

Draft Public Art Supplementary Planning Document

Statement of Consultation

The steps taken by the City Council to consult stakeholders and the public during the preparation of the Draft SPD are set out below.

1.0 Public Art Survey

1.1 The City Council carried out a public survey to establish awareness of and attitudes to public art between February and April 2008. Three hundred and sixty-six responses were received. The results are presented in Appendix 1 of the Draft SPD.

2.0 Key Issues Consultation

2.1 The Council prepared an issues paper (Appendix 1) asking for the views of stakeholders over a four-week period from Monday 22nd September until Monday 20th October 2008. The paper was sent to the 55 consultees listed in Appendix 2 and all members of the City Council. Appendix 3 sets out the comments received, the Council's responses and includes references to how the Draft SPD has addressed the issue.

2.2 At the same time Officers within the City Council covering planning, legal, active communities, community development and arts and entertainment services were consulted.

3.0 Consultation on Preliminary Draft SPD

3.1 A Preliminary Draft of the SPD was prepared by 29th October for internal and selective stakeholder consultation. Two meetings were held to discuss the draft:

- a. 13th November 2008 – stakeholders and Council officers; and
- b. 27th November 2008 – The Public Art Steering Group.

The people attending these meetings are listed in Table 3.1. Internal workshops were held to discuss the details of development control procedures. The preliminary draft was revised in the light of the comments received.

Table 3.1 Consultees for the Preliminary Draft

Organisation

Cambridge City Council Officers

Public Art Draft SPD Consultation Statement

Cambridge City Council Members
Future City
Commissions East
Shape East
Kettle's Yard
Fitzwilliam Museum
Anglia Ruskin University
Arts Council East
Arts and Business
South Cambridge District Council

4.0 Good Practice

4.1 Good practice within other local authorities has been reviewed, e.g. Essex, Southampton, Derby and Northern Ireland. Site visits were made to Bristol and Milton Keynes and Public Art Officers were interviewed.

5.0 Public Participation (Regulation 17)

5.1 The draft SPD and its accompanying Sustainability Appraisal were then made available for public consultation for 6 weeks from 14th April to 26th May 2009. The following bodies were directly consulted:

Public Art SPD Schedule of Consultees	
All City Councillors	GO-East
All County Councillors (City Wards)	Gonville & Caius
All Residents Associations/Interest Groups	Grantchester Parish Council
Accent Nene Ltd	Great Shelford Parish Council
Age Concern	Greater Cambridge Partnership
Anglia Ruskin University	Grosvenor USS
Anglian Water	GVA Grimley LL
Artichoke	Hauxton Parish Council
Arts & Business East	Highways Agency
Arts Council England East	Histon & Impington Parish Council
Arup Economics & Planning	Home Builders Federation
Ashwell Plc	Homes and Communities Agency
Barton Parish Council	Homerton College
Barton Willmore	Housing Corporation
Bedford Pilgrims Housing Association	Hughes Hall
Bell Education Trust	Hundred Houses Society
Berkeley Homes (South East London) Ltd	IXIA
Bettina Furnee (Artist)	Januarys

Bidwells	Jesus College
BT Open Reach Newsites	Jon Harris (Artist)
CABE East	Junction CDC Ltd
Cable & Wireless UK	Kettle's Yard
Cam Sight	King's College
Cambridge Association of Architects (via Moles Architects)	Kirsten Lavers (Artist)
Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Lawson Gallery
Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum	LDA Design
Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Liberty Property Trust UK Ltd
Cambridge Italian Community	Living Streets
Cambridge Licensed Taxi Owners Association	Longstanton Parish Council
Cambridge Older Peoples Enterprise (COPE)	Lucy Cavendish College
Cambridge Open Studios	Madingley Parish Council
Cambridge Preservation Society	Magdalene College
Cambridge Regional College	Marshall Aerospace Ltd
Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation (Addenbrookes)	Microsoft Research Ltd
Cambridge Water Company	Milton Parish Council
Cambridgeshire Constabulary	Mobile Operators Association
Cambridgeshire County Council	Mott MacDonald
Cambridgeshire Horizons Ltd	Murray Edwards College
Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	National Grid Transco
Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	Natural England
Camforum	Network Rail
Camstead Homes	Newhall
Cardozo Kindersley Workshop	Newnham College
Carter Jonas Property Consultants LLP	NHS Cambridgeshire
Christ's College	Nicholas Ray & Partners Ltd
Churchill College	Npower Renewables
Circle Anglia	NTL
Clare College	Pembroke College
Clare Hall	Peterhouse
Comberton Parish Council	Peters Elworthy & Moore
Commissions East	Phillips Planning Services Ltd
Colliers CRE	Places for People
Colin Buchanan	Planning Potential
Corpus Christi College	Primavera
Cottenham Parish Council	Public ArtOnLine
Coton Parish Council	Queen's College
Countryside Properties	Ridley Hall
Darwin College	Royal Mail
David Wilson Homes	Savills
Devplan UK	Selwyn College
Downing College	Shape East

Drivers Jonas	Sidney Sussex College
DTZ	Smith Stuart Reynolds
Dudley Developments	SOLACHRA
East of England Development Agency	South Cambridgeshire District Council
East of England Regional Assembly	SSR Planning
EDF Energy Eights Marina Management Board	St Catharine's College
English Heritage East of England Region	St John's College
Environment Agency	Sustrans Ltd
Emmanuel College	Teversham Parish Council
Estate Management & Building Service, Cambridge University	The Bursars' Committee
Eversheds LLP	The Carving Workshop
Faculty of Architecture & History of Art, Cambridge University	The Chapel, Ascension Burial Ground
Fairview New Homes Ltd	The Norfolk, Suffolk & Cambridgeshire Strategic Health Authority
Federation of Master Builders	Trinity College
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Trinity Hall
First Plan	Turley Associates
Fitzwilliam College	Turnstone Estates
Fitzwilliam Museum	University Botanic Garden
Fulbourn Parish Council	University of Cambridge
FutureCity	Wesley House
Gallagher Estates	Westminster College
George Wimpey North Thames	West Cambridge Preservation Society
Girton College	Wolfson College
Girton Parish Council	Wysing Arts

5.2 In addition, the consultation was advertised in the Local Press and copies of the consultation documents were made available at the City Council's Environment and Planning Reception. The consultation was also available on-line through the City Council's website.

5.3 By the end of the consultation period, the Council had received a total of 16 responses with 152 separate representations: 21 in support and 131 objecting to the draft SPD. One representation was also received in objection to the Sustainability Appraisal. Many of the representations sought clarification and/or strengthening of particular paragraphs of the draft SPD. A Summary of Representations on the SPD and an Officer Assessment (Regulation 18 (4) (b) Statement) with recommendations for amendments to the SPD is available as a separate document to this Statement of Consultation.

5.4 The remaining representations objected to a range of different issues within the draft SPD. These include a number of key issues, around viability, compliance of the SPD with the Planning Obligations Circular 05/05, off-site S106 contributions, process, public access and types of artworks appropriate for delivery through the S106 contribution and these key issues are set out within Appendix 4. Appendix 5 contains a Table of Changes to the SPD.

6.0 The Sustainability Appraisal

6.1 The overall findings of Stage B of the SA process were that the existence of the Public Art SPD would have positive benefits on the SA objectives. The appraisal of the SPD also considered the option of not producing an SPD to guide the implementation of affordable housing policy. The appraisal of this option found that it would have a negative impact on many of the SA objectives. The conclusion of this assessment is that the only viable option for delivering public art effectively in Cambridge is to proceed with the Public Art SPD. The 2002 SPG does not cover adequately current issues and as its status as an SPG fell away with the adoption of the Local Plan, it lacks effective status. It is felt that although the Local Plan policies would remain in force using the business as usual approach, a lack of appropriate implementation guidance would result in extended periods of negotiation on each planning application and delays to the preparation of planning applications because the Council's approach to public art provision would not be available for reference. This would delay development and undermine attempts to get the best possible value out of public art.

6.2 The SA process did identify a number of uncertainties and risks surrounding the SPD, chiefly around the negative impacts for Objective 12 (to reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and fear of crime). Public Art can become the focus of anti-social behaviour such as graffiti and such activity can heighten the fear of crime amongst some groups. However the precise nature of impacts will be very much dependent on the maintenance of public art. The draft SPD recognises this issue and makes arrangements for the long-term maintenance of public art, which should help overcome these negative impacts.

6.3 As a result of the consultation a number of changes were made to the SPD, as shown in Appendix 5. However, as only a very minor change was made to one of the Objectives of the SPD, and this change does not affect the principle of that objective, it therefore does not materially alter the purpose of the SPD. This change does not warrant a review of the Sustainability Appraisal. The final SPD and its accompanying Sustainability Appraisal will be made available on the City Council's website following adoption.

For further information, please contact the Joint Urban Design Team as follows:
Tel: 01223 457989
Email: publicart@cambridge.gov.uk

Public Art Supplementary Planning Document

Key Issues Consultation

September 2008

1.0 Introduction

1.1 In July 2002 the City Council adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance: 'Provision of Public Art as Part of New Development Schemes' and since then that document has guided the Council's approach to public art. A Public Art Plan was adopted at the same time. Today, the Public Art Plan and the Public Art Supplementary Planning Guidance are both held in high esteem nationally. However, whilst there is robust policy for the provision of public art, there are elements of the Action Plan and the policy, which are not working as well as others. The creation of the Public Art Initiatives Fund was visionary; however, contributions to the Fund have been slow in building, partly because of developers being hesitant to provide contributions to unidentified schemes, and the lack of strategic guidance on how this should be spent. Therefore a review of how contributions to the fund are commuted is required, including expanding the Public Art Strategy to identify key locations and projects in the City for the installation of public art. In addition, the status of the Public Art Supplementary Planning Guidance has been superseded and it requires revising to become a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

1.2 Integrating the work and creative thinking of artists and crafts people into the design of internal and external public spaces can be the difference between success and failure in effective place making and the positive effect this has on people's lives. Additionally it supports artists and craftspeople and raises public awareness and appreciation of excellent art and design. In order to promote this the City Council is preparing a new Public Art Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The purpose of the SPD is to help establish a policy framework to guide public art through: a clear vision; a spatial and community strategy; and policies to guide development control and provide a framework for delivery.

1.3 Support for public art is identified in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) in citywide policy 3/7, as a requirement of development in the urban extensions, policy 9/3, and within the Station Area, policy 9/9. Public art is included as a development

principle in the Cambridge East Area Action Plan (2008) Policy CE/2. The requirement is that new development funds public art through a contribution made as part of a Section 106 agreement.

2.0 The Issues

2.1 This paper sets out twelve key issues and asks for comments from key stakeholders.

Issue 1 What is the vision for public art in Cambridge?

Should public art be seen as central to the future of a well-designed city that offers a high quality environment to residents and visitors alike? Is it part of the image that Cambridge should present to the world as a centre of creativity and learning? Or is it something that should be incidental to the experience of the City, something understated and included as opportunities arise?

Issue 2 What is the function of Public art?

Public art can perform many roles in a city. Which of the following are most important for Cambridge?

- Supporting community identity
- Creating harmonious places that encourage safe use
- Adding to and expressing sense of place
- Interpretation of places
- Celebrating and interpreting issues, e.g. the environment
- Signalling arrival, e.g. at gateways and transport hubs
- Identifying routes and improving legibility
- Creating landmarks and shaping views
- Celebration history, culture, heritage and people,
- Revealing hidden meanings
- Is it art for art's sake?
- Are there others?

Issue 3 What is public art and what qualifies?

The phrase 'public art' is very broad and raises questions about what we mean by 'public' and 'art'.

How accessible does the art have to be? Does 'public' mean:

- The public realm – streets, open spaces and so on?
- On private buildings, but visible from public places?
- In public buildings?
- In College and other private grounds that are regularly open to the public?
- In shopping centres?

Art comes in many forms. For the purposes of public art:

- Does it include crafts as well as 'fine art'?
- Should the works be permanent or are temporary ones acceptable?
- Are artist designed street furniture and interior design acceptable?
- Does the art always have to have a physical form or does performance – music, drama, performance art – qualify?
- Would facilities for artists to practice be acceptable?

Issue 4 Where should public art be located?

Where public art is provided through a Section 106 agreement associated with a particular major development (see Issue 5) the location will usually be fixed by that development. However, some funding will be available for public art through the Public Art Initiatives Fund (see Issue 6) and complementary to the Environmental Improvements Programme, for example, where there is discretion in the choice of location. Options will include:

- The City centre
- Within local communities, especially local centres
- In the urban extensions
- Public buildings, such as schools and community centres
- At key arrival and meeting points;
- On parks and open spaces
- Are there other places?

The City Council leading group's Annual Statement (2008) has already expressed the aim to: 'Ensure that public art is provided in local neighbourhoods as well as the city centre through a new public art strategy; and 'Review our process for allocating grants for Environmental Improvement Projects including providing more support for local neighbourhood schemes.'

Issue 5 What development should provide public art?

