

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

REPORT OF: Head of Planning Services

TO: Planning Committee

2 March 2016

WARDS: All

**Update on Public Art at the University Arms Hotel Site
(13/1087/FUL)**

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to allow members to see the details of the Public Art proposal for the University Arms Hotel following the granting of planning permission on 6th November 2013 where members sought to have the details of the Public Art once known to be brought back to Committee.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The applicants have provided a detailed Public Art Delivery Plan. The Public Art Officer has commented that this is now acceptable. In addition, Public Art Panel received a detailed update on 27th October 2015 and members of the Panel have given the project a green light rating. Informal discussions have been held with the Executive Councillor who is supportive of the new approach. The following is recommended:

- 1: To agree to the revised Public Art Delivery Plan
- 2: Not to seek a commuted sum for the remaining part of the 1% contribution, amounting to £83,000 of a total £235,000 (representing 1% of the capital construction costs) with a value of public art equivalent to £152,000 being delivered as part of the PADP, due to changes in the CIL regulations and to authorise officers to subsequently enter into a S106 deed of variation to agree this.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The first draft of the Public Art Delivery Plan proposed the installation of statues near to Regent Street. The Public Art Panel of 22nd July 2014 reviewed this approach and felt that this was not acceptable for a number of reasons:
- 1) It did not meet the Public Art SPD in terms of public engagement. It was felt that, *“the engagement ideas were simply added to the proposal, which was led by the architect and not the policy to provide a programme, which might comply with the Council’s policy...[for the art work] to have a public benefit”*;
 - 2) There wasn’t an appropriate location for the statues to be installed. *“The Panel also felt Regent Street is a particularly busy thoroughfare, and situating the artwork there would provide limited opportunities for people to stop and engage with it, [as well as] compromised the works of art and the architecture.”*
 - 3) The proposals were not sensitive to the site context, in particular taking the opportunity to examine the rich history of the building.
 - 4) The art works proposed were traditional and it was felt that the opportunity to deliver something contemporary and exciting was being missed.
- 3.2 The art consultant has spent time working up new proposals with the developers, owners and architects of the site as well as taken advice from City Council officers about the importance of community engagement.
- 3.3 The new PADP (attached as appendix 1) includes a range of temporary works which will involve participatory events with the local community and stakeholders, who will be included very early on in the process in order that the shape of the activities and events that will form the public art programme. The programme will be delivered in response to community needs.
- 3.4 The Public Art Panel reviewed the revision and commented that they were supportive of this proposed approach. Anglia Ruskin University was offered as a potential venue space for exhibition if needed. The appointed artist is suggested as forming partnerships

including with Parkside School, the YMCA, the Police and Fire Services, Park Terrace residents and the NCI Cricket Club.

- 3.5 The principal S106 agreement stated that the Public Art Delivery Plan shall be agreed and if no agreement can be reached then a sum of money equating to 1% of the Capital Construction Cost shall be lodged with the Council. The Members at 6th December Committee concluded that a scheme on site would be more beneficial and the agents have worked with their consultants and City Council to deliver an acceptable scheme on site.
- 3.6 In the meantime the Community Infrastructure Levy has been introduced and seeks to make appropriate use of obligation money. The CIL regulations set out three tests:
1. necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms
 2. directly related to the development; and
 3. fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 3.7 The value of the Public Art money under the CIL regulation would need to be delivered on site. With regards to the 1% tariff the CIL regulations would not be appropriate as this cannot demonstrate that the 1% is a fair and reasonable in scale and kind to the development. The reduced cost reflects the change in the approach to the delivery of Public Art on site and considering that there cannot be a pooled contribution of monies the shortfall cannot be expected to be received under the CIL regulations.
- 3.8 Officers recommend that the approach be supported as the development will deliver a project on site and would meet the tests of the CIL. Risks about perception of temporary art work will be mitigated by the approach to a rich programme of early community engagement on this project.

4 CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 None.

5 OPTIONS

- 5.1 Not relevant

6 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 To accept the recommendation as set out at para 2.1.

IMPLICATIONS

- (a) **Financial Implications - None**
- (b) **Staffing Implications - None**
- (c) **Equalities and Poverty Implications - None**
- (d) **Environmental Implications – None**
- (e) **Community Safety - None**

BACKGROUND PAPERS: The following are the background papers that were used in the preparation of this report:

None.

To inspect these documents contact Toby Williams on extension 7312

The author and contact officer for queries on the report is Toby Williams on extension 7312.