

# Public Document Pack

Community Services Scrutiny Committee

CmSrv/1

Thursday, 14 January 2016

## COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

14 January 2016

2.30 - 4.15 pm

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

Executive Councillor for Communities: Richard Johnson

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

### Officers:

Director of Customer and Community Services: Liz Bisset

Director of Environment: Simon Payne

Head of Communities, Arts and Recreation: Debbie Kaye

Head of Streets and Open Spaces: Joel Carré

Cultural Manager: Jane Wilson

Community Funding and Development Manager: Jackie Hanson

Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager: Alistair Wilson

Principal Accountant (Services): Chris Humphris

Committee Manager: James Goddard

### Others Present:

Cambridge Live (Chair): Sara Garnham

## FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

### 16/49/Comm Apologies

No apologies were received.

### 16/50/Comm Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Bird	16/60/Comm	Personal: Forum Manager - The Cambridge Forum of Disabled People.  Personal: Rowan

		Humberstone Board member.  Chair - Friends with Disabilities.
Councillor O'Connell	15/60/Comm	Personal: Trustee of Encompass Network.  Member of Trumpington Residents Association.  Partner is the trustee of Encompass and of SexYOUality.  Other partner is a volunteer with the CAB.
Councillor Ratcliffe	16/60/Comm	Personal: Director of Cambridge Live.
Councillors Reid	16/60/Comm	Personal: Cambridge Literary Festival Chair.  She said that if the committee were to discuss this grant application she would leave the room and regard her interest as prejudicial. The Committee did not specifically discuss the Literary Festival grant application.
Councillor Reid	16/60/Comm	Personal: Director of Cambridge Live.  She said that if the committee were to discuss this grant application she would leave the room and regard her interest as prejudicial. The Committee did not specifically

		discuss the Cambridge Live grant application.
--	--	---

### **16/51/Comm Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 October 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

Councillor Reid queried details regarding P29 of minute item *15/47/Comm Srvcs Tree Strategy*. She understood that Ward Councillors would be consulted before the Executive Councillor took a decision regarding the Tree Strategy. The Executive Councillor for City and Public Places said this was the case. Details were set out in the Tree Strategy even though they were not explicitly stated in the 8 October minutes.

The Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager undertook to circulate a copy of the Tree Strategy to Councillors.

### **16/52/Comm Public Questions**

There were no public questions.

### **16/53/Comm City Centre & Public Places Portfolio Revenue and Capital Budgets**

#### **Matter for Decision**

The report detailed the budget proposals relating to the City Centre and Public Places portfolio that are included in the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2016/17.

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

##### Review of Charges:

- i. Approved the proposed charges for this portfolio's services and facilities, as shown in Appendices A1-A2 to the Officer's report.

##### Revenue:

- ii. Considered the revenue budget proposals as shown in Appendix B.

##### Capital:

- iii. Considered the capital budget proposals as shown in Appendix C.
- iv. Agreed to adjust capital funding for item 2c (iii above).

#### **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 Principal Accountant (Services). He stated there was a typographical error on P5 of the report which should read: Strategy and Resources – City Centre & Public Places Portfolio Revenue and Capital Budget Proposals for 2015/16 **2016/17** to 2019/20.

Councillor O'Connell sought clarification regarding Parks and Open Space - Event Income (report P18). The Executive Councillor for City Centre & Public Places said figures were indicative. There were no confirmed locations for events, although the Beer Festival may be held on Jesus Green.

Councillor Austin sought clarification regarding the review of fees & charges - Bereavement Services (report P12). The Director of Environment said the charges were proposed to change by 5% to take into account changes in costs to deliver the service. This was in line with the strategy brought to Community Services Scrutiny Committee in 2015. The Council need to invest in the Service to maintain quality.

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.

### **16/54/Comm 2015/16 S106 Priority-Setting Follow-Up: Public Realm Improvement Proposals**

#### **Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report presented further proposals for a couple of public realm improvements over several years so that relevant S106 developer contributions could be used before they expired pre-2020. This was a follow-up to 2015/16 S106 priority-setting reports for Community Services Committee October 2015,

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

- i. Prioritised up to £75,000 of S106 contributions towards public realm improvements along Cherry Hinton Road (between the junction with Hills Road and corner of Rock Road), subject to project appraisal.
- ii. Prioritised up to £43,000 of S106 contributions towards a later public realm improvement scheme on Sidney Street, subject to project appraisal.