The existing Public Art Supplementary Planning Guidance¹ says, 'the requirement to meet the public art policy will apply to all developments meeting the following criteria:

- Residential development comprising 10 or more dwellings (or a site area of 0.5ha or more)
- Other developments where the floor space to be built is 1000 m² gross or more (or where the site area is 0.5ha or more), including office, manufacturing, warehousing and retail developments
- On smaller developments encouragement will be given to developers to seek to include public art within their scheme as a means of enhancing the quality of their development.'

Are these criteria still the right ones? If not how should they be changed?

Issue 6 When should on-site and off site art or contributions be required?

Some smaller value developments falling within the criteria above may generate relatively small amounts of money for public art that is insufficient to commission high quality work. The City Council's draft Planning Obligations Strategy (2007) says that where the value is less than £15,000 the preference will be for off site provision through the Public Art Initiatives Fund. Is this approach acceptable and is the £15,000 threshold right?

The City Council is keen to spread the benefits of public art across the City. There is a case for seeking to boost the Public Art Initiatives Fund in order to achieve this. One option is for all the 1% for art contributions from major developments to be split 75/25 between onsite art works (where appropriate) and the Public Initiatives Art Fund. This would help to build up the Fund over time and ensure a consistent funding stream for public art. Is this supported?

¹ Available at

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/pdfs/Public%20art%20supplementary%20planning%20guidance.pdf>

Public Art Draft SPD Consultation Statement

Issue 7 When should public art be built into the planning and development process and the artist commissioned?

The City Council accepts that there is strong evidence that the best public art, and by extension the best development, is achieved by having the artist engaged in the planning and development process from the outset? Is it reasonable for the Council to require this of all developments?

Issue 8 What other funding could be used to support public art?

Section 106 money is likely to be the main source of funding for public art. Should some of the money available for the programme of environmental improvements in the City be used to complement other initiatives to provide public art? What priority should be given to using other Council money to support public art? Are there other sources of funding available?

Issue 9 How could the public and stakeholders engage in the public art processes?

Art, public or otherwise, is not something that should be imposed on people. Public art will be appreciated and fulfil its objectives most effectively if the public and stakeholders are engaged in its planning, design and implementation. Should this apply in all cases and how is it best achieved?

Issue 10 How is specialist advice built into providing public art?

Implementing public art requires informed decisions on matters where subjectivity can override objectivity. What is the role of specialist advisors in supporting the City Council members and officers? Is action needed to ensure a more proactive approach to public art through the development control process and if so how and at what stage? A Public Art Steering Group has been in existence for several years. What should its role be and what sort of people should be on it if it is to be effective in promoting public art?

Issue 11 How should the public art programme be managed?

If the approach to public art that will be promoted by the SPD is successful there will be a need for greater proactive management of the programme to ensure that its objectives are met. There is already need to project manage the planning development and installation of specific projects, which can be very time consuming. Is there a case for the Council to establish a Public Art Unit, as has been proposed by some local authorities? Is it acceptable and legally permissible to use some of the funding collected through S106 agreements to buy in project management skills on a project by project basis?

Issue 12 How will art works be maintained in future?

Most public artworks will have an extended life, with many expected to remain in the public realm for decades. If they are to continue to provide delight to residents and not deteriorate they must be maintained. Who should be responsible for maintenance? How should maintenance be funded? If funded through a S106 commuted payment what period of time should this cover? How should publicly visible public art on private land, e.g. sculpture adjacent to office buildings, be maintained?

Are there other issues not covered above that you want to raise, if so we will welcome your views.

3.0 Next Steps

3.1 The views expressed on these issues will be evaluated and used to influence the drafting of the SPD. A draft SPD will be published for consultation in January 2009 and it is expected that this will be formally adopted in March 2009.

3.2 If you have any questions about this consultation, or there are matters you want to discuss please contact Glen Richardson, tel. 01224 457131, e-mail glen.richardson@cambridge.gov.uk

3.3 Please send your comments to Glen Richardson by 20th October 2008.

Cambridge City Council
September 2008

Appendix 2

External Issues and Options Consultees

Organisation	
Public Art Consultant	Greater Cambridge Partnership
Anglia Ruskin University	Grosvenor USS
Arts & Business East	IXIA
Arts Council England, East	January's
Ashwell PLC	Junction CDC Ltd
BPHA	Kettle's Yard
Bidwell's	LDA Design
CABE East	Liberty Property Trust UK PLC
Cambridge Association of Architects	Marshall Aerospace Ltd
Cambridge Open Studios	Public Art On line
Cambridge Preservation Society	Savill's
Cambridge Preservation Society	Shape East
Cambridge Regional College	Reynold's
Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cambridgeshire Constabulary	Turnstone Estates
Cambridgeshire County Council	Arts organisations: Wysing Arts Byard Arts
Cambridgeshire Horizons	Cambridge Residents
Cambridgeshire PCT	Jesus College Trinity College New Hall
Carter Jonas	Magdalene College
Commissions East	
Countryside Properties	
David Wilson Homes	
English Heritage	
University of Cambridge	
Fairview New Homes Ltd	
Future Cities	
Gallagher Estates	
Go-East	

Appendix 3

Public Art SPD – Issues and Options External Responses

Issue 1	What is the Vision for Public Art in Cambridge?		
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action – Draft SPD Ref.
Addenbrooke's	Public art in Cambridge needs to work in harmony with the historic character of the City while not restricting itself to heritage and nostalgia. The key issue for the City Council to address is in promoting public art which serves the permanent population and the city's external perception.	Agreed	Sections 1 & 6
	Public art in the City can fulfil more than one aim and should be used to represent the different facets of the City - ancient university town and home of cutting edge businesses and research work. Public art can add a twenty first century aspect to the presentation of Cambridge's historic cultural icons.	Agreed	Sections 1 & 6
Anglia Ruskin	The Public Art strategy should be seen as a component of a much larger vision for developing a creative identity for Cambridge. A strong creative and cultural offer is a vital element of developing an internationally successful city.	Agreed Some of the wider issues will be addressed in the Council's Arts and Entertainment Strategy 2008-13	Sections 1 & 6
Arts Council	The vision for public art in Cambridge is for it to contribute to place making, increasing the cultural offer of Cambridge for the artists and the wider public. The opportunity is to make visible and engage with the technology innovation which is Cambridge's USP. Public art can encourage excellence, risk-taking and innovation.	Agreed	Section 1
	Artistic excellence can encourage engagement with the arts.	Agreed	Para. 3.9
	Audience engagement is very important, to engage and challenge the wider public, enabling them to take part in high quality creative art.	Agreed	Para. 6.4

Issue 1	What is the Vision for Public Art in Cambridge?		
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action – Draft SPD Ref.
Bidwells	Public art should be incidental to a development and the character of Cambridge. We are in danger of public art becoming a tick box exercise and a diluted feature within Cambridge.	Public art can become a significant feature of and add to individual developments; each case needs to be treated on its merits. It should become a recognisable feature of the cultural life of the City. The process for developing public art set out in the SPD should insure that public art proposals are high quality, integrated and meaningful and not just a tick box exercise.	Sections 1 & 6
Cambridge Regional College	The vision for public art in Cambridge is one that in brings different sorts of people into contact in creative ways.	Agreed	Sections 1 & 6
Commissions East	Public art should be seen as central to the future of a well designed city. It should be integral to developments where appropriate and should provide a way for engaging both residents and visitors in the understanding and development of both central and local places. Public art should be an indicator of the emphasis the Council places on leading the development of a high quality environment	Agreed Agreed	Sections 1 & 6 Sections 1 & 6
Countryside Properties	Public art should be incidental to a development and the character of Cambridge. We are in danger of public art becoming a tick box exercise and becoming a diluted feature within Cambridge.	See Bidwells above	
Kettle's Yard	Public art in Cambridge needs to match the City's worldwide reputation as a centre of innovation and excellence.	Agreed	Section1
Marshall	Cambridge blessed with spectacular legacy of buildings and spaces. Public art is not critical to raising the standard of quality for the townscape nor of people's enjoyment of it. New public art will be incidental to the experience of the city although it may be placed in locations where it brings pleasure to otherwise modest or disadvantaged surroundings. In the context of the issue as expressed it is more likely to be understated and opportunistic.	Public art can become a significant feature of and add to individual developments; each case needs to be treated on its merits. It should become a recognisable feature of the cultural life of the City.	Sections 1 & 6

Issue 1		What is the Vision for Public Art in Cambridge?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action – Draft SPD Ref.
Marshall	Traditionally Councils have had an important role in providing public art. That role must continue. It will be supplemented by art deriving from contributions by developers, but the city fathers must be resolved to make civic contributions.	Agreed, however, in a climate of great financial stringency the Council has to consider carefully its priorities for spending and this is likely to limit the scope for civic contributions.	Paras 7.10-7.11, 10.7-10.8
Mole Architects	Public Art should be seen as central to the future of a well designed city, however, it should not be just installed because there is a written policy to do so. In each site the selection of the art form needs to be carefully made. Further there is a focus on objects as opposed to process-led work, which might be more appropriate in certain sites.	Agreed Agreed	Section 3 Paras. 3.3, 3.5, 3.9, 3.11
Turnstone Estates	Central to the future of a well designed city. In Cambridge, in particular, it should enforce the City's image as a place of creativity.	Agreed	Sections 1 & 6
Cambridge Artist 1	Incidental and understated – something that grows with revisiting.	Public art can become a significant feature of and add to individual developments; each case needs to be treated on its merits. It should become a recognisable feature of the cultural life of the City.	Section 3
Individual 1	Public art should be part of a well designed city, but not used as a gesture to satisfy section 106. Need flexibility in use of the money. Public art should enhance a space or building and provide aesthetic, cultural, intellectual stimulus. Placement crucial. There are too many bad schemes around. Some places, less is more, others can take a dramatic and risky project. The funds could go to curatorial or educational or practical use.	Agreed Agreed Agreed	Sections 3 & 6 Sections 3, 6 & 7 DC Guidance 2, para. 10.2

Issue 1			
What is the Vision for Public Art in Cambridge?			
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action – Draft SPD Ref.
	<p>They could be used to improve existing grotty urban streetscapes. They could be used to remove grotty lamps and bollards.</p> <p>Public schemes need to work with the Highways department and surrounding architecture. A commissioned piece must not be seen in isolation. This needs imagination and collaboration with authorities.</p>	<p>Disagree. This is not public art and should be covered by the Environmental Improvements Programme and highways maintenance budgets.</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Section 6, paras 8.8 & 10.3</p>
Cambridge Artist 2	<p>Public art in all various forms has the potential to contribute to the creation of a well designed city and high quality environment for.</p> <p>Cambridge is a centre of creativity and learning and therefore will demonstrate this through its approach to its public art strategy.</p> <p>Public art can be many things – incidental, integral, subtle, “in yer face”, understated, responsive, lead the way, controversial, fun, inspiring, irritating, beautiful - it can be all these and many more.....</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Sections 1 & 6</p> <p>Sections 1 & 6</p> <p>Section 6</p>
Cambridge Resident 1	<p>Yes to first two statements</p> <p>Enhancing a rapidly changing city</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Sections 1 & 6</p> <p>Sections 1, 6 & 7</p>
Individual 2	<p>Public Art should be central to any vision for the city. The policies should aim to be internationally dynamic and as forward looking. Public art should mirror the fact that the city is at the cutting edge of many intellectual developments and seek to find ways to involve its diverse communities in participatory debate and action and not to placate them with second rate ornament. This will revitalise and enhance the image of the city and have a lasting impact on its future.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Sections 1 & 6</p>
Individual 3	<p>Public art should be seen as central to the future of a well-designed city. It should be part of the image that Cambridge should present to the world, a centre of creativity and learning</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Section 1</p>

Issue 1			
What is the Vision for Public Art in Cambridge?			
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action – Draft SPD Ref.
	However, it should not be too overt, but much should be understated and included as opportunities arise.	Public art can become a significant feature of and add to individual developments; each case needs to be treated on its merits. It should become a recognisable feature of the cultural life of the City.	
Cambridge Resident 2	Cambridge a city of wonderful buildings of many periods. Public art must match these – quality is a top priority.	Agreed	Sections 3 & 6
Anon 1	Different for different places. Some symbolise the role of Cambridge as centre of creativity, some create an exciting environment	Agreed	Sections 6 & 7
Anon 2	To add a contemporary lustre to the City's historic renown and beauty	Agreed	Section 1
Anon 3	Acts or objects, contrived, and created to question or renew our concept of the world constitutes 'art'. Cambridge should be a place where many of such acts and object keep it as a centre of civilization.	Agreed	Sections 1, 3 & 6
Anon 4	It depends on where about in the City the public art is going to be sited because all three of your questions mentioned could be relevant.	Agreed. However, public art can become a significant feature of and add to individual developments; each case needs to be treated on its merits. It should become a recognisable feature of the cultural life of the City.	Sections 6 & 7
	If it is ashamed of itself it will fail. It must be visible, coherent, bold.	Agreed	Sections 3, 6 & 7

Issue 2		What is the Function of Public Art?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Addenbrooke's	<p>The Trust does not have a firm view of the roles for art. The role of art may vary from location to location within the city.</p> <p>From the Trust's point of view, art plays a role in providing landmarks and improving wayfinding. Art also improves the perception of the hospital as a caring environment with an emphasis on excellence. Art can also be used to mark and celebrate history.</p> <p>Art can be a key driver in promoting community cohesion. Public art can act to raise the self esteem of whole communities. At the same time, a thriving cultural scene can generate a cultural identity and promote economic activity.</p> <p>Most of all though, art should be engaging, fun and stimulating.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Sections 3, 6 & 7 cover all these points</p>
Anglia Ruskin	<p>Adding to and expressing sense of place – developing a 'creative ecology'; supporting community identity; celebrating and interpreting issues.</p> <p>Art for art's sake</p> <p>Other include: Creating a city's identity and the power of creativity in urban living; and educating and engaging the public about art and developing an engagement and appreciation for expression, bridging cultural diversity, community building, etc</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agree in the sense that it is right to support art in its own right – it has a value above the purely functional.</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Section 3</p> <p>Paras 3.9 & 6.1</p> <p>Section 6</p>
Arts Council	As 1 above	See above	See above
Bidwells	<p>From the list provided it is not possible to say which are the most important issues for Cambridge as these will be determined on a case by case scenario. One may be more relevant than the other depending on the site circumstances.</p> <p>As covered elsewhere in this submission, we are in danger of producing art for art's sake.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Depends on how the phrase 'art for art's sake' is used. Agree in the sense that we should not be creating</p>	<p>Section 6</p> <p>Section 6</p>

Issue 2	What is the Function of Public Art?		
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
		public art to tick a box. However, it is right to support art in its own right – it has a value above the purely functional. The process for developing public art set out in the SPD should insure that public art proposals are high quality, integrated and meaningful.	
Cambridge Regional College	The function of public art is that it is a potential tool for communication and supporting community identity.	Agreed	Sections 3 & 6
Commissions East	The function includes the encouraging of community ownership, public safety, placemaking, legibility and creating landmarks. Sometimes projects are all of these things and sometimes only one or two. This will depend on context.	Agreed	Sections 3 & 6
Countryside Properties	<p>From the list provided it is not really possible to say which are the most important for Cambridge as these will be determined on a case by case scenario. One may be more relevant than the other depending on the site circumstances.</p> <p>As covered elsewhere in this submission, we are in danger of producing art for arts sake. However of the functions listed it is considered that the following are the most important when art is provided as part of a large development: identifying routes and improving legibility, creating landmarks and shaping views, adding to and expressing sense of place.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Depends on how the phrase 'art for art's sake' is used. Agree in the sense that we should not be creating public art to tick a box. However, it is right to support art in its own right – it has a value above the purely functional. The process for developing public art set out in the SPD should insure that public art proposals are high quality and meaningful.</p>	<p>Section 6</p> <p>Section 6</p>
Kettle's Yard	Its function is to broaden and sharpen our perceptions and stimulate our imaginations. If it does this it will help to support community identity, add to a sense of place and create landmarks, but it is probably better not to give it too many 'jobs' to do.	Agreed	Section 6
Marshall	The most important role for public art is to give pleasure to the	Agreed	Section 6

Issue 2		What is the Function of Public Art?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	<p>beholder, e.g. in signalling arrival or helping with the interpretation of places. The table mounted models/bronzes funded by the Rotary Clubs are excellent examples.</p> <p>The Cambridge Blue Plaque Scheme is an initiative the results of which are informative to, and popular with the public (see Issue 3).</p>	Agree that these are valuable, but they are not public art	Paras. 3.5-3.8
Marshall	The one discordant role mentioned is art for arts sake. This can be an excuse for all sorts of nonsense	Depends on how the phrase 'art for art's sake' is used. Agree in the sense that we should not be creating public art to tick a box. However, it is right to support art in its own right – it has a value above the purely functional. The process for developing public art set out in the SPD should insure that public art proposals are high quality, integrated and meaningful.	Section 6
Mole Architects	Items on the list which are already overloading what public art can do – need to be careful not to try to use public art to 'solve' bad architecture! Public art is best used when, adding to and expression and informing a sense of place, but art is great at telling you things you don't know – there needs to be the space for this to happen – not just interpretation.	Agreed	Section 6
Turnstone Estates	To add to and express a sense of place, to stimulate thought.	Agreed	Section 6
Cambridge Artist 1	Earlier public art came about through a need to celebrate or commemorate. In Cambridge art for arts sake hasn't generally caught on, e.g. Talos, but there are exceptions: Spinoza, the Station Road Ceres. I support points 1-4, 7, & 9-10 and 81/2 shaping views.	Noted and agreed	Section 6
Individual 1	<p>Public art should enhance a space or building and provide aesthetic, intellectual stimulus. Placement is crucial. Need some mental or physical response. Make people look at things again.</p> <p>Give pleasure, identity to places, pride in a place. Good art can be witty as well as practical.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Section 6</p> <p>Sections 3 & 6</p>

Issue 2	What is the Function of Public Art?		
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	<p>Railings, bike sheds, loos.</p> <p>Traffic calming should enhance not irate.</p> <p>Green projects should be included; all listed are relevant.</p>	<p>Yes, if artist designed</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Section 3</p> <p>Section 6</p>
Cambridge Artist 2	<p>To amuse, bemuse, inspire, celebrate, encourage. To ask questions and share answers. To involve, share, provoke, evoke.</p> <p>Most important for Cambridge? Public art that supports and celebrates community identity, creates landmarks and shapes new views and pride of/in the city beyond the gown into the town.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Section 6</p> <p>Section 6</p>
Cambridge Resident 1	Add to and express sense of place; create landmarks and shape views; celebration history culture; involving local art community.	Agreed	Sections 6 & 9
Individual 2	<p>Public Art promotes an exchange between the work of art and its location. Location might be mobile but should include a consideration of past and present use. A Public Artwork should consider habitual users and of visitors to that place. Respond to architecture, history, landscape and of the environment.</p> <p>The function is to involve people in the current debates and developments of art practice in new and surprising sites which are not those in which art is usually found (i.e. the gallery / book). This will challenge both artists and to spectators to reimagine and redefine what art is for them outside of its usual confines. Promote ownership, participation in the artwork by those who engage with it.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Sections 6 & 7</p> <p>Paras 3.1-3.12, Section 6</p>
Individual 3	Supporting community identity; creating harmonious places that encourage safe use; adding to and expressing sense of place; interpretation of places; celebrating and interpreting issues; signalling arrival; identifying routes and improving legibility; creating landmarks and shaping views; celebration history, culture, heritage and people; and revealing hidden meanings	Agreed	Section 6 covers all these points

Issue 2		What is the Function of Public Art?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	<p>Integrating the work and creative thinking of artists and craftspeople into the design of internal and external public spaces can be the difference between success and failure in effective place making and the positive effect this has on people's lives.</p> <p>Commissions support artists and craftspeople and raises public awareness and appreciation of excellent art and design.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	
Cambridge Resident 2	To stimulate our imaginations, widen our appreciation and understanding of visual additions to architecture and landscape.	Agreed	Section 6
Anon 1	<p>Different for different locations – site specific functions.</p> <p>But not art for art's sake (far too Tate Modern)</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Depends on how the phrase 'art for art's sake' is used. Agree in the sense that we should not be creating public art to tick a box. However, it is right to support art in its own right – it has a value above the purely functional. This will involve supporting 'modern' approaches. The process for developing public art set out in the SPD should insure that public art proposals are high quality, integrated and meaningful.</p>	<p>Section 6</p> <p>Section 6</p>
Anon 2	To enhance the built environment and open spaces, and to provide landmarks. To inject an element of surprise into familiar places.	Agreed	Section 6
Anon 3	To turn the heads of passers, to cause others to come just to see or hear it. Animate a place and make a city a celebration of the arts.	Agreed	Section 6
Anon 4	Creating a landmark and expressing a sense of place	Agreed	Section 6
Anon 5	Key roles: sense of place; signalling arrival, identifying routes; creating landmarks; celebration; community identity.	Agreed	Section 6

Issue 3		What is Public Art and What Qualifies?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Addenbrooke's	Healthcare facilities, such as hospitals are a crucial part of the presentation of public art as the entire population is likely, at various times, to access a hospital as a visitor or patient. This also means that the population of the hospital is very diverse and varies daily.	Agreed	Paras 7.6 & 7.7
	Hospital and healthcare facilities should be included in the list of locations where art is considered to be "public".	Agreed	Para. 3.4
	A crucial aspect of public art is that it is accessible to the whole population, regardless of age, gender, ethnic background, physical disability, etc. In placing work in a hospital setting we attempt to consider all the potential audience for public art to ensure work is not exclusive or inaccessible. These considerations should be applied to the application of any public art.	Noted and agreed. Public art should be accessible to the whole population, regardless of age, gender, ethnic background, physical disability, etc.	Para 3.4
	In the Trust's view, art includes the full range of performance and "fine" art, including "temporary art". All public art should be commissioned on the basis that it has a life and thus a decommissioning process should be factored into any commission. The cost of maintaining and decommissioning work is a valid expense to be incorporated into Percent for Art calculations.	Agreed	Para. 3.6, Appendices 2 & 5
	Facilities for artists to practise is an interesting issue – the Trust's view is that it would be valid to spend art funding on facilities within which the public engage with art – e.g. a public gallery space, a performance area, but not on rehearsal rooms or artist studios.	Agreed where a practising artist is commissioned	Para. 3.6
	Trust also considers it important that artist influenced design decisions can be considered as part of the public art allocation. The Trust proposes that the definition of art should include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fixed items of art including, sculpture, visual art including painting and photography, mosaics, external and internal features, links to wayfinding, lighting and increasing the aesthetic value of green spaces; 2. Other arts activity, including, poetry, music, storytelling, 	Agreed in principle where a practising artist is commissioned	Para. 3.6
		Agreed, where designed by an artist	Para. 3.6

Issue 3		What is Public Art and What Qualifies?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	<p>cultural activities designed to celebrate the diversity of the building's population and opportunities for occupants of the building to participate in the arts</p> <p>The Trust defines art to include: paintings, mobiles, graffiti, automata, computer games, landscaping, sound recording, woodworking, workshops, poetry, storytelling, collage, film-making, light, sculpture, drawing, clowning, dance, magic, acrobatics, literature activities, opera, ballet, sculpture, singing, puppetry, lightboxes, music, slides, performance art, projection, mosaics, rapping, craft, graphic design, drama.</p> <p>At the same time these artforms could be used in a limitless variety of ways from murals on walls to digitally transforming reception desks, from sculpture in gardens to specially commissioned virtual gaming areas.</p>	<p>Agreed generally with the exception of music. Work should be created for the location or community by an artist working in the fields covered by Section 3.</p> <p>Agreed generally with the exception of music (see above); case by base discussion likely to be required</p>	<p>Para. 3.6</p> <p>Para. 3.6</p>
Anglia Ruskin	<p>Public art should be art that involves the public – either through consumption, participation, appreciation or development.</p> <p>Public can mean all of the examples given but can also include spaces 'created' for public art. Establishing as part of new development spaces which are specifically for public art.</p> <p>The phrasing of the question gives a bias towards 'art furniture' rather than fully inclusive notions of what public art might constitute.</p> <p>There shouldn't be a distinction between kinds of art - focus on the quality of each application. Unless the vision wished to move the City in a particular direction to capitalise on strengths or a unique identity.</p> <p>Both temporary and permanent work should be acceptable, as you can engage the public more effectively at times. This would also see a departure from the current 'sculpture trail' practice.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>This was not intended; the Council supports inclusive view of public art</p> <p>Agreed. The vision does not show a commitment to any particular art form.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Sections 3 & 6</p> <p>Para. 3.4</p> <p>Section 3</p> <p>Section 1 & 3</p> <p>Para. 3.6</p> <p>Para 3.6</p>

Issue 3		What is Public Art and What Qualifies?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	<p>Artist designed street furniture would be welcomed.</p> <p>Interior design would depend on whether the funds were going back to the developer and how their contribution was to be measured, monitored and made accessible.</p> <p>Performance should qualify as the benefit is for the public. As long as it meets those requirements then all art forms should be encouraged, rather than privileging the visual arts. There are excellent examples of this including work by Artichoke, Light Up Bristol, Nottingham's NOW festival.</p> <p>Artists' facilities are in high demand in Cambridge, and a lack of studio space has a negative impact on the creative activity of the, and limits the local talent which can engage with the Public Art strategy.</p>	<p>Such contributions would be required to be a true public art benefit and not offset against general building costs</p> <p>Agree include performance art. Work should be created for the location or community by an artist working in the fields covered by Section 3.</p> <p>Agreed, and the Public Art SPD may assist, but also needs to be addressed by other planning, cultural and property strategies and policies. The inclusion of facilities for artists will normally only be applicable in the case of very large scale developments. They should be included only where the funding is sufficient to pay for both them and significant public art works. The contribution is to mitigate the overall impact of the development. Large developments require facilities for artists creating public artworks to work in.</p>	<p>Section 3</p> <p>Para. 3.6</p> <p>Para. 3.6</p>
Arts Council	<p>There are so many forms of public art which can be included: Temporary interventions and performances, film and video, new media, literature, painting, dance, craft, design or artists workspace.</p> <p>Public art can also include the creation of workspace for artists but it is key that this practise involves the artists in the development</p>	<p>Agreed, but not including pure literature and dance; work should be created for the location or community by an artist working in the fields covered by Section 3.</p> <p>Agree overall, but the use should not be constrained in the way suggested – public art must engage</p>	<p>Para. 3.6</p> <p>Para 3.6</p>

