

Public Document Pack

Community Services Scrutiny Committee

CmSrv/1

Thursday, 17 March 2016

COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

17 March 2016
2.30 - 5.55 pm

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

Executive Councillors: Johnson (Executive Councillor for Communities) and O'Reilly (Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places)

Officers:

Director of Customer and Community Services: Liz Bisset

Director of Environment: Simon Payne

Head of Streets and Open Spaces: Joel Carré

Sport & Recreation Manager: Ian Ross

Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager: Alistair Wilson

Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield

Senior Asset Development Officer: Anthony French

Public Art Officer: Nadine Black

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Councillor Present: Gillespie (Market Ward Councillor)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

16/61/Comm Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Sarris, Baigent and Reid.

Councillors Benstead and Holt attended as Alternative Members.

16/62/Comm Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Austin	16/65/Comm	Personal: Member of Cambridge Rowing Club.

16/63/Comm Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendment:

16/50/Comm Declarations of Interest

Councillor O'Connell's partner, not Councillor O'Connell, was a Trustee of Encompass Network.

16/64/Comm Public Questions

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.

Members of the public asked a number of questions regarding river moorings (minute item 16/69/Comm), as set out below.

- 1. A member of the public raised the following points:**
 - i. Expressed concern that a private company would be responsible for operating the fines system.**
 - ii. Expressed concern that visitors may park in resident's moorings and so force them into other areas where they may be fined for illegally parking.**
 - iii. Asked that homes/boats were not treated like cars.**
 - iv. Expressed concern that demand for moorings may exceed supply.**

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places responded:

- i. Contract law wouldn't be implemented retrospectively.
- ii. The proposed 6 hour visitor mooring time limit had been discounted as an option.
- iii. Council staff would be responsible for imposing fines, this service would not be outsourced.
- iv. People with mooring licenses would not be subject to fines.

The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager said that contract law would enable officers to move visitors from residents' moorings.

- 2. A member of the public felt his lifestyle was under threat from mooring charges as he was concerned he would no longer afford to live on the river.**

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places responded:

- i. Reiterated that mooring fines were not aimed at licensed boats.
- ii. Said that all issues would be reviewed in the mooring policy paper coming to Community Services Scrutiny Committee in summer 2016.

The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager said that Central Government guidance was expected in future regarding low income families.

3. Mr Bristol raised the following points:

- i. **He had signed a moorings contract.**
- ii. **Living on the river was a lifestyle choice.**
 - **The cost of living on the river was increasing.**
 - **Expressed concern that he would be arbitrarily moved on from moorings.**
- iii. **Queried who would be affected by contract law.**
- iv. **There was no formal retraction of notices asking people to move their boats although the notices had been superseded.**

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places responded:

- i. She was working with Cam Boaters to liaise with the boating community.
- ii. There was no intention to move existing boating community members from their current moorings. The intention was to bring in a policy that would apply in future. A regulatory measure was needed to protect long term mooring occupiers.

4. Ms Hurst raised the following points:

- i. **Referred to the Moorings Civil Contract Law Approach addendum and said this had been published very close to the date of the committee.**
- ii. **Stated the moorings consultation period was not long enough.**
- iii. **Hoped the City Council, Cam Boaters and Cam Conservators continued to work in partnership.**
- iv. **Vulnerable moorings users needed to be safeguarded.**
- v. **Asked for confirmation that visitors would not be allowed to moor in residential moorings.**
- vi. **Asked for confirmation that contract based enforcement would not be used on residential moorings.**
- vii. **Queried if safeguards would be written into the residential licence agreement in case residents were forced to park in visitor moorings due to a lack of space.**

- The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places responded:
- i. Undertook to work with Cam Boaters in future.
 - ii. The addendum was published late due to technical reasons. A number of late responses were received to the Contract Law Model Consultation, these did not change the recommendations, but it was thought best to publish them.
 - iii. Licensed and existing residents' boats would be excluded from fines even if signs on the river did not explicitly say this.
 - iv. Enforcement action could be taken against visitors illegally mooring in residential areas through fines if the officer recommendations were agreed later in committee.

The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager said contract law was intended to stop visitors using residential moorings. The City Council had a duty of care before taking enforcement action. If the officer recommendations were agreed later in committee then the Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager would look to amend the residential licence agreement and signage to clarify who would be affected by fines.

5. Mr Ukarnis raised the following points:

- i. Visitors were not given enough time to moor in the city and visit it.**
- ii. Penalty payments would discourage people from using moorings.**
- iii. The river could attract visitors to the city.**

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places responded:

- i. A major problem was the backlog of boats in the wrong moorings. This would be addressed through the evictions process, which would take time.
- ii. Contract law would be more of a deterrent as action could be taken faster. However, it would not be retrospective.

The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager said visitors could stay in their moorings for 48 hours. There was no clear support or objection to this from the consultation, so the proposal was left unchanged. It could be reviewed in future.

6. Councillor Sinnott referred to a written statement from Mr Tidy circulated to the Committee. She asked for a definition of reasonable condition that boats needed to be kept in (on behalf of Mr Tidy).

The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager referred to P2 of his report. A boat was considered to be in reasonable condition if it was safe and well maintained. It was part of the licence requirement to get a boat safety certificate. This did not cover aesthetics.

7. The Committee noted written statements regarding river moorings from Ms Tillson and a Cambridge resident.

8. Councillor Gillespie raised the following points:

- i. Expressed concern regarding the consultation process and because the EQiA was only provided the night before Committee.**
- ii. The impact of the Moorings policy on the boating community needed to be considered.**
- iii. Asked for a guarantee that a Public Space Protection Order would not be used on boaters.**

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places reiterated that contract law would not affect the existing boating community or be applied retrospectively.

16/65/Comm 2015/16 S106 Priority-Setting Round: Follow-Up Report

Matter for Decision

Following on from the 2015/16 S106 priority-setting report to this Committee last October, the Officer's latest report identified further needs and opportunities for allocating S106 contributions to strategic sports and community facility projects before the next round.

Two new eligible proposals had come forward in recent months which were ready to be considered now and would give the Council more room for manoeuvre to ensure that S106 contributions, due to expire before the end of 2017, are used on time.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

- i. Allocated up to £250,000 of strategic S106 outdoor sports funding as a grant to Camrowers for a joint project with Cambridgeshire Rowing Association to build a new community boathouse on the River Cam, subject to business case approval and community use agreement.**

- ii. Allocated up to £25,000 of strategic S106 community facilities funding for equipping the new community centre on the Darwin Green development in Cambridge, subject to business case approval.

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 Urban Growth Project Manager and Sport & Recreation Manager said the following:

- i. Camrowers were allocated to use the boat house morning and evening.
- ii. Use of the boat house was split between Camrowers and clubs associated with the Cambridgeshire Rowing Association. Part of the community use agreement stipulated space allocation as 60% general and 40% Camrowers.
- iii. The City Council was working with Camrowers to provide a boat for disabled people's use. The Council had funded 2 adapted boats in 2015.
- iv. Rowing was being promoted to males and females of all ages through Camrowers. This requirement would be put into the Community Use Agreement over time.

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.

16/66/Comm General & Sunday Market Rent & Terms of Trading Review

Public Questions

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

1. Mr Rice raised the following points:

- i. A lot of rubbish in the market square area was caused by non-market traders, but they were charged for the clean up.**
- ii. There were insufficient facilities (eg gas) for food sellers at present. These should be improved before increased market stall charges were considered.**
- iii. Equality and fairness were important policy considerations. Suggested a clumsy one size fits all approach policy was proposed. Cold food sellers were not charged the same amount of fees as hot food sellers.**

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places responded:

- i. The intention was to streamline and simplify a complicated pricing process with a more uniform approach.
- ii. Cleaning costs were part of the charge for market stall rent to hot food sellers, regardless of who caused the mess.

The Head of Streets and Open Spaces responded:

- i. There was a noticeable increase in electricity costs in the last few years, which was reflected in charges to stallholders.
- ii. Recommended charges were now in-line with other city markets.
- iii. Cold food stalls were already charged for area cleaning as well as hot food sellers. Under the recommended changes, hot food sellers would pay an additional surcharge.

2. Mr Bernard raised the following points:

- i. It was unfair to increase charges to all stallholders for area cleansing. People who caused any mess should be charged more.**
- ii. Took issue with the proposed charges, they would make it unprofitable to have a stall due to the high levels of competition (people would go elsewhere if the market became too expensive).**

The Head of Streets and Open Spaces responded:

- i. The intention was to attribute costs fairly.
- ii. The aim of the review was to simplify a 3 tier tariff into 2: premium and standard.
- iii. There was no differentiation between corner and perimeter stalls, both were premium.
- iv. The market was a popular venue. There was high demand for stalls and high occupancy of these due to high visitor numbers.

- v. The Council was reviewing market cleanliness and how to keep it so in future.
- vi. The Council supported traders through training and promotion. It was keen to promote the market.

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places added that some market traders would be hit harder than others by the increased charges, but this should only be a minority. It was hoped the price structure would assist the majority.

3. A market trader raised the following points:

- i. Took issue with the proposed increased charges.**
- ii. Traders had to provide their own facilities.**
- iii. People booked week day slots just so they could get weekend slots which were more profitable. (Council policy only allowed people to book whole weeks). This meant that stalls were empty during the week.**

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places responded:

- i. Proposed charges were benchmarked to be in-line with other markets across the country.
- ii. Referred to P57 of the Officer's report. Cambridge market costs were in-line with, sometimes cheaper than, other markets including smaller town ones.

The Head of Streets and Open Spaces responded:

- i. The Council tried to spread different types of stalls across the market, but people would be given a specific site upon request.
- ii. Officers had to be mindful of the impact of food stalls on others eg food smells on clothing stalls.
- iii. The Council had a duty of care regarding the market and would look into the impact of siting stalls to ensure that fire regulations were complied with.

4. Councillor Gillespie raised the following points:

- i. Asked that Member's did not accept recommendations in the Officer's report. Expressed concern that traders may lose their livelihood through increased charges.**
- ii. The market place had been neglected for decades. Members now had a chance to do something positive by investing funding raised through fees back into the market.**

- iii. **Traders had little confidence in support offered by Officers.**
- iv. **Traders had to clear up stall areas themselves.**
- v. **Expressed concern over health and safety in the market area due to uneven cobblestones.**
- vi. **Occupancy number were based on bookings not stall use. Stalls may be unused during the week so traders could get a weekend slot. The two should be separated, current regulations were unfair.**
- vii. **Suggested implementing incubator stalls to facilitate growth.**
- viii. **Took issue with the propose fees and charges.**
- ix. **The City Council should use the market as an income stream, but fairly.**

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places responded:

- i. Officers had liaised with Cambridge Past Present & Future about the market.
- ii. Uneven paving was the Highways Authority's responsibility.
- iii. The City Council did not have the resources to renovate the market area at present.
- iv. Actions to ensure the market was healthy in the short term:
 - Bringing fees in-line with other markets across the country.
 - Working with Cambridge BID to see how to invest in the market.

The Head of Streets and Open Spaces said that various officers were providing support to traders. They actively promoted the market and visited it every day. Expressed concern that traders did not feel supported and undertook to follow this up.

The Director of Environment said the market was an asset for the city. The intention was to co-ordinate cleansing and market support services. The market was cleansed early on a daily basis.

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report followed a LEAN process review of the markets administrative procedures and the supporting financial reconciliation function as part of the Support Services Review. The recommendations were supported by the outcome of a benchmarking exercise to compare the offer of Cambridge markets with that of similar regional and national operators and would bring city charges up to parity.

Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places

Agreed to:

- i. Adopt a dual premium/standard stall fee structure over all days to replace current multiple or flat rent structure.
- ii. Harmonise charges to bring Sunday rent in line with fees levied on Saturdays.
- iii. Adopt a £7 per pitch premium for traders licenced to sell hot food.
- iv. Adopt a £5 per pitch premium for traders operating on days not licenced.
- v. A 4% rebate to all traders that pay by direct debit and are trading at financial year end.
- vi. Withdraw credit of two weeks absence charges (holiday entitlement).
- vii. Adopt rental charges as outlined in section 3.13 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 Streets and Open Spaces on behalf of the Markets & Street Trading Development Manager.

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

- i. A diverse market was a healthy market ie not limited to 1 – 2 stall types.
- ii. A lot of rubbish in the market square was caused by revellers not stall holders. Hoped that Officers would liaise with traders to address issues. An unclean market square caused a (poor) reputation issue for the Council.

In response to Members' questions the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places said the following:

- i. Demand for stalls was higher than supply.
- ii. Cambridge BID was working with traders regarding market area cleaning. This would be included in the 5 year plan in future.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Streets and Open Spaces said the following:

- i. Undertook to check if market traders were offered an exit interview. Would implement one if not.
- ii. The intention was to simplify the pricing structure. It would be reviewed on an annual basis in future to ensure it was fit for purpose.

The Director of Environment said there was no conflict of interest between (independent) environmental health operatives and street cleaning operatives.

The Committee resolved by 4 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.

16/67/Comm S106 Developer Contributions: Taking Stock

Matter for Decision

A report to this Committee March 2015 highlighted significant changes arising from restrictions (from April 2015) on the use of future S106 contributions. New ones had to be for specific projects and no more than five of these could be used/pooled for any particular project.

An interim approach to seeking new, specific S106 contributions was agreed and introduced last June. This anticipated a gradual build-up in securing new S106 funding alongside a need to strengthen the evidence base for justifying specific developer contributions. A review of the interim approach in early 2016 was requested – and this was the focus of the report for this item.

The Council may need to continue the interim approach for another year (at least) before the CIL system can be implemented locally.

The interim approach for new, specific contributions also needed to be viewed alongside the use of existing, generic S106 funds. In the last six months, over £2 million had been allocated to new priority projects.

Overall, the availability of generic S106 funding was tapering off and running down.

Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places

- i. Agreed that the Council's interim approach should now focus on seeking specific S106 contributions:

- a) primarily from appropriate **major** developments for projects relating to specific open spaces, community facilities and indoor and outdoor sports facilities;
- b) from both major **and minor** developments, as appropriate, for specific play area projects;
- ii. Approved the 'target lists' of possible specific play area and open space projects as a starting point for seeking new S106 contributions from planning approvals in 2016/17 as set out in Appendices B and C;
- iii. Noted the other improvements to make the interim approach to seeking specific S106 contributions simpler and more effective (see paragraphs 4.5 – 4.14 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 Urban Growth Project Manager.

In response to Members' questions the Urban Growth Project Manager said the following:

- i. Specific S106 contributions could only be entered into for mitigating the impact of particular developments at nearby facilities, where a case could be made (backed up by audit findings and other evidence) that this was necessary. For this reason, specific contributions would not be evenly spread across the city. This explains why the target lists of play areas and open spaces for which specific S106 contributions could be sought did not cover facilities in all wards.
- ii. S106 developer contributions were used to mitigate the impact of developments, not address areas of deprivation.
- iii. Whilst target lists of facilities for which S106 specific contributions could be sought were a starting point for negotiation. Specific contributions for other facilities may also be considered if it can be demonstrated that there is a strong need to mitigate the impact of a particular nearby development..

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places added that the Outdoor Play Investment Strategy would be a way to implement play

area improvements through funding separate to specific S106 contributions.

- iv. Alongside the arrangements for specific S106 contributions, the council still had some generic S106 contributions (from S106 agreements entered into before 6/4/2015), albeit that this funding availability is tapering off and running down. The next S106 priority-setting round would be in 2016/17. Officers would bring a report on the arrangements for this priority-setting round to the committee in June or September 2016.

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.

16/68/Comm Coldhams' Common Management Plan

Public Question

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

1. Mr Smith raised the following points:

- i. Referred to barbed wire on Coldham's Common (P126 of the Officer's report). This prevented access and was a danger to animals. Requested it be removed.
- ii. Referred to a written statement submitted by Ms White, Vice Chair of Friends of Coldham's Common. Queried if there had been adequate consultation on the Coldham's Common Management Plan. Also, what was the timeframe for action?

The Senior Asset Development Officer said the wire was due for removal through the Management Plan, but there was a legal challenge on one section of the fence.

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places said the intention was to minimise the amount of wire on the Common and its removal would be a priority for action.

The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager said recommendations in the Officer's report would lead to dialogue then action if approved. The Management Plan would be reviewed after a year then brought back to committee if there were any issues.

Matter for Decision

Coldham's Common is one of the largest open spaces in Cambridge; it is widely used by people for a variety of different activities and is important for its natural habitats and the biodiversity they support. Cambridge City Council oversaw the management of the common for the people of Cambridge.

The 10 year management plan seeks to deliver a vision for Coldham's Common. Extensive public consultation had been undertaken to establish how local residents and visitors use and value the site. These views have been considered carefully when balancing the multifunctional uses and values of the common.

The plan collates information on important features of the common. Each feature review includes a brief description of why it is considered important, sets key objectives for the next ten years and proposes specific actions to achieve them. It also sets out a monitoring and review timetable for the actions.

A 5 year review of the plan is proposed to be consulted on in 2021.

Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places

- i. Adopted the ten year Coldham's Common Operational Management Plan for implementation beginning April 2016;
- ii. Instructed officers to promote the new plan amongst stakeholders and users and invite volunteer participation in appropriate activities;
- iii. Instructed Officers to review the management plan in 12 months' time and report back any exceptions to Scrutiny Committee on the effectiveness of the management regime.

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 Development 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.

16/69/Comm Moorings Civil Contract Law Approach

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report contained recommendations for amendments to, and the management of, the Council's visitor moorings.

The report summarised responses and also detailed issues and options that have been raised by respondents to a recent consultation on the introduction of a management regime for the regulation and enforcement of the City Council moorings based on civil contract law.

Feedback received through responses to the consultation supported the need for an effective enforcement policy for the efficient management of the City Council's River Moorings. As a consequence of receiving and considering feedback through the consultation process, officers' propose changes and new recommendations.

Community Services Scrutiny Committee previously considered a report on 8th October 2015 that set out two options to regulate moorings to overcome the current management issues; the civil possession claims for trespass to move on unauthorised boaters, and a contractual approach based on the Oxford Model, which sets out 'licence' terms that are a contract for the non-exclusive use of a space for a period of time.

The Officer's report made recommendations on continued formulation of a regulation policy using contract law principles in addition to the current civil possession claim for trespass.

Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places

Instructed officers to:

- i. 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;
- ii. Establish and implement a management regime based on civil 'contract law' as soon as practicably possible, that allows visitor boats to be regulated and enforced within the existing resources of the Council;
- iii. Work with Cam Boaters and the Cam Conservators on the process and procedures required to support a Contract Law Model; and
- iv. Review the existing River Moorings Policy and report back to Scrutiny Committee in October 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 Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager. This was supplemented with an addendum.

The addendum included an additional recommendation (shown in bold):

- i. 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;
- ii. To establish and implement a management regime based on civil 'contract law' as soon as practicable possible, that allows visitor boats to be regulated and enforced within the existing resources of the Council;
- iii. To work with Cam Boaters and the Cam Conservators on the process and procedures required to support a Contract Law Model; and**
- iv. To review the existing River Moorings Policy and report back to Scrutiny Committee in October 2016 further recommendations.

The Chair ruled that under 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 the addendum from the Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager be considered despite not being made publicly available five clear days prior to the meeting.

The reason that this document could not be deferred was that it was impracticable to defer the decision until the next committee.

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

- i. Expressed concern at rule-in of the addendum and revised recommendations. Both documents were published late. There was insufficient time for councillors and the public to read and scrutinise the documents.
- ii. Expressed concerns about the moorings policy process. It felt rushed. The Council should take more time to find a solution with the boating community to tackle problems caused by a minority.
- iii. Requested the decision be deferred.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The option to defer the report had been considered.
- ii. The contract law principle had come to committee before.
- iii. There were no material changes to the report in the addendum, so there were no material reasons to defer it.
- iv. There was a need to implement a sufficient deterrent (ability to take enforcement action) as soon as possible. Delaying the report would delay implementation of enforcement action for months until the next committee.
- v. The Executive Councillor had committed to the boating community 12-18 months ago that she would implement enforcement action, hence it coming to committee now.
- vi. Undertook to work with Cam Boaters to review any issues.
- vii. Approving the Officer recommendations today would put signs/processes in place to protect those who were licensed to use moorings. The intention was to tackle issues pre-summer when demand for moorings increased.

Labour Councillors made the following comments in response to the report and addendum:

- i. There had been sufficient time to read the Officer's report and addendum.
- ii. A decision should be taken today so that an enforcement action policy could be implemented as soon as possible. This would deter visitors from parking in residential moorings. People who did this were unaware of the impact they had on others when illegally parking in someone's permanent mooring.

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

- i. Visitors would be allowed to stay for forty eight hours instead of six. Six hours was a provisional figure that had been discounted.
- ii. People in long term liveables had been encouraged to sign up to the moorings list, but not all had. The Council would work with Cam Boaters to ensure they did not 'slip through the net' in policy terms, but some engagement was required from the boating community so that a name appeared on the list at some point.

In response to a Member's question the Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager said the issue of moorings for holiday hire boats would be addressed in future.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 2 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.

16/70/Comm Public Art Projects

Matter for Decision

In October 2015, it was reported to the Community Services Scrutiny Committee that new large scale public art projects would be developed and further details presented back to the Committee in 2016.

The Officer's report set out the proposed development principles and process for a new public art commission to promote and celebrate the story of the River Cam; including exploring its relationship to the foundation of Cambridge as a city, its ecology and also its social history.

The principal aim of the project is also to promote the use of the river and its environs; to understand its heritage, and encourage social engagement and leisure activities to the wider residents of and visitors to Cambridge.

The indicative budget for the project is up to £550,000, funded from currently £450,000 of strategic public art developer contributions (which cannot be spent on anything other than off-site public art, and must be spent within a limited timescale), and external grant applications.

The Officer's report set out the intended process to achieve a high quality programme of public art projects for Cambridge.

Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places

Approved the development, implementation and completion of programme of public art projects for the River Cam with a maximum combined budget of up to £550,000 to be funded in part by Public Art Developer Contributions subject to Capital Programme Board and final 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 Development Manager. He withdrew the original recommendation and tabled a revised one (new text in bold):

To approve the development, implementation and completion of programme of public art projects for the River Cam with a maximum combined budget of up to £550,000 to be funded in part by Public Art Developer Contributions **subject to Capital Programme Board and final project appraisal.**

The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager made these changes as the spend or authority to spend at Project Appraisal will need Community Services Scrutiny Committee sign off as the spend would be over £300,000.

The Committee supported the aims of the report.

In response to Members' questions the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places said the following:

- i. When the report came back to committee for sign off, it could include details of which areas/wards of the city the S106 public art allocations came from.
- ii. The intention was to engage communities in the public art project

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 5.55 pm

CHAIR