**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.

Councillor Bird asked if seating in Cherry Hinton Road and Sidney Street public realm improvements could have arms (agenda P35). The Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager undertook to review this.

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.

**16/55/Comm Capital Delivery Approval: Cherry Hinton Hall Grounds Improvements (Phase 2)****Matter for Decision**

This project related to phase 2 of the grounds improvements at Cherry Hinton Hall. It had already been allocated £400,000 of S106 informal open space contributions, as agreed by the then Executive Councillor following a report to this Committee in January 2012.

Capital projects with a value of greater than £300,000 required Executive Councillor approval.

The Capital Programme Board reviewed this project and considered that it was ready for implementation, subject to Executive Councillor and funding approval.

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

Agreed to:

- i. Approve the Cherry Hinton Hall grounds improvement – phase 2 project, as detailed in the attached appendices, which has been properly planned and is ready for implementation.
- ii. Recommend the Cherry Hinton Hall grounds improvement – phase 2 project is put forward for funding approval in the Budget Setting Report (BSR).
- iii. Delegate to the Director of Environment to invite and evaluate tenders for the Cherry Hinton Hall grounds improvement – phase 2 project.
- iv. Delegate to the Director of Environment, following consultation with the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places, to award a contract for the Cherry Hinton Hall grounds improvement – phase 2 project to the tender(s) evaluated as the most economically advantageous to the Council.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

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

Not applicable.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

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.

**16/56/Comm Cambridge City Centre Accessibility Review Action Plan Progress Report****Matter for Decision**

In 2014 a review was commissioned to gain a fuller understanding of the issues affecting ease of access in and around the city centre for a range of users but particularly pedestrians, disabled and wheelchair users. The review report was considered at the March 2015 Community Services Scrutiny Committee, and in July 2015 a plan of action was developed and approved at committee to take the next steps to bring about the identified changes needed. The Officer's report provided a progress update of the actions undertaken from the action plan.

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

Noted the contents of the 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 made no comments in response to the report from the Head of Streets & Open Spaces.

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.

**16/57/Comm Communities Portfolio Revenue and Capital Budgets****Matter for Decision**

The report detailed the budget proposals relating to the Communities portfolio that were included in the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2016/17.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities**

Review of Charges:

- i. Approved the proposed charges for this portfolio's services and facilities, as shown in Appendix A to the Officer's report and subject to Junior swimming charges being £2.35 (P27 & 28 Appendix A).

Revenue:

- ii. Considered the revenue budget proposals as shown in Appendix B.

Capital:

- iii. Considered the capital budget proposals as shown in Appendix C.
- iv. Agreed to adjust capital funding for item 2c (iii above).

### **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 Principal Accountant (Services).

The Executive Councillor for Communities referred to P27 & 28 Appendix A of the supplemental second circulation paper. He proposed to reduce the Junior swimming charge from the proposed £2.40 back to £2.35 as on reflection it was felt this was more appropriate than the £2.40 figure proposed by GLL (contractor). This was to bring the percentage increase for the Junior swimming charge into line with the average proposed increase across all the other non-commercial fees and charges.

Councillor O'Connell sought clarification regarding GLL charges as set out on P28 & 29 of the Officer's report. The Head of Communities, Arts and Recreation said the report reflected proposed savings, fees and charges. All swimming sites would be retained by the City Council.

Councillors requested a change to P27 & 28 Appendix A of the supplemental second circulation paper (as referenced in recommendation 2a. Councillor Sinnott formally proposed to amend the increase to Junior swimming charges from the proposed £2.40 back to £2.35.

The Committee unanimously approved this amendment, and that recommendation 2a would become:



a) Approve the proposed charges for this portfolio's services and facilities, as shown in Appendix A to this report **and subject to Junior swimming charges being £2.35 (P27 & 28 Appendix A)**.

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

The Executive Councillor approved the revised recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

## **16/58/Comm Strategic Approach to Community Provision**

### **Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report provided:

- i. An update on the work of the review to date and outline proposals for the next steps of the information gathering exercise.
- ii. Headline findings from the audit of city-wide community facilities.

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

- i. Noted the headline findings of the city-wide community facilities audit.
- ii. Agreed the next steps as identified in section 3.6 of 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 Community Funding and Development Manager.

In response to Members' questions the Community Funding and Development Manager said the following:

- i. There had been 68 returns to the audit, 50 facilities were run by charity organisations and another 2 by voluntary groups.
- ii. 22 churches had responded to state they provided community facilities. They were required to register as charities as a result of a change to the law.

- iii. Officers could provide headline details of responses currently. They would identify further detail to report back to area committees in future.
- iv. Officers were drawing up stakeholder engagement plans. Details would be made available through community centres and the council website.

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.

## **16/59/Comm Cambridge Live Performance 2015/16**

### **Matter for Decision**

2015 was the first year of trading for Cambridge Live, an independent charity set up by the Council. Cambridge Live was contracted by the Council to run the Corn Exchange, Guildhall Event Programme, Cambridge Folk Festival and the City Events Programme. The Officer's report provided an overview of performance management and proposed new key indicators for the contract.

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

Approved the key performance indicators listed in paragraph 3.4b of 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 Head of Communities, Arts & Recreation. This was supplemented by a presentation from the Chair of Cambridge Live.

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

- i. This was a good time to recognise the hard work by Officers in setting up Cambridge Live and delivering services.
- ii. The City Council and Cambridge Live worked well together.
- iii. Cambridge Live were delivering their contracted obligations.

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

- i. Key performance indicators focussed on the Black, Asian & Minority Ethnic (BAME) community as these reflected issues that encouraged/discouraged service uptake. It was assumed that age and gender details were also collected at the same time.

The Executive Councillor for Communities said he was happy in principle to report BAME, age and gender details collected from key performance indicators. Officers said they would discuss this with Cambridge Live.

- ii. Performance against key performance indicators would be benchmarked against national data as there was no local level data equivalent.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation.

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.

## **16/60/Comm Community Grants 2016-17**

### **Matter for Decision**

This was the second year of the Community Grants fund for voluntary and community not-for-profit organisations. The Officer's report provided a brief overview of the eligibility criteria, support provided and process undertaken.

Applications received were detailed in Appendix 1 of the Officer's report, alongside recommendations for awards.

The Officer's report also detailed the budget available for Area Committee Community Grants 2016-17.

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

Approved the Community Grants to voluntary and community organisations for 2016-17, as set out in Appendix 1 of the Officer's report, subject to the budget approval in February 2016 and any further satisfactory information required of applicant organisations.

### **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 Community Funding and Development Manager.

The Executive Councillor for Communities made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Thanked Officers for their hard work.
- ii. There was less funding available this year to support community and voluntary organisations. This was because last year there was a special, one off, 'transition fund' of £75,000 to take into account changes to the eligibility criteria and the overall Community Grant fund pot.
- iii. Officers were doing all they could to support applicants and maximise their value for money.

In response to Members' questions the Community Funding and Development Manager said the following:

- i. A range of applications had been received from community/voluntary organisations, some were strong (ie met criteria for funding) and some were not.
- ii. Officers had provided a range of support for applicants who sought funding such as offering training to help them progress their applications. Organisations known to be interested in making applications were approached to signpost assistance available. Help guides had been updated to make the application process as user friendly as possible.
- iii. An annual monitoring report would be produced for all councillors circa June 2016.
- iv. It was difficult to compare the number of projects to last year as some forms contained multiple applications for funding, some organisations had submitted multiple applications.
- v. Applications could be made for more than one funding stream, so officers allocated them to the most appropriate.
- vi. There were a similar number of organisations that made applications for this year's funding round compared to last year.

There were 15 applications supporting mental ill health.

The Community Funding and Development Manager undertook to circulate figures regarding the number of organisations who had made

- applications to councillors. Specifically the number of applications and funding awarded for this year and last broken down by categories for comparison.
- vii. Officers would advise applicants if projects could attract funding from multiple sources. If projects could apply for more than one source of funding, this may affect the amount the City Council was prepared to offer them.
  - viii. Funding had been offered to the University of Cambridge over various years where their projects benefitted the community and contributed to outreach work, and could not be funded through 'usual' University sources.
  - ix. Community/voluntary organisations did not have to pay the living wage in order to get funding under the current scheme, this would be reviewed in future. The grants team are collating information regarding the living wage from funded organisations. A lot of applications were made by voluntary rather than paid staff, so they would not be covered by living wage criteria.

Officers undertook to review the impact of the living wage policy on general partnership working arrangements, and report findings back to councillors.

The Executive Councillor for Communities offered to liaise with any Councillor regarding living wage policy outside of the meeting.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation.

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.

The meeting ended at 4.15 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank