in advance of receipt of officer conclusions.

- iii. Reports would be brought to committee at various stages of the work. Officers would involve and update members during the review process. Links would be made to other strategies as part of the evidence base for review.
- iv. The community facility review would cover all facilities, including those provided in schools and churches. It would capture current use, demand and gaps. All providers would get the same questionnaire. Collected data would be collated and reported back to committee in January 2016.
- v. Community Centres are part of the Council's carbon management plan. Officers undertook to circulate a link to this in respect of community centres.

Councillor O'Connell proposed the following amendments to recommendation (i):

After the end of recommendation 2.1, add:

With the following changes:

- 3.4: Addition of Sustainability to list of outcomes.
- 3.4: Addition of Schools for scope of work.

- 3.7: Phase two, first bullet point: Delete “Consider options for future focus of The Meadows and opportunity for any redirection of resource from there”.
- 3.7: Phase three: Delete July 2016 decision point.
- Addition of reports to the Executive Councillor and Community Services Scrutiny Committee for approval between each phase.

The Executive Councillor said that points 3.4 and 3.7 did not need to be amended as the scope of the review already covered points Liberal Democrat Councillors wanted to cover.

The Director of Customer and Community Services referred to paragraph 3.8 of the Officer’s report which set out the timetable for the review. Reports would be brought back to committee for decision, but not for information. Officers could offer information briefings to councillors outside of the scrutiny committee.

Councillor O’Connell sought reassurance that the audit phase results would be reported back to committee and that resources would not be arbitrarily cut for The Meadows (it had the highest costs, but also highest usage).

The Executive Councillor said that resources would be determined by consultation/audit phase 1 results.

The Head of Communities, Arts and Recreation re-iterated that the committee would be kept involved and informed. Reports would be brought back to the committee whenever a decision was required.

The amendment was lost by 5 votes to 3. Councillors then voted on the original recommendations.

The Committee resolved by 5 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

### **Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)**

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

### **15/39/Comm Srvcs S106 Priority-Setting: Sports and Community Facilities Strategic Projects**

**Matter for Decision**

Between June – August 2015, the Council ran its latest S106 bidding round. It invited proposals and grant applications for projects which could help to mitigate the impact of development in Cambridge through funding from generic, off-site developer contributions.

Around 65 bids had been received in this latest bidding round. Of these, 11 related to proposals that need to be considered by the Executive Councillor.

All proposals received had been assessed against the council's criteria for the use of off-site S106 developer contributions. Of the 11 strategic/city-wide proposals featured in the report, 3 are eligible for S106 funding, feasible and ready to be considered in October.

In addition to these 3 proposals, it is envisaged that between 3 and 6 others could be considered in a follow-up report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee in early 2016 in light of updated evidence base information about community and sports facilities in Cambridge.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities**

- i. Prioritised the following proposals for strategic/city-wide S106 funding, subject to project appraisal and community use agreement:
  - a. A grant of up to £100,000 to the Greek Orthodox Community of St Athanasios for the refurbishment of the Memorial Hall and large church hall on Cherry Hinton Road as a community facility – this was also conditional on the further £50,000 requested being allocated from the South and East area committees.
  - b. A grant of up to £75,000 to Cambridge Gymnastics Academy for a sunken trampoline & foam pit in the gym which was being developed on the North Cambridge Academy site.
  - c. £40,000 grant to the Kelsey Kerridge Sports Hall Trust to improve and extend the Outlooks Gym changing rooms and to develop a new health suite at the Kelsey Kerridge Sports Centre.
- ii. Requested a follow-up report to this Committee in early 2016, with recommendations for further S106 priority-setting within the current round in the light of updated audits of sports and community facilities in Cambridge.
- iii. Requested a monitoring report to this Committee in June 2016 to review the progress of some key sports and community facilities projects allocated S106-funding in previous priority-setting rounds, which were currently still under development.

**Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

**Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

**Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Urban Growth Project Manager.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Communities, Arts and Recreation said the following:

- i. Funding could be applied for by community facilities projects in schools as well as other venues.
- ii. When projects were considered for s106 funding, the hours of availability for community use were among a number of factors taken into consideration when deciding if funding could be allocated.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

**Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)**

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

**15/40/Comm Srvcs Environmental Improvement Programme****Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report considered changes and modifications to operating protocols for the Environmental Improvement Programme (EIP).

The programme creates direct, lasting and noticeable improvements to the appearance of the public realm and is accessible to all residents of Cambridge through local Ward Councillors and Area Committees.

The number of EIP projects being considered at any one time, and often with their complexity, has historically made the management and delivery of the programme challenging at times, with project delays frequent.

The EIP report considered options and made recommendations on changes to the frequency of allocations, the selection process, setting funding caps and

the number of allocations per ward, with the aim to improve project delivery timescales.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

The Executive Councillor agreed that:

- i. Area Committees may consider EIP allocations up to twice per year, should they wish.
- ii. Area Committees are set a cap of £5,000 per project, which can be overruled by a majority vote of the area committee.
- iii. A maximum of two projects is included per round (maximum three projects per year), per ward.
- iv. Projects are considered through a selection process before Area Committee approvals.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

This item was not requested for pre-scrutiny and the committee made no comments in response to the report from the Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

### **Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)**

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

### **15/41/Comm Srvcs Cherry Hinton High Street Local Centres Improvements**

#### **Public Question**

Councillor Ashton addressed the committee in his role as a Ward Councillor and Chair of the Cherry Hinton Residents Association. He raised the following points:

- i. Expressed concern regarding the condition of the public realm in Cherry Hinton.



- ii. Looked forward to funding coming into the area to improve its appearance, remove clutter and improve Rectory Terrace.
- iii. Queried if Rectory Terrace improvement work could be undertaken before work to improve the general appearance of the area, residents thought the former was a priority.

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places undertook to liaise with the Urban Design and Conservation Manager regarding Cherry Hinton work.

### **Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report detailed proposals to improve Cherry Hinton High Street. The scheme would be jointly developed and funded by Cambridge City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council. The scheme would involve upgraded cycleways, soft and hard landscaping, improvements to crossing points and improved public realm on Cherry Hinton High Street between the Robin Hood junction to the south and Teversham Drift to the north. The City Council part of the project has been developed in line with the Local Centres Improvement Programme, for which approval was granted by the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places in October, 2014, to improve two local centres (Cherry Hinton High Street and Arbury Court) and a third still to be determined.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

- i. Noted the results of public consultation on improvements to Cherry Hinton High Street as set out in Appendix B of the Officer's report.
- ii. Noted that the scheme was being proposed for funding through the Mid-Year Financial Review (MFR).
- iii. Agreed the proposed improvements to Cherry Hinton High Street as set out in report Appendix C, which would be finalised for the purposes of procurement in partnership with Cambridgeshire County Council; and agreed that any final modifications to the detailed improvements and design would be agreed with the Chair, spokes and city and county members of Cherry Hinton ward.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

This item was not requested for pre-scrutiny and the committee made no comments in response to the report from the Urban Design and Conservation Manager.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

**Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)**

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

**15/42/Comm Srvcs Cambridge BID - Annual Update**

**Matter for Information**

Cambridge BID representatives provided the Committee with an update on their activity over the past 12 months.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

Not applicable.

**Reason for the Decision**

Not applicable.

**Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

**Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a presentation from the Chair and Manager of Cambridge BID.

The Director of Environment made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Council Officers had a good working relationship with BID Officers.
- ii. The BID undertook deep cleansing work in the city centre in addition to that undertaken by the Council's Community Engagement and Enforcement Team.

In response to Members' questions the BID Manager said the following:

- i. The BID worked closely with Cambridge Live at a strategic and operational level. There were also close links with the City Council. A

meeting would occur in future with other stakeholders such as Tourist Information.

- ii. Pop up shops were welcome on principle in the Grand Arcade, but were not a priority as they were time/resource intensive projects. A pop up shop had previously been set up as a fixed term project to use an empty unit, but there were not many empty premises in Cambridge.

### **Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)**

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

## **15/43/Comm Srvcs Outdoor Play Strategy**

### **Matter for Decision**

The proposed strategy detailed in appendix A of the Officer's report provided a strategic framework to steer future outdoor play provision and associated investment decisions.

The strategy had been informed by a detailed audit of outdoor play provision including an assessment of current quantity, quality and accessibility against current and future population growth. The results of this assessment were used to identify deficiencies in provision in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility.

The strategy had been developed in consultation with both internal and external stakeholders including senior officers of the Council whose responsibilities relate to children's and young people's play provision.

The strategy made recommendations which aimed to maximise the use of available resources and associated future investment opportunities to deliver high quality, high value, well used outdoor play provision for children and young people over the period 2016 to 2021.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

- i. Approved the proposed outdoor play investment strategy in appendix A of the Officer's report.
- ii. Instructed Officers to:
  - a. Prepare ward based profiles to inform the planning and decision making around the allocation of Section 106, CIL and other such investment opportunities on outdoor play provision.
  - b. Use the ward profiles to inform reviews of specific outdoor play spaces considered to be low value/ low use involving key

stakeholders, including children, young people and their families and local Ward councillors.

- c. Prepare an investment plan for both local and strategic play provision, informed by the strategy and ward profiles.
- d. Use the investment plan to make recommendations on the allocation of funds for both local and strategic outdoor play provision, such as S106, CIL, bids to the Council's capital plan, and external investment opportunities.
- e. Develop a design guide to aid future planning and delivery of good quality/ high value children's and young people's outdoor play provision.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager.

The Committee asked the following questions in response to the report:

- i. Queried the approach to consultation on new play spaces.

The Executive Councillor said the Outdoor Play Strategy was an overarching strategy, operational details would be covered in other ways eg through Area Committees. Consultation would be undertaken to ascertain needs as it was important to install appropriate equipment rather than having to respond to queries post implementation.

The Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager said the report looked at equipment availability not usage. Ward profiles would be built up over time so Area Committees could decide how to assign play equipment.

- ii. Queried how to address resident's concerns about fencing around play areas and a lack of seating.

The Executive Councillor said fencing was put around play areas in response to parents' concerns about dog fouling. This was considered on a case by case basis, but generally done around children's facilities.

The Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager said play areas would have various public realm facilities such as benches and bins.

- iii. Sought clarification about Dundee Close facilities.

The Executive Councillor said facilities were omitted for Dundee Close as it was assumed there were some in place already, although there were not.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

### **Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)**

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

### **15/44/Comm Srvcs S106 Priority-Setting: Open Spaces, Play Areas, Public Art and Public Realm Improvements**

#### **Public Question**

A member of the public asked a question as set out below.

Mr Bond raised the following points:

- i. Chesterton Community Association had made a bid for s106 funding.
- ii. A comprehensive review was required to look at facilities currently available in Chesterton and further ones that may be required in future. Queried the reference to the splash pad in the Officer's report.
- iii. Chesterton Community Association was an established organisation and registered charity. It would be willing to enter into a service level agreement with the City Council to represent residents' views and ensure appropriate facilities were established in the area.
- iv. Facility usage could be expected to rise once they were in place (ie they wouldn't be unwanted).

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places responded:

- i. The Officer's report was in response to residents' views that a lot of play equipment was put in on a piecemeal basis without the City Council checking if it was needed.
- ii. A splash pad was proposed at the request of a councillor. There may not be sufficient resources to implement it in the current financial year.

- iii. Welcomed the proposal for the City Council to work with Chesterton Community Association as a single point of contact for recreation ground users.

The Sport & Recreation Manager said that a number of capital projects were being worked on this year. Various facility projects for Cherry Hinton Pavilion would (jointly) come forward next year.

### **Matter for Decision**

This was the second of two S106 reports on the agenda. Between June to August 2015, the council ran its latest S106 bidding round, inviting proposals and grant applications for projects which could help to mitigate the impact of development in Cambridge through funding from generic, off-site developer contributions.

Around 65 bids were received in the latest bidding round. Of these, 30 were proposals that needed to be considered by the Executive Councillor.

All proposals received had been assessed against the council's criteria for the use of off-site S106 developer contributions.

Of the 30 proposals featured in the Officer's report, 15 (with revisions to a few projects) were eligible for S106 funding, feasible and ready to be considered. If all 15 are prioritised (as recommended), this would equate to over £360k of S106 funding allocations for strategic/city-wide projects in this portfolio.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

The Executive Councillor agreed to:

- i. Prioritise the following proposals from strategic/city-wide S106 funds, subject to project appraisal and grant agreements (as appropriate):

<b>Recommended projects</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>S106 type</b>	<b>Ref.</b>
Improve access to Hodson's Folly	£15k	Open space	D1
Mill Road Cemetery access and main footpath improvements	£175k	Open space	D3
Sheep's Green watercourse improvements & habitat creation	£40k	Open space	D4
Grant for Mill Road 'gateway' sign ( <i>the</i>	£42k	Public	F3

<i>estimated costs are likely to be revised)</i>		realm	
Grant to Cambridge Live for Syd Barrett public art commemoration	£10k	Public art	G1
Grant to Chesterton Community Association for Chesterton mural	£3.4k	Public art	G2
Grant to Growing Spaces project in King's Hedges for public art	£2k	Public art	G3
Grant to Historyworks for History Trails	£15k-£20k	Public art	G4
Grant to Historyworks for 'Sounds of Steam' project	£15k	Public art	G5
Grant to Friends of Mitcham's Corner for Mitcham's Models at Christmas	Up to £6k	Public art	G7
Grant to Newnham Croft Primary School for stained glass window	£12k	Public art	G8
Grant to Kettle's Yard for public art at North Cambridge Academy	£15k	Public art	G9
Grant to Rowan Humberstone for public art at front of 40 Humberstone Road	Up to £2k	Public art	G12
Grant to St Matthew's Primary School for 'The place where we stand' performance	£15k	Public art	G13
Grant for Trumpington Stitchers' wall-hanging about life in Trumpington	£7.5k	Public art	G14

- ii. Ring-fence £100,000 of public art S106 contributions for small-scale public art grants to local community groups and organisations in future bidding rounds across 2016 and 2017 (see paragraph 5.3 of the Officer's report).
- iii. Develop proposals for large-scale public art projects - to be commissioned by the council and to reflect the city's identity – and to report these proposals to the Community Services Scrutiny Committee from early 2016.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

### Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Urban Growth Project Manager. He brought the report up to date by amending the figure in recommendation 2.1 'F3' from £34k to £42k as set out below

Grant for Mill Road 'gateway' sign ( <i>the estimated costs are likely to be revised</i> )	£34k <b>£42k</b>	Public realm	F3
--	---------------------	--------------	----

In response to Members' questions the Sport & Recreation Manager said that the East Chesterton Recreation Ground did have a mains water supply, but the infrastructure was not in place to connect it to the proposed splash pad. This added to the costs of the proposed project.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations as amended.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

### Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

### 15/45/Comm Srvcs Council Appointments to the Conservators of the River Cam

#### Matter for Decision

The three year term of office for the seven Conservators of the River Cam appointed by the City Council (4 non-councillor appointments and 3 City Councillors) ends on 31 December 2015.

The maximum term of office is 3 x three-year terms with thereafter a break period of three years before a re-application can be made.

New appointments are required for the three year term commencing 1 January 2016.

Appointments are made by the Council on the recommendation of the Executive Councillor.

### Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places



- i. Agreed the recommendation of the non-councillor appointments applicants 1, 2, 3 & 4 (see report appendix A) to the Conservators of the River Cam commencing 1 January 2016 for Council's approval.
- ii. Noted that Council considers and approves the nominations of three City Councillor appointments to the Conservators of the River Cam commencing 1 January 2016.
- iii. Undertook to write, on behalf of the Council to those Conservators whose term will end thanking them for their valuable contribution.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Democratic Services Manager.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

### **Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)**

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

## **15/46/Comm Srvcs    Review of the River Moorings Policy**

### **Public Question**

Members of the public asked a number of questions, as set out below.

1. Mr Wright raised the following points:
  - i. He lived on a boat on the Cam.
  - ii. The Council were trying to undermine their own policy.
  - iii. The river community felt that they were all treated alike as troublemakers and not as people who needed help.
  - iv. Took issue with how officers managed the moorings policy.
  - v. Asked Councillors to consider the impact of the River Moorings Policy on the river community.

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places responded:

- i. The Officer's report was focussed on how the policy would be enforced on a holistic basis across the river. People would be treated equally if they followed the rules.
- ii. The River Moorings Policy was a moorings policy, not a housing policy.

Mr Wright said that policy inconsistencies should be resolved as this was a residential mooring policy, not a car parking scheme.

2. Ms Tillson raised the following points:

- i. Decisions should be made using an evidence base.
- ii. The River Moorings Policy was based on anecdotal evidence.
- iii. Expressed concerns that policy changes may be based on flawed data.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. Anecdotal evidence from 3 organisations had shaped the draft policy.
- ii. Proposals would be consulted upon before being finalised.
- iii. Consultation responses were invited from boat users to help shape the scheme.

3. Mr Tidy raised the following points:

- i. There was a lot of concern regarding the proposed Moorings Policy as it would affect boats that people lived on.
- ii. The Executive Councillor had previously given assurances that people would not be made homeless as a result of policy decisions. However, the ultimate sanction in the proposed policy was to seize a boat, which would make the owner homeless. Queried if other options had been considered and if there was a political will to seize boats.
- iii. Other organisations used criminal enforcement action rather than civil to avoid the possibility of seizing people's boats.
- iv. Queried who would undertake enforcement action ie in-house or out-house personnel.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. There were 2 areas of the river particularly affected by moorings issues: Riverside and visitor moorings.
- ii. Enforcement action needed to be taken to make the mooring scheme effective.
- iii. The ultimate sanction of seizing people's boats was required in the policy. However, it was hoped that moorings charges would encourage compliance before the ultimate sanction was implemented.

- iv. The use of enforcement through criminal law would be explored in the consultation. Criminal enforcement action took a long time and an alternative (ie civil law) was required.
- v. Enforcement action by in-house personnel was desirable.

The Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager said the River Manager had experience of enforcement schemes elsewhere. Mooring Policy scheme implementation could be reviewed as part of the consultation.

Mr Tidy re-iterated his concerns about the proposed mooring policy. The Executive Councillor said her earlier reassurance referred to those who had signed up to the Moorings Policy as they would be protected from enforcement action. Only those who had not signed up were liable to having their boats seized.

4. Mr Maddison raised the following points:
  - i. Mooring sites should be reviewed to ensure they were in an appropriate place.
  - ii. Risk was not covered in the policy.
  - iii. The policy covered 'illegal' boats, not 'legal' boats moored incorrectly.
  - iv. Queried who was registered under the Moorings Policy eg boat owners or occupiers. Queried how sub-lettings were covered.
  - v. Queried if the policy would address:
    - Boat users burning any fuel they wished, even if this (negatively) impacted on neighbours.
    - Some boats had noisy generators.
    - Some boats did not move from their moorings and stayed in place until they sank.
  - vi. His concern was that some boat users did not take responsibility for their actions, not that people lived on boats (or with people who did so in general).

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The intention was to review moorings as a whole. The proposal was to move inappropriately moored boats first, then review mooring sites in future.
- ii. An enforcement policy needed to be put in place before action could be taken in future against people who breached the Moorings Policy.
- iii. Pollution issues would be addressed as part of the wider policy review after the consultation stage.

The Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager said the list of registered boats/owners was as per people who registered in August 2015.

Mr Maddison raised the following supplementary points:

- i. Better communication was needed with residents regarding actions being undertaken.
- ii. There was a perception that some boat users were not playing by the rules, although most did.

The Executive Councillor responded that she was aware that Riverside residents had concerns that not all boat users were following the Moorings Policy. A majority of boat users did follow the policy, but the Council needed enforcement powers to take action against the minority who flouted the rules.

5. Ms Symons raised the following points:

- i. Spoke as a Riverside resident.
- ii. Expressed concern that some people were not adhering to the Moorings Policy and this led to anti-social behavior such as rubbish dumping.
- iii. The threat of future enforcement action has led to some changes in people's behavior already, but sanctions were needed to ensure all people conform to the Moorings Policy.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. There were a variety of issues affecting Riverside:
  - Moorings.
  - Parking.
  - Entrance to Stourbridge Common.
- ii. The above issues had to be addressed through a variety of different policies. Enforcement action would be taken first, then wider issues addressed later.
- iii. Community cohesion should improve once the anti-social behaviour of the minority had been addressed.

The Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager said he had liaised with the Senior Anti-Social Behaviour Officer regarding Riverside issues.

6. Ms Clarke raised the following points:

- i. Some boaters would prefer mooring fees to be used more efficiently ie directed towards services rather than enforcement.

- ii. The consultation should allow boaters and non-boaters to comment.
- iii. Anti-social behavior was committed by boaters and non-boaters.

The Executive Councillor said that boaters and non-boaters could respond to the consultation, to get the correct solution.

7. Mr Ross raised the following points:

- i. Took issue with the Council implementing a policy that took away people's homes. The Moorings Policy was aimed at moorings issues, but impacted on people's homes.
- ii. There were lots of historic issues with the River Moorings Waiting List.
- iii. The Moorings Policy should be applied equally, not on a discretionary basis.
- iv. Asked if the Committee would consider an amnesty for people not on the River Moorings Waiting List, or those in dispute with the City Council, rather than taking enforcement action.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. Asked that Mr Ross raise points from his representation in the Moorings Policy consultation.
- ii. An enforcement policy was required, albeit one to tackle a few unlicensed moorings users, or those who had not joined the moorings scheme.
- iii. Those who had signed up to the Moorings Policy would not be affected by enforcement action.
- iv. No amnesty was proposed for those who had no right to moor on the river.
- v. Re-iterated that a consultation would be undertaken before the policy was further developed or implemented.

Mr Ross raised the following supplementary points:

- i. There was a perception that the Moorings Policy was being applied in different ways.
- ii. Hoped that a policy of mediation would be applied instead of a discretionary enforcement policy.

The Executive Councillor said that Cambridge moorings were cheaper than anywhere else.

8. The River Manager raised the following points:

- i. He had introduced pilot river management schemes in Oxford and Surrey.
- ii. He was familiar with the Moorings Policy and how it could be implemented.
- iii. He had not had to resort to seizing boats using other river management schemes to date as other measures had resolved issues before they got to that stage.

### **Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report contained recommendations that the Council consults about amendments to, and the management of, the Council's River Moorings Policy.

The report detailed issues and options that had been raised by stakeholders, namely:

- The management of the waiting list.
- Overstays on the 48 hour visitor moorings.
- Issues that arose from boats not on the regulated moorings scheme at Riverside.

The report highlighted areas for further consideration and scrutiny relating to the need for consultation to include the option to use a civil contract law approach for the regulation and management of the Council's moorings.

Further investigative work was required to establish how the civil contract law approach would be best implemented and managed should the results of the recommended consultation support the approach.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

Instructed Officers to:

- i. Consult on the following proposals:
  - a. To introduce a management regime for the regulation and enforcement of the City Council moorings based on civil contract law.
  - b. To retain the existing provision of a free 48 hour visitor mooring period, with no return for 7 days on designated moorings owned by Cambridge City Council;
  - c. To introduce a free 6 hour mooring period, with no overnight stay or return for 7 days on all moorings owned by Cambridge City Council except the 48 hours visitor moorings.
  - d. Levy a charge for overstaying/ or for mooring without a licence.
- ii. Report the outcomes of the consultation, and to make further recommendations with regard to the management and enforcement of

the City Council moorings taking into account the consultation responses.

**Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

**Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

**Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager.

In response to Members' questions the Executive Councillor said the following:

- i. Moorings were a small part of the wider river management issue. The Council needed to live up to its commitment to boaters to tackle illegal moorings before tackling wider issues.
- ii. There would be a consultation on wider issues after enforcement ones.
- iii. The point of a regulated moorings scheme was to protect people; so only unregulated moorings or people who use moorings since the list closed in August 2014.
- iv. Recommendations would be brought back to committee in future setting out the policy to follow if enforcement may lead to boat seizures.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

**Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)**

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

**15/47/Comm Srvcs Tree Strategy****Matter for Decision**

The Strategy highlighted the value and role of tree management and tree canopy cover within an urban forestry context. It provided the Council with a strategic approach to the management of its tree assets for the period 2016 to 2026.

The strategy considered key national, regional as well as local influences and gave clarity on the complexities of managing trees as assets. By

understanding these key requirements, the Council could prioritise service needs, improvements and investment.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

- i. Approved the Tree Strategy.
- ii. Instructed the Head of Streets and Open Space to create an action plan on how to achieve the objectives, targets and outcomes stated in the Officer's report.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. An action plan was needed to increase tree planting in the city.
- ii. As many people as possible would be contacted to invite them to respond to consultation exercises.
- iii. The consultation period took a long time to complete in Conservation Areas. This could lead to conflict between different council policies.

In response to Members' questions the Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager said the following:

- i. Amendments to text could be made out of cycle so a revised document could be presented to committee in future.
- ii. A lot of data was based on aerial photographs. An action plan could be developed in future based on this.
- iii. Planning policy sets out who should be contacted for consultations. Generally there was low feedback from residents. The Council went beyond the basic requirements of only contacting contiguous properties as set out in planning policy.
- iv. The Council was tasked to undertake consultation activity within 6 weeks in conservation areas.

In response to Members' questions the Executive Councillor said the following:



- i. Consultation contacts would be reviewed in future. Various contacts were consulted depending on circumstances (eg planning applications were treated differently to tree works).
- ii. The Council tried to consult as many people as possible. Ward Councillors could act as a focal point for residents' representations.
- iii. Undertook to liaise with Councillor Reid after the meeting regarding possible changes to Tree Strategy wording.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

### **Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)**

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

## **15/48/Comm Srvcs Working With Friends Groups**

### **Matter for Decision**

Cambridge had a significant number of open spaces, and some of these now had established and active Friends Groups associated with them. These groups undertook a range of different site management support functions including 'hands on' days involving operational tasks such as litter picking, vegetation management and site surveying; and organising community events and activities. They also provided a valuable conduit between the Council and the local community in terms of shaping strategic documents, for example, site management plans and providing membership feedback on public consultations.

The Council had undertaken a review of Friends Group expectations and aspirations and associated support needs. The review results have been supplemented by a recently convened city wide Friends Group Forum.

The Officer's report highlighted the results of this work and made recommendations to improve how the Council works with and supports Friends Groups to deliver mutually shared management aims and objectives for the city's open spaces.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

- i. Approved the development of a joint protocol which guides how the Council works with Friends Groups.
- ii. Instructed officers to:

- a. Support Friends Group to develop and adopt written constitutions that are robust, democratic and accountable.
- b. Support Friends Groups to engage fully in the review, development and implementation of existing and new open space management plans and projects.
- c. Develop generic support documentation to aid the sustainable development and functioning of strong, active Friends Groups.
- d. Hold a bi-annual Friends forum with guest speakers and minutes circulated to aid communication.
- e. To establish a Friends Group website, including online forum and generic and individual group pages/news, to aid communication.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager.

In response to Members' questions the Executive Councillor said the following:

- i. Friends Groups were one of several contact points for the council to liaise with when consulting with the community. They were a valued contact group, but it was recognised they could not represent the views of all stakeholders eg public realm users may travel from outside of a ward to use facilities (eg play areas).
- ii. The Officer's report just listed Friends Groups linked to open spaces. Once an assessment of good practice had been undertaken, a model would be rolled out to other friends groups in future.
- iii. A workshop was proposed for Friends Groups on a bi-annual basis with guest speakers to share good practice.

The Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager signposted Sheffield City Council as an example of a council that worked well with Friends Groups. The City Council had authority to adapt their good practice models and use in Cambridge.

The Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager was liaising with the City Council Web Team to set up links to Friends Groups websites.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

**Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)**

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

The meeting ended at 6.40 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank