

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

REPORT OF: Urban Growth Project Manager

TO: West/Central Area Committee

9/3/2017

WARDS: Castle, Market, Newnham

S106 DEVOLVED DECISION-MAKING: 2016/17 PRIORITY-SETTING

1. INTRODUCTION

In late 2016, the council invited ideas to improve open spaces and play areas in Cambridge as part of the latest S106 funding round. Four proposals were suggested in this Area (see Appendices A-D). Section 3 sets the context and Section 4 assesses the applications against the council's S106 selection criteria (see Appendix E).

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

That the West/Central Area Committee prioritises the following local project proposals for the use of devolved S106 contributions from the Area, subject to business case approvals (as appropriate):

- a. footway construction, landscaping & play safety surface refurbishment within the play area at Histon Road Rec Ground (estimated cost: £40,000, 'informal open space' contributions);
- b. creating a sustainable open space within St Clement's churchyard, Bridge Street (estimated cost: £10,000, 'informal open space' contributions).

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 New homes and development lead to more demands on local facilities. The council can ask developers to pay off-site S106 contributions to mitigate that impact when not addressed on-site. An overview of the council's approach to S106 contributions can be found at <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/our-approach-to-s106>.
- 3.2 Decision-making over the use of some off-site, generic¹ S106 contributions from local developments has been devolved to area

1. Generic contributions relate to broad infrastructure types (eg, 'informal open space') and were the sort that the council tended to secure prior to the changes to

committees since 2012. The West/Central Area Committee has received S106 priority-setting reports every year since then.

- a. During 2016, the S106-funded projects completed in the West/Central Area included:
 - Christ's Pieces tennis court improvements (Market ward);
 - Shelly Row play area improvements (Castle ward);
- b. In addition, the business case for the Lammas Land tennis court improvements (up to £45,000 in Newnham ward) has been recently signed off for implementation, following consultation with the Area Committee chair and vice chair and opposition spokes.

3.3 **S106 funding availability:** Reports over recent years have alerted the Area Committee to the implications of new national restrictions² and regulation changes. In Cambridge, the receipt of new generic S106 contributions is tapering off. Overall, generic S106 funds are running down. Whilst consolidating remaining generic contributions into either 'all devolved' or 'all centralised' funds (see paragraph 3.6) helps to maximise spending power, availability is still limited.

3.4 Table 1 provides an estimate³ of funding availability as at mid-February 2017: these figures are currently being reviewed⁴. The ward-level funding availability analysis may change as a result, with the possibility of some increase in the availability of 'informal open space' contributions in Market ward in particular. An update will be given at the meeting.

Table 1: Availability of S106 funding devolved to West/Central Area⁵

Ward	'Play provision'	'Informal open space'
Castle	Below £15,000	£30,000 - £50,000
Market	Below £15,000	£15,000 - £30,000
Newnham	Below £15,000	Below £15,000

government regulations in April 2015. Since then, however, the council can now only seek specific contributions relating to improvements to particular facilities.

2. S106 funds can no longer be sought from developments of fewer than 11 homes.
3. These estimates consolidate all available 'open space' and 'play provision' contributions from the Area into separate devolved funds.
4. The review is taking place ahead of the S106 report to the Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 16 March. It will account of new S106 income received recently and reallocations of S106 funding in order to optimise links between the location of local and strategic projects and where the contributions come from.
5. Variations in funding across the Area reflect different levels of development between wards and the allocation of local funds to local projects.

- 3.5 Whilst S106 contributions have been devolved on an area basis, the need to provide a ward-level analysis becomes more important in this context. This does not mean that S106 contributions from a particular ward can only be used to fund projects in the same ward (as parts of other wards may come within the catchment area for an improved facility too). Officers aim to fund local projects from relevant, devolved S106 contributions from nearby developments in the same ward before allocating contributions from nearby developments in neighbouring wards in the same Area.
- 3.6 **2016/17 funding round:** The overall arrangements for the latest round were agreed following a report to the Community Services Scrutiny Committee in October 2016.
- a. All remaining generic S106 contributions for providing/improving 'informal open space' and play 'provision for children and teenagers', which have been received from developments in a local area⁶ are devolved to the relevant area committee.
 - b. At the same time, the use of all remaining contributions in the 'outdoor' and 'indoor sports', 'public art' and 'public realm' types are decided by the relevant executive councillor⁷.
 - c. proposals for the use of the 'community facility' and 'public realm'⁸ contribution types have not been sought in the 2016/17 round, in order to allow the council take stock of the findings of the on-going strategic review of community provision and the budget implications of a number of on-going public realm improvements.
- 3.7 The 2016/17 S106 funding round has proceeded as planned.
- a. Local residents and community groups were invited⁹ to put forward proposals over seven weeks (from late October until 19 December 2016)¹⁰ for improving open spaces and play areas.

6. Based on area committee boundaries (North, East, South and West/Central).

7. Even so, the council continues to seek to fund projects in a particular ward or area from S106 contributions received from developments in the same ward or area.

8. Deferring the next funding round for 'public realm' contributions is not an issue for this, which has no generic S106 contributions available in this category.

9. Awareness of the funding round was raised amongst residents / residents' associations, community groups, equalities groups and councillors by email, social media, the council's website, news releases and 'Cambridge Matters' magazine.

10. Following the 19/12/16 deadline, councillors were given until mid-January to put forward any other proposals. Council services were also asked to suggest possible schemes which would complement the proposals from local communities and councillors, mitigate the impact of development and address needs identified in recent strategies, such as the Outdoor Play Investment Strategy.

- b. All proposals received have been assessed by officers against the council's 2016/17 S106 selection criteria (see Appendix E).
- c. S106 grant applications for small-scale public art projects in Cambridge (including some from this Area¹¹) are being reported to the Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 16 March.

4. **CONSIDERATIONS: ASSESSMENT OF THE S106 PROPOSALS**

- 4.1 Three project proposals have been received in the 2016/17 round (see Appendices A – D) and have been assessed against the criteria.

A. HISTON ROAD REC GROUND: FURTHER IMPROVEMENTS			
Ward:	Castle	Estimate:	Not costed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since this proposal was received, benches and bins have been installed at Histon Road Rec Ground in early 2017, funded from repairs and renewals budgets (these items would not have been eligible for S106 funding anyway). • Following the concerns from local councillors about the informal paths and surfacing within the play area (including pitted areas beneath swings and other play equipment), council officers have put forward Proposal B to set out how this could be addressed. • If the noticeboard has deteriorated, this would be a matter for funding from the repairs & renewals budget, not S106 funding. • Whilst the climbing rocks are popular amongst some users of the Recreation Ground, when options for park improvements have been raised previously, some doubts have been expressed about whether the use of them is so great to warrant an extension. • The estimated costs of proposal B are likely to use up all the devolved 'informal open space' S106 contributions within Castle ward, meaning that it is unlikely that there would be any appropriate, generic S106 funds left for ditch dredging or climbing wall extensions in due course. 			

11. The public art grant applications include: purchasing an existing stone carving at Ascension Burial Ground (Castle); a pop-up gallery/art space at the Big Weekend (Market); 'Eddington Flag Parade' on the North West Cambridge development (Castle), 'Michael Rosen History Walking Trails 2' (including two primary schools from this Area); performance art related to the temporary installation of an Antony Gormley sculpture on Northampton Street Green (Castle) and a showcase of Queer Arts (city-wide project, launched at the Big Weekend). Not all proposals meet the S106 selection criteria for public art. The Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces will be asked to choose which eligible proposals to prioritise.

B. HISTON ROAD REC GROUND: FOOTWAY CONSTRUCTION, LANDSCAPING & PLAY SAFETY SURFACE REFURBISHMENT

Ward:	Castle	Estimate:	£40,000
--------------	--------	------------------	---------

Recommended. These proposals for improving the surface within the play area, making it more accessible all year round, have been developed following a site meeting with one of the ward councillors.

Going ahead with this proposal would help to make sure that remaining, time-limited, 'informal open space' S106 contributions from Castle ward can be used on time. Delaying the use of this funding for another, later project would not be advised.

C. JESUS GREEN DITCH – BIODIVERSITY IMPROVEMENTS

Ward:	Market	Estimate:	Two phases: £30,000 - £50,000 per phase ¹²
--------------	--------	------------------	---

This proposal has been raised before (and has attracted local support) but was unfortunately unsuccessful in a previous bid for lottery funding. Officers are keen to put forward the idea again, this time for use of S106 funding. They will be contacting the Friends of Jesus Green and Jesus College about revisiting the proposal.

Whilst the current S106 funding availability analysis indicates insufficient local S106 contributions to undertake this project, it is hoped that the on-going review of S106 spending/allocations might help to increase the amounts available. An update will be provided at the meeting. If it turns out that appropriate S106 contributions could be made available, some funding towards this project could be recommended, either now or at a later date.

This project proposal is based on two phases of work. Improvements nearer the path between Lower Park Street and Victoria Avenue would be likely to require more engineering and, hence, might be more expensive. Biodiversity improvements further away from the path would involve softer landscaping and would cost less per metre.

Once there is greater clarity about funding availability, options to be considered might include:

- weighing up whether to carry out one phase only if there is not sufficient funding to do both; and/or
- seeking other sources of funding beyond generic 'informal open space' S106 contributions.

12. A section of board walk (estimated to cost an additional £25,000) could be installed through the new marsh area should sufficient funds be available.

D. ST CLEMENT'S CHURCHYARD – CREATING A SUSTAINABLE OPEN SPACE

Ward:	Market	Estimate:	Up to £10,000
--------------	--------	------------------	---------------

Modified proposal recommended. Many aspects of this proposal meet the criteria of providing/improving open space and improving access. However, maintenance works would not be eligible for S106 funding and would need to be resourced in other ways. The provision of a garden would also not meet the criteria and the church might need to raise the funds for this element themselves.

A mini management plan can be written for the site with members of the volunteer group, from which opportunities for enhancement of this small site would be recommended.

- 4.2 The proposals prioritised by the Area Committee will be allocated appropriate S106 contributions and added to the council's 'projects under development' list. Consultation will be carried out, as appropriate, on the proposals and designs for these prioritised projects. Business cases for local projects estimated to cost between £15,000 and £75,000¹³ will be developed and considered by the council's (officer-level) Capital Programme Board. Comments from the Area Chair, Vice Chair and Opposition Spokes¹⁴ will then be sought prior to sign-off by the relevant service manager under delegated authority¹⁵.

5. IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 **Financial implications:** Whilst it has been possible for this report to recommend at least a couple of substantial projects for S106 funding from the Area Committee's devolved funding, it is clear that there is significantly less room for manoeuvre than in the past. Once this off-site generic funding has been used, there will be little or no more.
- 5.2 Last October's Community Services Scrutiny report on the S106 priority-setting process highlighted that, although it will not be possible to come to a definitive view until after the 2016/17 round, this might be the last full priority-setting round covering such a range

13. Whilst projects below £15,000 do not require a business case, local councillors are still consulted on the development of the details.

14. The business case sets out the project's scope, design, costs, delivery timescales & other implications. It takes account of consultation findings too (as appropriate).

15. Appraisals for local projects above £75,000 would be reported back to the Area Committee, although this would not apply in the case of the proposals recommended in this report.

of the generic contribution types and all areas of the city. In future, there might have to be narrower priority-setting exercises based on certain contribution types or areas. Consideration may also need to be given to using residual generic contributions to supplement the funding of projects for which specific projects are being collected¹⁶.

- 5.3 **Staffing implications:** Those projects that are prioritised will be developed and (assuming business case sign-off can be secured) taken forward by council officers in the Streets and Open Spaces Development team, in the coming year as/when on-going projects are completed.
- 5.4 **Other implications:** Business cases for individual projects will consider a range of factors including equalities and anti-poverty implications, climate change ratings, community safety, procurement matters and communications and consultation. An overview of the progress being made on the delivery of S106-funded projects is updated every three to four months on the council's S106 projects web page (www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106-projects).

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 6.1 These background papers on the S106 devolved decision-making process were used in the preparation of this report:
- 'S106 priority-setting process' (Streets and Open Spaces) report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 6/10/2016;
 - 'Outdoor Play Investment Strategy, 2016-20' report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 8/10/2015;
 - 'S106 devolved decision-making: 2015/16 priority-setting' report to West/Central Area Committee on 3/12/2015;
 - 'S106 priority-setting: follow-up' report to West/Central Area Committee on 11/2/2016.
- 6.2 Further information (can be found on the Developer Contributions web page (www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106)). This includes sections on the council's approach to S106 funding, S106-funded projects, the S106 priority-setting process and changes to S106 funding.

16. More details about the council's interim approach to seeking specific S106 contributions can be found at www.cambridge.gov.uk/changes-to-s106-funding.

7. APPENDICES

S106 proposals for improvements at

- A. Histon Road Rec Ground: further improvements
- B. Histon Road Rec Ground: footway construction, landscaping & play safety surface refurbishment
- C. Jesus Green ditch – biodiversity improvements
- D. St Clement's Churchyard – Creating a sustainable open space
- E. 2016-17 S106 selection criteria (Cambridge City Council)

8. INSPECTION OF PAPERS

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name:	Tim Wetherfield
Author's Phone Number:	01223 – 457313
Author's Email:	tim.wetherfield@cambridge.gov.uk

Proposal from local councillors

Histon Road Recreation Ground

Suggested by Councillors Hipkin and Holland

We are calling for informal open space S106 funds to be dispensed entirely within the Histon Road Rec Ground as follows.

1. A number of informal paths within the fenced area are muddy and impassable, particularly those leading to the bucket swing, the infant play area and the roundabout leading from the gate at the Richmond Road end to the grounds.
2. A number of new and replacement benches are required. The two benches outside the fenced-in play area at the Richmond Road entrance side and close to the table tennis are dilapidated with metal fittings exposed and need replacing. There is also a need for new benches close to the mound and the zip wire and possibly the climbing wall in the fenced-in play area.
3. A number of pitted areas beneath the swings and other play equipment installations need to be filled and possibly resurfaced.
4. Replacement of noticeboards which have deteriorated.
5. Replacement and upgrade of litter bins (eg, recycling options)

Longer term schemes

- The brook / ditch needs dredging.
- Some local residents are calling for an extension to the climbing wall.

Proposal from council officers

Histon Road Rec Ground: footway construction, landscaping and play safety surface refurbishment

Suggested in response to the suggestions (1) and (3) in Appendix A in order to develop a more detailed proposal.

1. What sort of improvements do you have in mind?

To construct footways running through play area using safety surfacing materials to conform to RoSPA¹⁷ standards. The footways would form a link from one item to another. To remove existing safety surface beneath two items of play and install new upgraded surface and improve landscaping creating a safer play experience.

2. Why is this project needed?

Use of the play area can be limited following inclement weather due to ground being waterlogged. This prevents users with pushchairs or wheelchairs from accessing much of the play equipment. Some sections of safety surface can be difficult to navigate with pushchairs and wheelchairs following wet weather. High residential area scoring highly for location in the City Council Outdoor Play Investment Strategy 2016-2021.

3. How would local communities within Cambridge benefit?

Improvements would allow greater access for all users particularly benefitting disabled people and young people.

4. Have any preparations/discussions taken place about this?

Site meeting with one of the ward councillors and a discussion with the Friends group.

5. Any opposition / potential issues? How might this be overcome?

No opposition expected. Support from members and friends of group.

17. Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents

Proposal from council officers

Jesus Green ditch – biodiversity improvements

1. What sort of improvements do you have in mind?

To enhance Jesus Green ditch, situated between Jesus Green and Jesus College (ie, between Lower Park Street and Victoria Avenue). If sufficient funding was available¹⁸, these improvements could be along the whole side of Jesus Green. There is an opportunity (as supported and proposed within the previously unsuccessful Heritage Lottery Fund bid) to soften the banks of the ditch through replacing the existing concrete bank treatment with a more natural boundary. This would consist of using sweet chestnut stakes to support bundles of hazel to retain the bank, topped with coir (coconut fibre) rolls, pre planted with aquatic native vegetation. The eastern end of the ditch lends itself to lowering a section of the bank to wet an area of existing amenity grassland to provide suitable conditions for a more diverse wetland flora to flourish, including colourful native species such as Purple Loosestrife, Yellow Flag Iris and Water Mint.

Increasing the variety and diversifying the structure of the ditch edge will enhance the biodiversity value of Jesus Green and in combination with other projects such as Logan's Meadow Local Nature Reserve (LNR) backwater creation (Complete S106 project) and Sheep's Green LNR watercourse enhancement (current S106 project) will improve biodiversity within the River Cam (County Wildlife Site) floodplain. Species that would benefit include the protected water vole (a small population is present but the current conditions are not optimal for breeding and foraging).

Aesthetically the new bank will be a more pleasant and interesting environment to be explored by park users. The increased vegetation should assist in improving water quality and clarity within the ditch¹⁹.

Officers are currently reviewing the management plan and intend to promote this vision within it.

2. Why is this project needed?

The proposal would enhance the biodiversity within Jesus Green, and create a much more natural feel to this watercourse and the wider park. Previous discussions with Jesus College regarding the ditch suggest they might be interested in being partners in any proposed enhancements.

18. Work could be in two phases, costing between £30,000 - £50,000 per phase.

19. A section of board walk (estimated to cost an additional £25,000) could be installed through the new marsh area should sufficient funds be available.

3. How would local communities within Cambridge benefit?

Greater access to biodiversity with opportunities to explore natural habitats and discover less familiar species such as water voles.

4. Have any preparations/discussions taken place about this?

Officers have had outline project discussions with Jesus College in 2015. The outline proposal was raised as a suggestion within previously declined HLF bid, and was generally supported during the public consultation.

5. Any opposition / potential issues? How might this be overcome?
--

Not aware of any. Full public consultation would be undertaken as part of the project business case

Proposal from St Clement's Church

Creating a sustainable open space in St Clement's Churchyard on Bridge Street

Forwarded via Councillor Bick

1. What sort of improvements do you have in mind?

There are three elements to this proposal: (a) Creation of community open spaces, (b) Landscape improvements and (c) resource needs.

A: Creation of Community Open Spaces

St Clement's churchyard has "closed" status²⁰ and the city council already exercises maintenance responsibility. Over the last 3 decades volunteers from the church have worked with the council to maintain the church yard. The proposed plan is to enhance the churchyard to extend its use for two community purposes.

(i) To reclaim the 'wilderness' area at the back of the church yard which is overgrown with nettles and weeds. This will provide an open space for the children of Park Street Primary School. The school is within the parish of St Clements, and it has no green area within the school boundaries. The school uses Jesus Green for sports and activities, but Jesus Green does not provide an area for children to connect with nature or to explore the local habitat. The area in the churchyard would provide a much needed outdoor, educational space for the children to learn about trees, wild flowers, insects and nature. It would provide a 'hands on' educational environment, with wildflowers and a pollination patch to attract butterflies and other insects.

(ii) To use some of the wilderness' area and the present mown area to create a quiet, reflective outdoor space for local residents and members of the public. Many of the nearby residential townhouses have limited garden space. The aspiration of the garden is similar to that expressed by the Quiet Garden Movement which, 'nurtures low cost, accessible, outdoor space for prayer, contemplation, rest and aspiration in a variety of settings.'

B: Landscape

The boundary between the present mown area and the Old Vicarage is a shrub hedge that has been neglected for a number of years and it is now too wide for the site. It needs rejuvenating and some of it replanting.

20. It is no longer open for burials.

C: Resources needed

- The clearance of a ditch filled with rubbish and debris
- An overall planting plan by a landscape gardener
- Shrubs and perennial plants
- 3 or 4 Benches
- Garden tools for the school children to use
- Small garden shed to keep the tools in
- Edgings for the school children's beds (between the grass and the soil)

The overall planting plan will ensure that the improvements will not result in extra maintenance by the Streets and Open Spaces team, and the church's Parochial Church Council will be responsible for organising volunteers to maintain and sustain the scheme (see point 4 below).

2. Why is this project needed?

St Clement's Church has recently begun a restoration project which includes reclaiming the 'wilderness' area at the back of the church yard. The churchyard would provide a much needed green space for local residents, children of Park Street Primary school, members of the public, and tourists. Portugal Place and Bridge Street are very central busy areas, which have been intensively developed. It is important to preserve the churchyard and to maintain it as a tranquil and reflective destination.

As mentioned above, there is a lack of a secure, fenced-in 'green space' for the children of Park Street to explore and to learn from the natural habitat as well as from the historical significance of St Clement's Church.

The local residents do not have a community hub and the historical churchyard will play an important role in bringing the local residents together through the maintenance of the churchyard and by creating an open space for their use (reading, writing, drawing, gardening, reflecting).

3. How would local communities within Cambridge benefit?

The local communities within Cambridge will benefit from the project because the churchyard is in a central area and it will provide an accessible, quiet, and reflective haven in a very busy, congested area of Bridge Street.

The proposed 'open space' will provide a much needed tranquil destination for local communities to learn more about the history of this area and to enjoy the natural habitat. The churchyard will be accessible for a wide variety and diversity of people. These include children at the local primary school, disabled people and older people.

4. Have any preparations/discussions taken place about this?

1. St Clement's Parochial Church Council has consulted the Streets and Open Spaces team and has met the Tree Officer. The team is supportive of the envisaged plan and the church is clear that any development in the churchyard must be sustainable and low maintenance. The proposed changes will not result in increased maintenance from the Streets and Open Places team.
2. St Clement's Parochial Church Council has consulted the Park Street Resident's Association (PSRA), which is convening a local resident volunteer committee to help maintain the churchyard. Volunteers from PSRA have had several work sessions clearing the 'wilderness' area. The aims of the local resident volunteer committee are twofold: to maintain the churchyard in a cost-effective, sustainable manner and to encourage the local residents to interact with their neighbours.
3. St Clement's Parochial Church Council has consulted the acting Head of Park Street Primary School, who is very keen to extend the curriculum through regular pupil visits to the churchyard.
4. A representative from local conservation organisation has recently surveyed the winter plants in the churchyard. There is one unusual species. He will return to survey the spring, and then the summer plants. His findings will inform the landscape garden plan.

5. Any opposition / potential issues? How might this be overcome?

There are no known reasons for opposition because all local stakeholders have been consulted in the process.

Security: It will be necessary to lock the gate at dusk to prevent vandalism and to mitigate against unruly social behaviour in the churchyard in the interests of residents of abutting properties. A local resident whose property abuts the churchyard has volunteered to open and close the churchyard every morning/evening.

2016-17 S106 selection criteria

This is a shortened version of the criteria, tailored to the bidding process for proposals for play area and open space improvements and applications for small-scale public art grants.

Project proposals need to...

1. be **ELIGIBLE** for S106 funding

- a. Proposals need to be about providing, improving or giving better access to a facility within the city of Cambridge, in order to help mitigate the impact of local development.
- b. 'Informal open space' S106 funding can be used to fund improvements to the city's parks & open spaces, such as paths/surfacing, landscaping (including BMX tracks and skate parks), drainage, fences/gates, habitat creation, trees, shrubs and trim trails.
- c. 'Provision for children and teenagers' S106 funding can be used to fund improvements to the city's play areas, such as play equipment and safety surfacing under that equipment.
- d. To be eligible for S106 public art funding, the project needs to focus on original, high quality public art that is:
 - designed, produced or facilitated by an artist or craftsperson;
 - engages local communities;
 - is publicly accessible; and
 - has a legacy (there would need to be a permanent record of temporary artwork).

Small-scale, public art grants are for projects (normally, seeking up to £15,000 of public art S106 funding). Applications are expected from local organisations or community groups (not directly from an artist). Public art within schools (which is visible to school users, parents and visitors) comes within the scope of public art S106 funding.

2. be **AFFORDABLE** within the S106 funding available for the relevant contribution type in that part of the city to which it relates

- a. S106 funding availability is running down and spread unevenly between wards given variations in levels of development and the distribution of previous S106-funded projects.

- b. We would **particularly encourage proposals** for the following contribution types **from**:
- Informal open space: Trumpington, Castle, Coleridge, East and West Chesterton;
 - Provision for children and teens: Trumpington, Coleridge and Queen Edith's ward;
 - Public art: Trumpington, Coleridge, Romsey and Queen Edith's.
- c. Unfortunately, S106 funding availability is currently low for the following wards and so, realistically, it is not likely to be worthwhile making an application in 2016/17:
- Informal open space: Arbury, King's Hedges, Petersfield and Romsey;
 - Play areas: Arbury, East and West Chesterton, Abbey, Castle, Market and Newnham;
 - Public art: Cherry Hinton.
- d. For those wards not mentioned in these lists, it may be possible to put forward small-scale proposals, but please be aware that funding availability may be limited.
- e. Please note: councillors may not wish to invest all the available contributions available (for a particular contribution type) from a particular ward in a single project.
- f. Public art grant applicants must give assurances that they need the S106 funding that they are seeking (i.e., that they do not already have sufficient funding for the project).
- g. Local groups seeking S106 public grants should carry out other fund-raising too.

3. be an **EFFECTIVE USE OF RESOURCES**

Priority will be given to proposals where it is clear that the project would be consistent with council strategies, facility audits and related reports.

Tips: Focus proposals for play area improvements on larger play areas. Check which play areas & open spaces have already had S106 funding (see the recent/on-going project list).

4. provide **ADDITIONAL BENEFIT**

S106 funding cannot be used for replacing like-for-like facilities/equipment or repairing and maintaining existing facilities.

5. be **ACCESSIBLE**, in line with the council's grants and equalities policies

- a. Play area and open spaces need to be publicly owned and accessible to all.
- b. Successful public art grant applicants must sign a grant agreement (which is monitored), including an undertaking that the project will not to discriminate against any community group (eg, in relation to race, gender, religion, disability, sexual orientation and/or, age).

6. be **REALISTIC, ACHIEVABLE AND READY TO BE CONSIDERED**

- a. Proposals need to be clear about what is proposed, where it would be and how it would be implemented.
- b. Applicants seeking a S106 grant for a project they would take forward would need to give details of preparations being made to secure planning permission (if necessary) and steps taken to engage the local community about the proposed project.
- c. Grant applicants would also need to provide evidence of their fund-raising efforts and expected timescales for completing fund-raising.
- d. Priority will be given to project proposals which could reasonably be expected to reach the final stages of project delivery within 18 months of the priority-setting decision.

7. Be **FINANCIALLY VIABLE, WITH ROBUST MANAGEMENT PLANS**

- a. The council would need to be satisfied that sufficient resources are in place to ensure that the effective management and running of the new facility in future.
- b. Grants applicants seeking S106 funding would need to demonstrate that they could continue to resource the project in future. Grant agreements feature clauses for returning to the council grants received (in whole or in part) should the project not provide the expected public benefit for its expected lifespan.

Any organisation/community group seeking grant funding needs to have its own bank account.

October 2016