Issue 3		What is Public Art and What Qualifies?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	and transformation of the built environment. The development of workspace creates a permanent infrastructure to support the arts.	artists not just 'public artists'. Where there are large developments it is agreed that artists require facilities for creating public artworks	
Bidwells	<p>It should be sufficient for the art to be enjoyed from a public vantage point for it to qualify as being a piece of public art.</p> <p>There is no reason why a piece of public art could not be temporary where the circumstances prevail and items such as street furniture should absolutely be considered as opportunities for public art and indeed any visual embellishment of standard features on a development.</p> <p>It is difficult to see that interior design could qualify to be public art.</p> <p>The use of public art monies to facilitate a practice area for artists would absolutely not comply with Circular 05/05.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Qualifies in buildings accessible to the public.</p> <p>The inclusion of facilities for artists will normally only be applicable in the case of very large scale developments. They should be included only where the funding is sufficient to pay for both them and significant public art works. The contribution is to mitigate the overall impact of the development. Large developments require facilities for artists creating public artworks to work in.</p>	<p>Para. 3.4</p> <p>Para.3.6</p> <p>Para. 3.6</p> <p>Paras 3.6-3.7</p>
Cambridge Regional College	<p>Public art: the play of creative symbols of a community and its history.</p> <p>Public art comes in a variety of different forms which could include crafts, street furniture, performance art or fixed fine arts.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed, provided it is the work of an artist.</p>	<p>Sections 3 & 6</p> <p>Section 3</p>
Commissions East	Public art is made by artists; this is the most important	Agreed	Sections 3 &

Issue 3		What is Public Art and What Qualifies?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	<p>qualification, they bring new vision that challenge existing preconceptions</p> <p>Public art can be craft/applied art, temporary work, film and lighting. It should not, however, be a replacement for standard capital items.</p> <p>Public Art might can be involvement of artist in the 'thinking process'.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>6</p> <p>Para 3.6</p> <p>Paras. 3.3, 3.5, 3.9, 3.11</p>
Countryside Properties	<p>It should be sufficient for the art to be enjoyed from a public vantage point for it to qualify as being a piece of public art.</p> <p>There is no reason why a piece of public art could not be temporary where the circumstances prevail and items such as street furniture should absolutely be considered as opportunities for public art and indeed any visual embellishment of standard features on a development. It is difficult to see that interior design could qualify to be public art.</p> <p>The use of public art monies to facilitate a practice area for artists would absolutely not comply with Circular 05/05.</p>	See Bidwells response above	
Kettle's Yard	<p>Whether on public or private premises, it should be available to everyone on a substantial, regular basis, if not all the time.</p> <p>It may be permanent or temporary, depending on the relative public benefit. Not necessary to circumscribe its form if it fulfils its function – 'broaden and sharpen our perceptions, stimulate imaginations.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Para. 3.4</p> <p>Sections 3 & 6</p>
Marshall	<p>Embrace a variety of locations in which the art can readily be seen by the public or is accessible to the public regularly. Jesus College has a fine collection of sculptures generally being easily accessible.</p> <p>Craftsmanship may be an element. The recent striking addition of the lump of granite near Guildhall Place is more pleasurable because of the masonry involved in creating the striking banding.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Para 3.4</p> <p>Section 3</p> <p>Para. 3.6</p>

Issue 3		What is Public Art and What Qualifies?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	<p>Temporary art may be acceptable. In Cambridge there have been temporary exhibitions of sculpture - in which Christ's Pieces and New Square played a role.</p> <p>Beautifully designed or well crafted street furniture should qualify as public art.</p> <p>Works of interior design might but only if they are available on a reasonable basis to be seen by the public.</p> <p>The Blue Plaques scheme, making and honouring notable achievement, is worthy of recognition and funding support.</p> <p>The performing arts should not qualify in the sense that what is really under scrutiny is contributions to place making.</p> <p>Nor on the same basis would facilities for artists generally be acceptable.</p> <p>Provision of appropriate places for busking for example in the city centre to be made more comfortable for artists might qualify.</p>	<p>Agreed and noted</p> <p>Agreed if artist designed</p> <p>Agree in public buildings</p> <p>Agree that these are valuable, but they are not public art</p> <p>Performance art may qualify, but not all performing arts; work should be created for the location or community by an artist working in the fields covered by Section 3.</p> <p>The inclusion of facilities for artists will normally only be applicable in the case of very large scale developments. They should be included only where the funding is sufficient to pay for both them and significant public art works. The contribution is to mitigate the overall impact of the development. Large developments require facilities for artists creating public artworks to work in.</p> <p>Not appropriate for public art; currently part managed through a licensing arrangement</p>	<p>Para. 3.6</p> <p>Para. 3.6</p> <p>Para. 3.6</p>

Issue 3		What is Public Art and What Qualifies?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Mole Architects	<p>All of the places listed are suitable– but this can also be extended – e.g. Kirsten Lavers recent work at Arbury with Mark Dixon where public art extended into peoples houses – joining people together to work as a community in their private spaces on small things that could be seen from the street.</p> <p>A focus should be given to temporary art works although a clearer definition is required here. Works where the process involved is as important as the end product should be given more prominence. Key works that come to mind are those by Cambridge Curiosity and Imagination artists who work to facilitate creativity in others rather than the artist. Building community links and involvement – learning from others experience of place rather than bringing in an imposed set of ideas.</p> <p>I think the idea about encouraging long-term commitment in order to integrate art in to the city by supporting art practice is a good one.</p>	<p>Agreed that this seems to be appropriate as part of the process; needs further exploration.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Para. 3.4 also to be reviewed.</p> <p>Paras. 3.3, 3.5, 3.9, 3.11</p> <p>Sections 1 & 6</p>
Turnstone Estates	<p>Public art should be accessible and therefore generally in public places.</p> <p>It should be lasting and therefore generally of a physical nature.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Temporary work may be appropriate, for example where it celebrates an event, or by its nature has a short lifespan or is part of the process of engaging the public in public art. In all cases a permanent record must be created.</p>	<p>Para. 3.4</p> <p>Para 3.6</p>
Cambridge Artist 1	<p>Public art has to be what it says – mostly, because skylines, water-features, reflections & inscriptions, along with clocks and planting (e.g. the new frontage treatment of Emmanuel) enter the public realm, even though most of these will come about through private funding. In a shopping centre, I'm all for something like the old red lion in the Lion Yard that makes you look twice, and allow you to share a moment of reflection with it.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Para. 3.4</p> <p>Sections 3, 6 & 7</p>

Issue 3		What is Public Art and What Qualifies?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	Public art to embrace crafts, street furniture, and permanence - not performance art – but public art funding should be available for teaching facilities to set up in-house programmes and residencies.	Agreed, though performance art that contributes to place making should be included	Para 3.6 -3.7
Individual 1	<p>Public realm – streets yes. Don't want spray on tokenism. Bridge street: no public art could make traffic control scheme look attractive. The 'pipe' by Folk Museum damaged, meaningless to most people.</p> <p>Art in shopping centres rarely work; developers not well advised; out of scale; end up with bolt-on twee stuff. However P. Randall Page piece is very good. Not convinced by location. Is it appreciated?</p> <p>Big sculpture outside office developments can look bogus.</p> <p>Colleges. Have lovely artsclapes & viewsclapes but do not regard it as public, but it is accessible.</p> <p>Commissions done with passion or involvement of patron work best.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Disagree, can work well in shopping centres and gets public exposure when the proposal is fully integrated within the development design process.</p> <p>But not necessarily if conceived as part of the development</p> <p>Depends on degree of access; can be acceptable</p> <p>Agreed, need early engagement</p>	<p>Sections 3 & 6</p> <p>Para. 3.4</p> <p>Para. 8.9</p>
Cambridge Artist 2	<p>Public art is not an exhibition in a gallery, a play in a theatre, a concert in a hall; not something that you decide to buy a ticket or make time for. Public art is stumbled upon, you discover it, its free, it's for everyone. It makes you smile, curious, cross, dream, whistle a tune, talk. It celebrates where you live or what you do or what you hope for or what you have done.</p> <p>What qualifies? It can be fine art, performance, text, sound, permanent, temporary, carnival, song, sculpture, painting; it can be made by artists, encourage and support artists; be photographs, bill boards; it can be massive, tiny; it can be graffiti, postcards, outdoor projections, a footpath, a bench, a statue, a signpost, a etc</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Work should be created for the location or community by an artist working in the fields covered by Section 3.</p>	<p>Sections 3 & 6</p> <p>Section 3</p>
Cambridge Resident 1	All of the meanings you give. It should be accessible without having to pay entry fee or cross forbidding thresholds	Agreed	Section 3

Issue 3		What is Public Art and What Qualifies?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Individual 2	<p>It might be more useful to consider the term site-specific. This includes art which has been specifically designed for a particular location and which promotes a dialogue with that place. This dialogue or exchange is there for participants to engage with. This might include a variety of fixed and ephemeral forms.</p> <p>The funding of studio space in which artists were encouraged to come up with public art initiatives would be an excellent idea and would enhance the city's cultural and artistic life as well as having an impact on areas which need regenerating. This is funding of the practice of art (Public Art Initiatives Fund) rather than public art itself.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed. The inclusion of facilities for artists will normally only be applicable in the case of very large scale developments. They should be included only where the funding is sufficient to pay for both them and significant public art works. Large developments require facilities for artists creating public artworks to work in.</p>	<p>Paras 3.1 & 7.9</p> <p>Paras 3.6-3.7</p>
Individual 3	<p>It should include crafts as well as 'fine art; temporary ones are acceptable and even desirable; artist designed street furniture and interior design is acceptable</p> <p>The art does not always have to have a physical form performance – music, drama, performance art may qualify.</p> <p>Facilities for artists to practice would be acceptable.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Music and drama will not qualify; work should be created for the location or community by an artist working in the fields covered by Section 3.</p> <p>The inclusion of facilities for artists will normally only be applicable in the case of very large scale developments. They should be included only where the funding is sufficient to pay for both them and significant public art works. Large developments require facilities for artists creating public artworks to work in.</p>	<p>Para. 3.6</p>

Issue 3		What is Public Art and What Qualifies?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Cambridge Resident 2	Must be available to all, at all times if possible or as far as possible.	Agreed	Para. 3.4
Anon 1	Visible from the public domain. Street furniture OK, but not interior design. Can include performance art.	Agreed Street furniture must be designed by artist; interior design acceptable in public access buildings Agreed	Para. 3.4 Para 3.6 Para. 3.6
Anon 2	Interventions in the public realm, created by artists and crafts people. Permanent or temporary structures and installations, not just well designed street furniture etc.	Agreed	Para. 3.6
Anon 3	See Issue 1	See above	See above
Anon 4	I believe public art should be in places where the public can at all times gain access to view the art and is permanent.	Agreed	Para. 3.4
Anon 5	Crafts, yes in the right context. Preferably permanent in some sense, but facilities might achieve that while leaving room for some transient expressions. Purely ephemeral art should not receive public funding. Everyone has easy access regularly if they so wish. Places that are often closed, or that have entry fees, would not meet the spirit of this.	Agreed Temporary work may be appropriate, for example where it celebrates an event, or by its nature has a short lifespan or is part of the process of engaging the public in public art. In all cases a permanent record must be created. Agreed	Para. 3.5 Para. 3.6 Para. 3.4

Issue 4		Where Should Public Art be Located?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Addenbrooke's	It is important that hospitals and healthcare settings are included in the list of potential places for public art to be located. There are	Agreed	Paras 7.6 & 7.7

Issue 4		Where Should Public Art be Located?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	well understood arguments in favour of integrating art into healthcare and hospitals with their own arts team on staff have the capability to manage and maintain effective public art.		
Anglia Ruskin	Yes to all of the mentioned options	Noted	Section 7
Arts Council	The key issue with public art is that it is accessible to a wide range of people this is why public art needs to be located in the everyday environment including streets and square, healthcare, regeneration, master planning, heritage, education, urban design, green spaces.	Agreed generally true, but some art on private land can be enjoyed by many people	Para. 3.4 & Section 7
Bidwells	The purpose for public art must be to mitigate against the development in hand. This is the only basis on which public art can be sought through the planning system therefore the location of such must be directly relevant to the issue one is seeking to mitigate against. The requirement for the public art to be necessary very much limits discretion on the location of such art as it must be clearly related to the development that has made a contribution therefore it is difficult to agree that there should be a defined list on where or how such monies should be used for public art.	There are 7 points to be made here: 1. the application of this circular is intended to contribute to the wider planning objectives of delivering sustainable communities; 2. providing for public art is part of the approved development plan and it yields the benefits set out in the SPD; 3. the impact of any development will extend beyond the individual site, may be felt citywide and should be ameliorated; 4. it is important to use public art contributions effectively and efficiently, which may be difficult to achieve with small contributions; 5. use of contributions in the way is in the spirit of pooling set out in the Circular; 6. the City Council will seek to ensure that arrangements of this kind are negotiated	Sections 7 & 8

Issue 4		Where Should Public Art be Located?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
		amicably with the developer; and In the use of the Public Art Initiative Fund (PAIF) the Council will take into account the proximity of projects to the S106 generating developments that are funding them.	
Cambridge Regional College	Public art should be in public space, cultural community area or park.	Agreed	Section 7
Commissions East	Could be anywhere: emphasis should be placed on local centres, new developments and places where people live, learn and work.	Agreed	Section 7
Countryside Properties	The purpose for public art must be to mitigate against the development in hand. This is the only basis on which public art can be sought through the planning system therefore the location of such must be directly relevant to the issue one is seeking to mitigate against. The requirement for the public art to be necessary very much limits discretion on the location of such art as it must be clearly related to the development that has made a contribution therefore it is difficult to agree that there should be a defined list on where or how such monies should be used for public art.	See Bidwells response above	
Kettle's Yard	The statement to 'ensure that public art is provided in local neighbourhoods as well as the city centre' adequate. Much of current work is site specific or site 'sensitive' that it can be as well to have a menu of areas and then work with artists to settle on particular sites.	Agreed, but further work needed, e.g. through Public Art Action Plan and public art framework	Section 7
Marshall	All the suggested types of locations seem appropriate.	Agreed	Section 7
Mole Architects	Again a focus on the place as a final destination of an object. We should also think here about a process whereby art practices can develop the design process, where the artist could become part of the design team early in the building project and their skills used to think about the existing site more creatively alongside the architect.	Agreed	Section 7 & para. 8.9

Issue 4		Where Should Public Art be Located?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Turnstone Estates	<p>In all public places.</p> <p>Where it is provided as part of a S 106 Agreement, it should relate to and add to the development which is funding it.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>There are 7 points to be made here:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. the application of this circular is intended to contribute to the wider planning objectives of delivering sustainable communities; 8. providing for public art is part of the approved development plan and it yields the benefits set out in the SPD; 9. the impact of any development will extend beyond the individual site, may be felt citywide and should be ameliorated; 10. it is important to use public art contributions effectively and efficiently, which may be difficult to achieve with small contributions; 11. use of contributions in the way is in the spirit of pooling set out in the Circular; 12. the City Council will seek to ensure that arrangements of this kind are negotiated amicably with the developer; and <p>In the use of the PAIF the Council will take into account the proximity of projects to the S106 generating developments that are funding them.</p>	Section 7

Issue 4		Where Should Public Art be Located?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Cambridge Artist 1	<p>I think Section 106 needs to be flexible; it might be possible to devise a programme, available to City Centre contributors, where streetscape, facades or skyline features (missing or damaged through time, neglect) may be eligible for reinstatement or enhancement.</p> <p>Signage, and pedestrian safety and enjoyment, provide two targets, citywide.</p>	<p>A good point, but would not be public art generally; could be considered on case by case basis</p> <p>Disagree. This is not public art and should be covered by the Environmental Improvements Programme and highways maintenance budgets.</p>	Para. 3.6
Individual 1	<p>Arrival and meeting points; Park & ride; bus stations; cycle housing; car parks; cycle lanes.</p> <p>Junctions already messed up with road clutter. Not good sites for sculpture.</p> <p>Parks and open spaces - only if good enough and can stand alone.</p> <p>City centre. - get rid of all the junk street furniture and plastic street bollards before considering more objects. Use funds to de clutter the place.</p> <p>Market square: badly in need have overhaul; get the fountain working; put correct 'desire lines' in place.....</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Opportunities should be reviewed case by case</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Disagree. This is not public art and should be covered by the Environmental Improvements Programme and highways maintenance budgets.</p> <p>Important but not a present high priority</p>	<p>Section 7</p> <p>Section 7</p> <p>Section 7</p> <p>Section 7</p>
Cambridge Artist 2	<p>City centre is already very rich; the fountain in the Market Square needs addressing as a focal point; Issam Koubaj's proposal for Great St Mary's deserves to be realised as an artwork.</p> <p>Plea for prioritising a public art commissioning strategy for the local centres and communities connecting to the centre through interventions for the public park and open spaces – Midsummer Common, Coldham's Common, Riverside, Parker's Piece.</p> <p>Works that celebrate the history of Cambridge Town – e.g. the</p>	<p>Agree there are strengths and issues but not a present high priority</p> <p>Agree with principle; area for further exploration, e.g. through Public Art Action Plan and public art framework</p>	<p>Section 7</p> <p>Section 7</p> <p>Section 7</p>

Issue 4		Where Should Public Art be Located?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	footballing history of Parker's Piece ...	Agree with principle	
Cambridge Resident 1	Arrival & meeting points; parks & open spaces; in urban extensions.	Agreed	Section 7
Individual 2	Other places: disused shops and spaces which might have links to the industrial, commercial, historical fabric of the city. Libraries. Transport links (excellent work has been done on buses which serve as mobile site-specific conduits and bring lots of audiences together). It might be more useful to designate areas which need regenerating and ask artists / writers to make proposals for works in response to their own research. Digital artworks might also exist in relationship to public art works to offer another layer of participation / documentation and stimuli for future participation.	Agree with principle; area for further exploration, e.g. through Public Art Action Plan and public art framework	Section 7
Individual 3	The public realm – streets, open spaces; on private buildings, but visible from public places ; in public buildings; in College and other private grounds that are regularly open to the public; in shopping centres.; in local neighbourhoods as well as the city centre. It could also have a virtual presence online.	Agreed Agreed	Section 7 Section 7 & para. 9.7
Cambridge Resident 2	As listed in the document seems fine.	Agreed	Section 7
Anon 1	Anywhere – but visible from the public domain	Agreed	Para 3.4 & Section 7
Anon 2	Anywhere in the City where the setting can be enhanced, highlighted, given character by the intervention of an artist or craftsperson. Must be visible from public spaces.	Agreed, broadly	Para 3.4 & Section 7
Anon 3	In any inhabited place or thoroughfare, wherever people meet, mingle, pass through or otherwise visit. Especially in places that need cheering up.	Agreed	Para 3.4 & Section 7
Anon 4	To be decided and agreed between local residents and the Council.	Agreed	Sections 7 & 9
Anon 5	See my last point under issue 3. Anywhere that meets these criteria potentially suitable; rarely visited locations should be avoided.	Agreed	Section 7

Issue 5			
What Development Should Provide Public Art?			
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Addenbrooke's	<p>The Trust does not have a view about the minimum size of development for which an art contribution should be sought.</p> <p>Trust's view is that clinical development should be considered in a more flexible way than other types of development – particularly those developments promoted by the Trust. This is on the basis that it is not always appropriate to include public art within some areas of the hospital, it may not be appropriate to invest clinical funds on some art schemes and also that the Trust has an art strategy that is being actively implemented and managed across the site.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>As a matter of principle S106 requirements will apply to all developments. However, the Council recognises that there are particular issues arising from health care developments and will wish to treat these sensitively.</p>	Section 8
Anglia Ruskin	These still appear to be correct	Agreed	Section 8
Arts Council	Smaller developments should consider public art as part of engaging with wider community and ensuring good design principles.	Agreed in appropriate circumstances	Para. 8.7
Bidwells	Public art can only be sought where there is an issue to be mitigated against. It should not be a tick box exercise. For example a commercial extension of more than 1,000m ² gross floor area that is completely hidden from public view should not be required to provide public art as there would be no visual harm to be mitigated against through a piece of public art. The criteria should be more appreciative of site specific circumstances and not be an instant reaction to require public art.	Under the policy all major development is expected to contribute to public art. This is in mitigation of the direct and wider impacts. Where it is deemed inappropriate to provide art work on site, for whatever reason, the Council will consider a commuted sum towards the PAIF	Section 8
Cambridge Regional College	Smaller developers should consider include public art within their scheme as a means of enhancing the quality of their development.	Agreed in appropriate circumstances	Para. 8.7
Commissions East	The criteria fine. The Council should commission public art as part of its own developments. This is covered in the Public Art Policy: 'the Council should promote best practice in public art commissioning and demonstrate this in its own developments'	Agree, policies set out apply to City development	Section 8
Countryside Properties	Public art can only be sought where there is an issue to be mitigated against. It should not be a tick box exercise. For example a commercial extension of more than 1,000m ² gross floor	See Bidwells above	

Issue 5		What Development Should Provide Public Art?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	area that is completely hidden from public view should not be required to provide public art as there would be no visual harm to be mitigated against through a piece of public art. The criteria should be more appreciative of site specific circumstances and not be an instant reaction to require public art.		
Kettle's Yard	The questions of excellence and accessibility arise. If the budget is too small and if appropriate expertise not available, a contribution to the central fund is more appropriate. Likewise if site is not accessible.	Agreed	Section 8
Marshall	The suggested criteria seem reasonable.	Agreed	Section 8
Mole Architects	More emphasis given to health environments	Agreed	Paras 7.6 & 7.7
Turnstone Estates	All developments should provide it. Public art need not be big and expensive. On small developments, it can be minor. Pooling of s106 money from smaller developments should be considered.	Agreed in appropriate circumstances Agreed	Para. 8.7 Section 8
Cambridge Artist 1	Developers of smaller schemes should do their utmost to enhance and make sustainable the inherent quality of the development. And if there is a widow's mite left over, that may be applied (with their agreement) to one of the city-wide or just-off site strategies.	Agreed in appropriate circumstances	Para. 8.7
Individual 1	Developers should be allowed to gift the money to other cultural projects. Supports the theatres concerts galleries museums if they wish.	Disagree, contribution for public art must principally be for accessible public works that contribute to place making	Section 3
Individual 2	To include acquisition of land / property for development / profit by major businesses -- i.e. Tesco's on Mill Road and re-development of Station Road area by large businesses. Must designate certain amount of profits to be given back to Public Art funding initiatives - centrally administered by council.	Disagree. This sounds like a tax on development, which the S106 approach to public art is not – it is essentially a payment to mitigate impacts.	Section 5
Cambridge Artist 2	Concerned about the piecemeal approach that this strategy implies, developers not necessarily experienced in (or interested in) commissioning public art. Suggest that unless developers demonstrate a real passion for the inclusion of a public art within their project then a per cent for art approach contributing to a public Initiatives Fund would be a more useful way of generating	Disagree. The SPD aims at getting amore coherent approach and the principle of S106 is that the work should be on site to mitigate direct impacts. The Council will be working with developers to cultivate	Section 8

Issue 5		What Development Should Provide Public Art?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	funds for a genuinely creative and coherent city wide public art programme of commissioning and projects.	a more proactive approach. In certain circumstances contributions to the PAIF will be required.	
Cambridge Resident 1	Suggest residential development of 10 or more dwellings a bit small.	Disagree, will have an impact and can contribute to the PAIF	Section 8
Individual 3	Current criteria about right.	Noted	Section 8
Cambridge Resident 2	Wherever development has enough funds to achieve excellence, otherwise a contribution could be made to a public fund.	Agreed	Section 8
Anon 1	Current criteria OK	Noted	Section 8
Anon 2	Mostly big developments & smaller developments with visual impact.	Agreed	Section 8
Anon 3	No good reason to exclude 'new-build' development costing half a million pounds or more.	Agreed	Section 8
Anon 4	The existing Public Art SPG is about right.	The SPD provides an update	Section 8
Anon 5	No comment	Noted	

Issue 6		When Should On-Site and Off-Site Contributions be Required?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Addenbrooke's	Whilst the Trust supports the opportunity of splitting funding between the development on and off site in some circumstances, the option as presented in the Issue paper seems to be inflexible and essentially the wrong approach. Encourage organisations to prepare a public art strategy. The option of splitting the art allocation could be reserved for those organisations that do not have an art strategy or a clearly defined approach to public art.	The proposal for split contributions has been dropped.	Section 8
Anglia Ruskin	This issue brings into question a couple of areas. First is that without a larger strategic vision it is difficult for developers to see how their contributions can assist with developing that – as a consequence a £15,000 budget may seem limited to developing 'art furniture'. Second, the lack of anyone with public art	The SPD is intended to provide this vision and may be backed up by a more specified Public Art Framework at a subsequent stage. The Council is planning to work with	Section 8

Issue 6		When Should On-Site and Off-Site Contributions be Required?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	<p>experience who can guide the developer as planning stage. We don't have any resistance to contributions being commuted to the PAIF, it would be more helpful to suggest other ways smaller amounts could contribute to the City.</p> <p>In terms of developing the PAIF, then yes a mandatory split (perhaps even higher than 75/25?) could be a great idea. This would be supported but again it would come back to how that money was spent and where was the decision being made.</p>	<p>developers to encourage a commitment to public art.</p> <p>The proposal for split contributions has been dropped.</p>	
Arts Council	None	Noted	
Bidwells	<p>The 1% construction value for public art needs to be revisited. This percentage is not in the adopted Local Plan and cannot simply be a detail rolled forward to the new SPD without further assessment. The 1% creates a very large financial amount and can create a perverse relationship between quality of development and amount of public art required, for example, the more one spends on the quality, design and materials of the development then the greater in real terms the 1% contribution will be and therefore the perverse situation arises that more public art is required to mitigate against a more attractive development. Also the Code for Sustainable Homes will in time make the construction of dwellings much more expensive than the current situation. This in real terms will create a much larger 1% contribution at a time when the viability of many residential schemes is already under pressure. With the rising costs of construction the 1% requirement will be applied as a tax without consideration of the case in hand and the consideration of necessary mitigation.</p> <p>Off site public art can only be provided in those situations where the off site location is still reasonably related to the development in hand.</p>	The requirement is built on existing policy and is fully justified. The 1% approach is widely accepted as being reasonable and cannot be varied arbitrarily depending on how other externally driven cost factors affect construction costs. However, the Council recognises that there is scope for negotiation in the case of large developments.	Sections 5 & 8
Cambridge Regional College	The benefits of public art should be spread across the City and major developments should be required to contribute to a fund as well as seeking donations from the private sector on a continuous basis.	The SPD seeks to achieve this and contributions from major development will be felt citywide. DC Guidance 3 will provide funding	Section 8

Issue 6		When Should On-Site and Off-Site Contributions be Required?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
		for projects across the city.	
Commissions East	<p>Not certain that I agree with this. Developers should have the potential to spend 100% of their contribution on their sites. They could be encouraged to split it if this is not feasible or possible.</p> <p>£15,000 is quite low when you start to look at the ancillary costs. £20,000 would be better</p>	<p>The proposal for split contributions has been dropped.</p> <p>Agreed</p>	Para. 8.7
Countryside Properties	<p>The 1% construction value for public art needs to be revisited and it is considered that it should form part of this consultation on the new SPD. This percentage is not in the adopted Local Plan and cannot simply be a detail rolled forward to the new SPD without further assessment and consultation. The 1% creates a very substantial financial sum, particularly on large developments, which is often not justified. It can create a perverse relationship between quality of development and amount of public art required, for example, the more one spends on the quality, design and materials of the development then the greater in real terms the 1% contribution will be and therefore the perverse situation arises that more public art is required to mitigate against a more attractive development. Also the Code for Sustainable Homes will in time make the construction of dwellings much more expensive than the current situation. This in real terms will create a much larger 1% contribution at a time when the viability of many residential schemes is already under pressure. With the rising costs of construction the 1% requirement will be applied as a tax without consideration of the case in hand and the consideration of necessary mitigation.</p> <p>It is not accepted that a sum of £15,000 could never produce high quality work. Again, it depends upon the site.</p> <p>It is strongly considered that there is not a case for a 75/25 split between on site art works and any Fund. The entire public art contribution should be used on site only, except in rare cases where an off-site location is justifiable for certain reasons; any</p>	<p>The requirement is built on existing policy and is fully justified. The 1% approach is widely accepted as being reasonable and cannot be varied arbitrarily depending on how other externally driven cost factors affect construction costs. However, the Council recognises that there is scope for negotiation in the case of large developments.</p> <p>Agree there may be exceptions.</p> <p>The proposal for split contributions has been dropped.</p>	<p>Section 8</p> <p>Para.8.7</p>

Issue 6		When Should On-Site and Off-Site Contributions be Required?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	such location must be very closely related either physically or functionally to the development in question and .		
Kettle's Yard	The threshold could be raised to £20-25,000. There could be a presumption of a 75/25 split which could be waived for an exceptional scheme.	Agreed The proposal for split contributions has been dropped.	Para. 8.7
Marshall	Presumably the reference to value is a reference to commissioning costs. On that basis the threshold seems reasonable.	Covers commissioning, fabrication, installation, project management and maintenance. Noted	Para. 8.8
Marshall	The seeking and use of contributions secured by way of planning applications is the subject of advice in circular 05/2005. The suggestion that, having required a contribution, that part of that contribution might be put in the fund to be spent elsewhere in the city sits very uncomfortably indeed against the advice. For example, it could be said that funding public art in the north of the city, using monies from development in the south of the city, is not reasonably related to the southern development.	There are 7 points to be made here: 1. the application of this circular is intended to contribute to the wider planning objectives of delivering sustainable communities; 2. providing for public art is part of the approved development plan and it yields the benefits set out in the SPD; 3. the impact of any development will extend beyond the individual site, may be felt citywide and should be ameliorated; 4. it is important to use public art contributions effectively and efficiently, which may be difficult to achieve with small contributions; 5. use of contributions in the way is in the spirit of pooling set out in the Circular; 6. the City Council will seek to ensure that arrangements of this kind are negotiated	Section 8

Issue 6		When Should On-Site and Off-Site Contributions be Required?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
		amicably with the developer; and 7. in the use of the PAIF the Council will take into account the proximity of projects to the S106 generating developments that are funding them.	
Mole Architects	Why does art have to be expensive? Depends on the type of project and the place, smaller works can be effective – sometimes more than huge sculptures at getting people to think about the city in a new way, or to recognize their connections to it.	Agree there may be exceptions.	Para. 8.7
Turnstone Estates	Wherever practical, contributions should be on (or related to) the contributory site. Pooling contributions from small sites may be considered.	Agreed	Section 8
Cambridge Artist 1	Agreed in principle; 25% to the PAIF may serve as a curb on large metallic objects, e.g. on East Road. Nothing to stop the Council adding its own enhancement to the development. Or a small and perfect artwork on site, and the balance to PAIF.	The proposal for split contributions has been dropped. Council does not have funds to top up budgets, though external funding may be sought	Sections 8 & 10
Individual 1	Build up fund sound good. Onsite split should be negotiable.	The proposal for split contributions has been dropped. But PAIF can still be built up	Section 8
Cambridge Artist 2	Would reverse the ratio 25% onsite 75% PAIF but with a commitment to the Initiatives Fund supporting projects developed for the specific contexts of major developments that have contributed.	The proposal for split contributions has been dropped.	Section 8
Cambridge Resident 1	Again this seems quite a low threshold.	Agreed	Para. 8.7
Individual 2	Remove control of how the 1 per cent of art is spent by large corporations to control of committee run by artists, educators, trustees with an informed interest and who can advise at all stages of development on potential for projects - so some events or works might come into existence during the development.	Disagree, lead should remain with enlightened developers working with Council and specialist advisors; aim is at achieve active engagement	Section 8 & Appendix 2

Issue 6		When Should On-Site and Off-Site Contributions be Required?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Individual 3	No views	Noted	
Cambridge Resident 2	Threshold of £15,000 probably not high enough The 75/5 split could be reconsidered where a really high quality & expensive scheme possible.	Agreed The proposal for split contributions has been dropped.	Para. 8.7
Anon 1	Preferably on site – not commuted sum.	The proposal for split contributions has been dropped.	
Anon 1	The 75/25 split a good idea, to provide a PA Initiatives Fund.	The proposal for split contributions has been dropped.	
Anon 2	On site in cases of conspicuous developments. Off site in cases where artistic involvement/intervention would be irrelevant	Agreed	Section 8
Anon 3	Public art policy should comprise 'major' works and 'attached' ones. All development funds must contribute to major ones with the balance deployed on on-site schemes.	Agree need both. The proposal for split contributions has been dropped.	Section 8
Anon 4	The policy is about right, although the £15,000 could be raised.	Agreed	Para. 8.7
Anon 5	No comment.	Noted	

Issues 7		When Should Public Art be Built Into the Planning and Development Process and the Artist Commissioned?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Addenbrooke's	The Trust recognises that public art spending can yield much better results if artists are involved early in the development process. However, the approach implied by the issues paper is very inflexible, artists may not wish to be involved in lengthy design processes and the organisation's art strategy may call for an approach that has art within a predetermined space. More appropriate to encourage organisations to demonstrate a strategic approach.	Agree, and recognise that flexibility is required	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4
Anglia Ruskin	Yes we believe so, although again this prioritises some art forms.	Agreed	Section 7,

Issues 7		When Should Public Art be Built Into the Planning and Development Process and the Artist Commissioned?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	However, it is reasonable to request that an artistic consultant or commissioning body be engaged with the process.		para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4
Arts Council	The artist should be involved from the outset of the planning development process. This represents best practice.	Agree importance of early involvement	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4
Bidwells	Planning is becoming more and more frontloaded with greater financial input required from a developer at the early stages well before the time that any planning permission could be granted. The requirement of an artist too early in the design process will add greater financial burden and risk to a developer and could prevent even more development coming forward through the planning system due to the increasing financial risks now involved. There must be a compromise position such that a lead artist is not required at the early stages of a design concept but rather later when a detailed design is being considered.	Agree, and recognise that flexibility is required	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4
Cambridge Regional College	Public art should be built into the planning and development process and the artist commissioned at the outset of the development.	Agree importance of early involvement	Section 7, para. 8.9
Commissions East	As early as possible, however need to be realistic about when this is appropriate. Little benefit in having an artist involved in all sorts of pre planning issues that bear no relevance to potential opportunities.	Agree importance of early involvement	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4
Countryside Properties	Planning is becoming more and more frontloaded with greater financial input required from a developer at the early stages well before the time that any planning permission could be granted. The requirement of an artist too early in the design process will add greater financial burden and risk to a developer and could prevent even more development coming forward through the planning system due to the increasing financial risks now involved. There must be a compromise position such that a lead artist is not required at the early stages of a design concept but rather later	See Bidwells above	

Issues 7		When Should Public Art be Built Into the Planning and Development Process and the Artist Commissioned?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	when a detailed design is being considered.		
Kettle's Yard	Not always practical to have the artist in place at the beginning but, in absence of an artist, planning officers should be assured that there is sufficient expertise to ensure that the art element of the development will be dealt with satisfactorily from the outset. Where artist is in place from the start, officers should be satisfied of his/her quality and not await a final proposal.	Agreed	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4
Marshall	On larger schemes a development of a public arts strategy will be more effectively achieved by consideration from the outset. Care needed in the selection of those who are to inform if not achieve the public art strategy. Whilst the word artist is probably unavoidable it can embrace a wide range of individuals from talentless to talented.	Agreed	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4
Mole Architects	Again always context related is important	Agreed	Section 6
Turnstone Estates	Art should be a planning consideration but not one that becomes over-dominant or burdening in an already burdened process.	Agreed	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4
Cambridge Artist 1	Off-the-peg versus site specific and 'lived-with': in most cases, it will be best and most creative to have the artist or craftsman in on the earliest discussions. The options will be broadened – as they are when a landscape consultant is employed from the start.	Agreed	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4
Individual 1	As early as possible. Yes	Agreed importance of early involvement	Section 7, para. 8.9,
Cambridge Artist 2	Bring artists in to develop a vision in conversation with planners and developers; retain their involvement throughout the process – including public consultation, commissioning and installation/delivery.	Agreed	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4
Cambridge Resident 1	As early as possible. The commissioning process should start. Would it be possible to start a loan scheme too for a few open sites?	Agree importance of early involvement Disagree, not consistent with the principle of site specific work	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4

Issues 7		When Should Public Art be Built Into the Planning and Development Process and the Artist Commissioned?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Individual 2	As above	See above	
Individual 3	The best public art, and the best development, is achieved by having the artist engaged in process from the outset. It is reasonable for the Council to require this of all developments.	Agree importance of early involvement	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4
Cambridge Resident 2	The involvement of an artist as early as possible is vital, but there must be a system in place to judge the appropriateness, quality of artist's proposal before go ahead given.	Agree importance of early involvement	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4
Anon 1	From the earliest stage of the planning process – a firm proposal should be an integral part of the planning application, not an afterthought	Agree importance of early involvement	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4
Anon 2	As early as possible. Certainly before building commences.	Agree importance of early involvement	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4
Anon 3	Initial ideas should be a part of the outline. They should be worked up at reserved matters stage. They should be constructed as early as possible.	Agree importance of early involvement	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4
Anon 4	Yes, if this is practical and would not hold up development to appoint the artist	Agree importance of early involvement	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4
Anon 5	The starting point would be to include it from the outset since it will often require design features in the building to accommodate it and/or make it accessible.	Agree importance of early engagement	Section 7, para. 8.9, Appendices 2 & 4

Issue 8		What Other Funding Could be Used to Support Public Art?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Addenbrooke's	<p>The Trust supports the idea that the City Council funding should be made available for increasing the investment in art within the City area.</p> <p>In discussion with City Officers, the Trust was advised that there was a draft of an Art SPG for the S Fringe. It was explained that this included a proposal that Arts Council or other grant funding should be excluded from the Percent for Art calculations. This approach discourages approaches to alternative funding sources and should not be included in any future Supplementary Planning Documents.</p>	<p>Agreed, however, in a climate of great financial stringency the Council has to consider carefully its priorities for spending and this is likely to limit the scope for civic contributions.</p> <p>Disagree. The %4Art contribution is a specific policy requirement and other funding must not be used as a way of avoiding this commitment. On the contrary the S106 money should be used a match funding to lever in additional money from others sources.</p>	Paras 7.10-7.11, 10.7-10.8
Anglia Ruskin	<p>Yes, it is reasonable to explore using environmental improvement monies to explore public art – especially in terms of street furniture or open space / park areas.</p> <p>It may also be possible to look at EU Funding to develop public art funds or funding programmes.</p>	<p>Disagree. This is not public art and should be covered by the Environmental Improvements Programme and highways maintenance budgets.</p> <p>Agreed</p>	Section 10
Arts Council	Public art should be considered within wider council budgets and supported by them. They should be considered within the economic development, town centre improvements and city centre management budgets.	Agreed, however, in a climate of great financial stringency the Council has to consider carefully its priorities for spending and this is likely to limit the scope for civic contributions.	Section 10
Bidwells	The Council must take a more proactive and stronger role in the provision of general public art within the City. The current framework through development led public art places the overriding onus on the developer to provide public art and therefore is seen to be undertaking the role of the local council in providing public art throughout the City. If public art is indeed a	Agreed, however, in a climate of great financial stringency the Council has to consider carefully its priorities for spending and this is likely to limit the scope for civic contributions.	Section 10

Issue 8	What Other Funding Could be Used to Support Public Art?		
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	necessary element of life in the City then the Council must make sufficient public art provision themselves.		
Cambridge Regional College	Same comment in Issue 6.	See above	See above
Commissions East	There are increasingly limited sources of additional funding. Having said this there are opportunities for match funding on public building projects from the Arts Council, and Trusts and Foundations.	Agreed	Section 10
Countryside Properties	The Council must take a more proactive and stronger role in the provision of general public art within the City. The current framework through development led public art places the overriding onus on the developer to provide public art and therefore is seen to be undertaking the role of the local council in providing public art throughout the City. If public art is indeed a necessary element of life in the City then the Council must make sufficient public art provision themselves.	See Bidwells above	
Kettle's Yard	There could be external sources of funding, including the Arts Council, particularly if the scheme is sufficiently ambitious. The central fund could be developed to the point where several projects could be commissioned simultaneously, hence having the impetus of an exhibition such as that in Folkestone this year.	Agreed	Section 10
Marshall	There is a continuing role for some public art to be civically funded. There should be a civic fund, however modest, ring fenced to secure works of public art, ideally on an annual basis	Agreed, however, in a climate of great financial stringency the Council has to consider carefully its priorities for spending and this is likely to limit the scope for civic contributions.	Section 10
Mole Architects	If the artwork crosses into other environmental benefits than surely some of this money can be diverted. Might be good to make this information more readily available to artists.	Agreed	Section 10
Turnstone Estates	The need for art goes well beyond the need to improve new developments. It is a function the Council should embrace from far wider than s.106 monies.	Agreed, however, in a climate of great financial stringency the Council has to consider carefully its priorities for spending and this is likely to limit the scope for civic	Section 10

Issue 8		What Other Funding Could be Used to Support Public Art?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
		contributions.	
Cambridge Artist 1 Individual 1	I can't comment, except to argue for flexibility. How much is there already? There must be quite a lot considering development around Cambridge?	Agreed Agreed there is potentially a lot from development and Cambridge well placed to bid into other sources	Section 10 Section 10
Cambridge Artist 2	Public Art can contribute to the aims and objectives of funds such as environmental improvement, community development, road safety, tackling anti-social behaviour, youth work etc.: budgets for these areas could (and should) be approached to support the development of a public art project that serves a related remit. Other funds would be Arts Council, business sponsorship and National Lottery awards.	Agreed, however, in a climate of great financial stringency the Council has to consider carefully its priorities for spending and this is likely to limit the scope for civic contributions. Agreed	Section 10 Section 10
Cambridge Resident 1	Local and national charitable money and in Cambridge contributions from local enterprises. Sponsored roundabout scheme seems to work well. There are issues here about transport and maintenance. Where would this fit in? Prize winning pieces from local art schools.	Agreed Agreed Possibly, but may not be consistent with the principle of site specific work	Section 10 Para. 8.8 Section 9
Individual 2	Should some of the money available for the programme of environmental improvements in the City be used to complement other initiatives to provide public art? What priority should be given to using other Council money to support public art? If appropriate: High	Disagree, money not available for public art unless improvement schemes include public art proposals In a climate of great financial stringency the Council has to consider carefully its priorities for spending and this is likely to limit the scope for civic contributions.	Section 10

Issue 8		What Other Funding Could be Used to Support Public Art?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Individual 3	Section 106 money.	Agreed	Section 10
Cambridge Resident 2	Other external sources could be sought if necessary, e.g. Arts Council	Agreed	Section 10
Anon 1	Do not use the Environmental Improvement funds for PA – unless an Area Committee specifically wishes to do so.	Agree, money not available for public art unless improvement schemes include public art proposals	Section 10
Anon 2	Sponsors, benefactors, charitable foundations	Agreed	Section 10
Anon 3	A tourist levy on hotel rooms and out of term college visitor income.	Disagree. 1. There is no link between public art and this form of revenue 2. The Council has no powers to make such a levy	
Anon 4	Lottery grant?	Agreed	Section 10
Anon 5	Not appropriate to spend Environmental Improvement Money on public art, however, that would not preclude joint funding where art is incorporated into environmental improvements projects or an area is improved at the same time that public art is installed.	Agree, money not available for public art unless improvement schemes include public art proposals	Section 10

Issue 9		How Could the Public and Stakeholders Engage in the Public Art Processes?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Addenbrooke's	<p>Consultation is a crucial part of the process. It is important that the process includes careful consideration about who the stakeholders are, consults with them and then listens to the views they express. Good artists and public art providers will engage effectively with local communities.</p> <p>It will be important that if any guidance is to be given in the SPD on the matter of engaging stakeholders, that this guidance is not</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4 cover these points

Issue 9		How Could the Public and Stakeholders Engage in the Public Art Processes?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	<p>prescriptive but will be responsive to the type of development being proposed.</p> <p>Hospitals are generally effective at communicating with the public and have an obligation to listen to the views of the public. In order to provide a focal point for patients, visitors and staff the Trust has in place a Patient Advice and Liaison Service - these organisations are well placed to effectively utilise public art spending and engage stakeholders in art processes.</p>	Agreed	
Anglia Ruskin	<p>A very problematic area as opinions are so often very diverse and based on experience with art forms, artists and areas. It is important that the wider public feel a sense of involvement with any vision or strategy which is created, and its implementation. This might be done through open voting through media for schemes or plans, more education and arts participation activities to foster an interest, appreciation and involvement. However, sometimes to create and deliver a vision it requires a decision to be made by an informed smaller group to ensure clarity of vision and purpose.</p>	Agreed. Means of engagement will vary from scheme to scheme depending on location, form and content.	Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4
Arts Council	<p>The public, stakeholders and a range of professions could work collaboratively along with the artist to develop the idea.</p> <p>Public arts create a dialogue which can inspire, challenge and influence and is a great way of initiating public engagement with the arts.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4 cover these points
Bidwells	<p>This will have to be considered on a case by case scenario. When required, it appears that the types of consultation involved in the development control process by the applicant and Council could be extended in some fashion, whether that be informal, to include the public art process.</p>	Agreed, the standard CD process will have to be modified to suit the particular requirements of public art.	Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4 c
Cambridge Regional College	<p>The public and stakeholders should be actively involved in the process of funding and obtaining public art as well as being actively involved in the locations thereof.</p>	Agreed	Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4 c

Issue 9		How Could the Public and Stakeholders Engage in the Public Art Processes?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Commissions East	Through workshops, schools projects, project management and consultation processes and through participating in the art work. This should be undertaken as widely as possible.	Agreed	Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4 c
Countryside Properties	This will have to be considered on a case by case scenario. When required, it appears that the types of consultation involved in the development control process by the applicant and Council could be extended in some fashion, whether that be formal or informal, to include the public art process.	See Bidwells above	
Kettle's Yard	Art shouldn't be designed by committee. Some artists whose methods actively involve the public, others work privately. Once an artist chosen and a scheme developed, means should be found to introduce them to the public, e.g. a presentation by the artist and the development of educational projects pre- and post-installation.	Agreed. Means of engagement will vary from scheme to scheme depending on location, form and content.	Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4
Marshall	The appreciation of public art is an individual experience. Engaging the public and stakeholders, if it has a role, should be very marginal. The camel is a horse designed by a committee.	Disagree. It is important to establish public ownership of public art, even if it is challenging, and the public engagement needs to be more than marginal and may be central. Agree that art cannot be <i>designed</i> by committee.	Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4
Mole Architects	Important to allocate enough resources in terms of time for the artist – instead of always focusing on the end product.	Agreed	Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4
Turnstone Estates	Art should be accessible to the public, but that does not mean the public should choose it. Art by committee can be truly awful.	It is important to establish public ownership of public art, even if it is challenging, and the public engagement needs to be more than marginal and may be central. Agree that art cannot be <i>designed</i> by committee.	Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4
Cambridge Artist 1	Again, I'll keep my head down, and nod my head.	Noted	
Individual 1	Definitely need more involvement. Inform residents' associations, art associations, friends of galleries. For example, just heard there is to be a sculpture of Steven Hawking in our street. None of residents know about it.	Agreed	Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4

Issue 9		How Could the Public and Stakeholders Engage in the Public Art Processes?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Cambridge Artist 2	<p>Art that seeks to please everyone is unlikely to be good art. Art cannot be created by committee. Controversy, differences of opinion, points of view and taste are inevitable and therefore to be embraced a part of the process of creating public art.</p> <p>This is not to say that art “should” impose itself without consultation and involvement. The key to successful public and stakeholder relationships is creating opportunities for involvement and contribution throughout, to enabling the artist to thoroughly research and respond to the context and its issues before developing a proposal and supporting the artist in the process of communicating and realising their vision.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4 cover these points</p>
Cambridge Resident 1	<p>Open competitions and voting system - Overseen by council committee with professional advice.</p> <p>Local media</p> <p>Community Art projects in local parks etc.</p>	<p>Is a possible approach; further work needed, e.g. through Public Art Action Plan and public art framework</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4</p> <p>Section 7</p>
Individual 2	<p>Involve artists / writers with knowledge of current debates in public art to advise and to involve the public in debate around how to design projects and initiatives.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4</p>
Individual 3	<p>Art, public or otherwise, is not something that should be imposed on people. Public art will be appreciated and fulfil its objectives most effectively if the public and stakeholders are engaged in its planning, design and implementation. However, there has to be a overarching sense of what works for a particular environment and what does not.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4</p>
Cambridge Resident 1	<p>Depends on what chosen artist wants & on nature of the artist’s approach to creating an art work.</p>	<p>Agreed. Means of engagement will vary from scheme to scheme depending on location, form and</p>	<p>Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4</p>

Issue 9		How Could the Public and Stakeholders Engage in the Public Art Processes?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
		content.	
Anon 1	As a normal part of the consultation process for a planning application.	The standard CD process will have to be modified to suit the particular requirements of public art.	Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4
Anon 2	By suggesting sites. By involvement in the selection of artists and craftspeople	Agreed Means of engagement will vary from scheme to scheme depending on location, form and content.	Section 9, Appendices 2 & 4
Anon 3	A series of talks, lectures, events should highlight the general issue of public art – beyond that a panel of advisors like the Conservation and Design Panel.	Agreed	Section 9
Anon 4	Always try and engage stakeholders	Agreed	Section 9
Anon 5	No comment	Noted	

Issue 10		How is Specialist Advice Built Into Providing Public Art?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Addenbrooke's	The crucial role for any such body is to oversee PROCESS not OUTCOMES. A Steering Group is not there to say what it likes, but simply to ensure that the commissioner of the public art is carefully following an effective process. If a correct process is followed, then the art should be able to look after itself. By ensuring the process is observed, a Public Art Steering Group would fulfil a very effective function without getting involved in matters of taste. Key commissioners of public art around the City should be involved in this process to encourage joined up thinking - the Addenbrooke's Arts Co-ordinator to be co-opted onto the Council's Public Art Steering Group.	Agreed Composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be agreed	Section 9 Para. 9.6
Anglia Ruskin	Raises the issue of having a clear vision which can be proactively	Agreed	Section 9

Issue 10	How is Specialist Advice Built Into Providing Public Art?		
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	<p>promoted to developers in advance of the planning process. Specialist advisors can then coordinate vision and assist developers with their plans and ideas.</p> <p>The Public Art Steering Group can provide a vital tool for interrogation and vetting of ideas to ensure that developers are clear in their commitment and intention. It is also a good way to ensure that public art is not just an extension of the development.</p> <p>I think it is important that the composition of the team reflect a diverse range of interest from within the artistic spectrum but embrace all forms and kinds of artistic work.</p>	<p>Agreed in principle</p> <p>Agreed</p>	covers these points
Arts Council	A public art steering group should be continued and continually refreshed alongside the expertise of the public art commissioning agency, this will in turn push excellence and innovation. The steering group should include artists, architects and arts organisations.	Composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be agreed	Para 9.6
Bidwells	One must be careful not to have too many individuals and bodies inputting into the public art process as this would inevitably slow the process down and may also water down the public art product. The Steering Group should act as a quality control panel and not to impose ideas but rather ensure outcome.	Composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be agreed	Para 9.6
Cambridge Regional College	The Public Art Steering group should be actively involved in giving advice to the public and developers and be a major payer in the funding process.	Composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be agreed	Para 9.6
Commissions East	<p>Specialist advice is crucial to the success of all projects. Public Art can, and often is a complex process involving both the lives of people and considerable sums of money.</p> <p>A key improvement that one could make to the PASG would be to reduce its membership, make sure that it is consulted on all schemes, and ensure that it is a dynamic group committed to making things happen. This would inevitably mean that it would need to have specialist knowledge in public art and related areas.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be agreed</p>	<p>Section 9</p> <p>Para. 9.6</p>

Issue 10	How is Specialist Advice Built Into Providing Public Art?		
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	Member representation is also critical.		
Countryside Properties	One must be careful not to have too many individuals and bodies inputting into the public art process as this would inevitably slow the process down and may also water down the public art product. The Steering Group should act as a quality control panel and not to impose ideas but rather ensure outcome. It should be recognised that certain developers have considerable experience of delivering high quality public art and they must be an integral part of the process.	Agreed. Composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be agreed	Section 9
Kettle's Yard	Advice needs to be well-informed, effective and seen to have authority. High profile artists or curators could be invited to serve as advisors on applications and/or curators of a public art programme – they would need to be paid. They could work in association with a suitably qualified local advisory group. There then needs to be a specialist officer and/or a pool of advisors who could be attached to particular developments, paid for by the developer if there is insufficient internal expertise. They could take the approach of identifying artists whose work they would like to see represented in Cambridge and then matching site to artist – i.e. applying quality control at the outset.	Agreed in principle, composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be agreed	Section 9
Marshall	Whilst there may be a role for specialist advisers, the City Council would be well advised to appoint the equivalent of a public art champion, who should be a councillor with an informed interest in public art. Steering groups ought to be avoided.	Disagree: risk is that a champion become too closely associated with a particular approach; will be part of the remit of the Design Champion Composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be agreed	Para. 7.11 Para. 9.6
Mole Architects	Public Arts Steering group is important and key to ensuring that appropriate projects are selected and encouraged. Should involve artist curators architects from Cambridge, but also maybe from other cities if possible - people with a broad range of public art experience.	Agreed, composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be agreed	Para. 9.6
Turnstone Estates	The Public Art Steering group should be used, as should Commissioning Agents and other arts “professionals”. But it is	Agreed, composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be	Para. 9.6

Issue 10	How is Specialist Advice Built Into Providing Public Art?		
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	subjective and any advisory groupings should be small.	agreed	
Cambridge Artist 1	These are the right questions to be asking. Enhance the role of the PASG so that it can, like the Design and Conservation Panel, report effectively to the Planning Committee.	Agreed, composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be agreed	Para. 9.6
Individual 1	Subjective and Objective experience needed. Steering group could have artists, curators, collectors, dealers, architects, urban landscape and gardeners on it As well as stakeholders. Case histories scrutinised. Good projects and less good projects recorded.	Agreed, composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be agreed Agreed	Para. 9.6 Section 11
Cambridge Artist 2	Need a proactive approach with a dedicated team well equipped to develop a coherent city wide strategy a programme of public art projects of different scales and time spans - what is needed is a curatorial vision.	Staff resourcing to be agreed. SPD endorses curatorial approaches	Para. 10.2 and Appendix 2
Cambridge Resident 1	Advisory committee to address quality issues. Representatives form art and gallery community. Also using SHAPE, Arts Council and Commissions East.	Agreed, composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be agreed Agreed	Para 9.6 Para 9.2
Individual 2	As above	See above	
Individual 3	Key arts professionals in the City such as the Directors of the Fitzwilliam and Kettle's Yard should be involved, as should local community residents.	Agreed, composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be agreed; residents to be engaged	Section 9
Cambridge Resident 2	Essential to have established well-known artists and/or curators to advise on choice of works generally and may be an individual or group attached specifically to an individual development.	Agreed, composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be agreed	Para 9.6
Anon 1	Do not think the Public Art Steering group has been very effective or even very active. It should be merely an advisory body, reporting to the Planning Committee.	Agreed, composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be agreed	Para. 9.6
Anon 2	Through Commissions East and the Public art Committee/Panel of experts	Agreed, composition and Terms of Reference of Public Art Panel to be agreed	Paras 9.2 & 9.6
Anon 3	See Issue 9	See above	
Anon 4	I would like to hear the views of the Public Art Steering Group on	Noted	

Issue 10		How is Specialist Advice Built Into Providing Public Art?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	this question before I make any comments.		
Anon 5	No comment	Noted	

Issue 11		How Should the Public Art Programme be Managed?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Addenbrooke's	<p>If the Council sees public art as a priority and sets objectives that are to be met, this should be funded through the Council's own funding streams. Not appropriate for the commuted art contributions.</p> <p>Would a requirement for developers to self-report progress with art within a development be more practical, if it was not possible to expand the expertise and manpower devoted to public art within the planning team?</p> <p>Establishing a Public Art Unit seems unnecessarily complex and expensive for what is required in Cambridge.</p>	<p>S106 contributions will not be used to pay for core management; the matters to be covered are set out in the SPD</p> <p>This can be explored as apart of ongoing development of monitoring and developers will be required to evaluate projects at their conclusion.</p> <p>Agreed that this is not appropriate at this time</p>	<p>Paras 8.3-8.6 & DC Guidance 2</p> <p>Section 11</p>
Anglia Ruskin	<p>We have long discussed the need for a Public Art Officer within the Council to ensure that the planning officers receive support, to manage the contributions and the PAIF and also to liaise closely with the Council's Arts and Entertainment division.</p> <p>Project management can be included as part of larger art programmes and this should be embraced and encouraged by the Council. However, buying in project management can be a very costly basis and doesn't allow for continuity.</p>	<p>The Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art</p> <p>Management of individual projects should be funded from S106 contributions</p>	<p>Section 8 & Appendix 2</p>
Arts Council	<p>Public Art does need managing and section 106 money should be used for this. The approach to this should be looked at case by case as a formulaic approach would not work here.</p>	<p>Management of individual projects should be funded from S106 contributions</p>	<p>Section 8 & Appendix 2</p>

Issue 11	How Should the Public Art Programme be Managed?		
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Bidwells	A lot of Section 106 money for public art can be spent on consultants and peoples' time and there should be efforts to ensure that the monies are spent on the actual public art product itself. The funding of a Project Manager on a case by case scenario would not sit comfortably with Circular 05/05. It isn't clear why the Council would need to take such an active and large role in the process.	Management of individual projects should be funded from S106 contributions The Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art	Section 8 & Appendix 2
Cambridge Regional College	As per comment on Issue 10	See above	
Commissions East	I think that it would be useful to establish a public art unit. Regionally Essex County Council has a public art unit of three officers within Design and the Built Environment. The policy recommends that the Section 106 can be used to cover project management and consultation costs.	Agreed that this is not appropriate at this time. The Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art Management of individual projects should be funded from S106 contributions	Section 8 & Appendix 2
Countryside Properties	A lot of Section 106 money for public art can be spent on consultants and peoples' time and there should be efforts to ensure that the monies are spent on the actual public art product itself. The funding of a Project Manager on a case by case scenario would not sit comfortably with Circular 05/05. It isn't clear why the Council would need to take such an active and large role in the process. In any event on large strategic developments the Council requires developers to appoint public art consultants.	See Bidwells above Agreed	Section 8 & Appendix 2
Kettle's Yard	A Unit at this stage sounds expensive but there is a job for a specialist officer whose tasks would include the quest for additional sources of money as well as the practical management of projects, advice to developers, overseeing the welfare and conservation of works, and instigating educational and community work in connection with commissions.	The Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art	

Issue 11		How Should the Public Art Programme be Managed?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Marshall	The establishment of a public art unit seems unnecessarily grand, if not clumsy. It would be a shameful misuse of any funds collected if they were simply directed to funding a unit which consumed most of the resources and delivered very little by way of pleasurable public objects.	Agreed that this is not appropriate at this time. The Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art	
Mole Architects	Be careful here of adding too many layers of administration here – costing more money to no greater effect – the artist is in many cases perfectly capable of managing their work, although connections with local communities always helps – but not too heavy handed.	The Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art	
Turnstone Estates	The Council may consider offering a commissioning service to developers and other public arts providers. However, there are specialist commissioning agents that it might be more effective to use, e.g. Commissions East. The cost of this service to a developer should form part of any s.106 contribution.	Management of individual projects should be funded from S106 contributions; other agencies may be used	Section 8, Para. 9.2 & Appendix 2
Cambridge Artist 1	Shan't comment, except right questions. Management skills for large scale projects, e.g. CB1 and Addenbrooke's 2020?	Agree big projects do need management skills.	
Individual 1	There should be a limit on management costs. ? % of fund. But good project management is needed.	Management of individual projects should be funded from S106 contributions; other agencies may be used The Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art	Section 8 & Appendix 2
Cambridge Artist 2	See above – yes a Public Art Unit that isn't just about admin and delivery and bureaucracy but encourages experimentation and conversation, encouraging curatorial vision and involving artists, planners, community leaders etc in the development of a coherent strategy. Definitely, don't just buy in piecemeal project by project management – it's definitely acceptable to spend S106 money on project management but this must be part of an overall vision	Public Art Unit is not appropriate at this time. The Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art Management of individual projects should be funded from S106 contributions	Section 8 & Appendix 2

Issue 11		How Should the Public Art Programme be Managed?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	interlinked and interrelated with past, present and future projects and visions.		
Cambridge Resident 1	Public arts officer on payroll of City Council answerable to council committee.	The Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art	
Individual 2	A public Art Unit is a good idea -- as long as it is not controlled or co-opted by those who may have conflicts of interest in terms of business investments in existing sites earmarked for PA initiatives and it includes arts professionals and those familiar with current debates in art practice.	Public Art Unit is not appropriate at this time. The Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art	
Individual 3	There is a case for the Council to establish a Public Art Unit. It is acceptable to use some of the funding collected through S106 agreements to buy in project management skills on a project by project basis.	Public Art Unit is not appropriate at this time. The Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art Management of individual projects should be funded from S106 contributions	Section 8 & Appendix 2
Cambridge Resident 2	A permanent post handling all projects & setting up appropriate groups for each, helping fund raising, records, etc would help with continuity & quality.	The Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art	
Anon 1	Learn from best practice – such as Bristol City's LA.	Agreed, the Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art	
Anon 2	By the City Council with advice and control by experts in the field, e.g. Commissions East	Agreed, the Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art	Para 9.2
Anon 3	By a specially appointed 'public art' curator, whose salary was shared among a number of 'stakeholders'.	The Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art	
Anon 4	Is it possible we could be involved with other authorities and organisations with an interest in art and the city to manage the public art programme?	Agreed, but The Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art	Para. 9.2

Issue 11		How Should the Public Art Programme be Managed?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Anon 5	I believe that failure to manage significant projects will doom them to failure.	Agreed	Section 8 & Appendix 2

Issue 12		How Will Artworks be Maintained in Future?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Addenbrooke's	<p>At the point of commissioning, a lifespan should be set out for each major commission. The provider then has an obligation to maintain until this date and pay for decommissioning at the end if this is deemed appropriate.</p> <p>After this date, if the Council wants the work to be maintained, maintenance costs should be met by the Council.</p> <p>Maintenance and decommissioning costs should be included in the Percent for art calculations.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed, after 25 years or other agreed timescale</p> <p>Agreed</p>	Para. 8.3 covers these points
Anglia Ruskin	Legal advice should be sought on this as there are issues of commitment for both the artist and developer and this could potentially be a contentious area.	Agreed and advice sought	Section 8
Arts Council	It is important to ensure maintenance is included in the budget from the outset and this is considered when selection is made.	Agreed	Para. 8.8
Bidwells	On the whole it would seem unreasonable to request a developer to maintain a piece of public art for a period greater than 5 years. If it is on private land then the Council will have to have confidence in the public art agenda, that if the piece of public art has proved a success then it will very likely remain in situ beyond the 5 years.	Disagree, Council cannot afford to take on long term unfunded commitments in the public realm. On private land it is the responsibility of the developer, but the Council will still expect a commitment to long term maintenance, where needed.	Paras 8.3 & 8.8
Cambridge Regional College	As the Public Art Steering Group would have full details of funding, life span of works, whether works require maintenance or should	Agreed	Para. 8.8

Issue 12	How Will Artworks be Maintained in Future?		
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	be replaced, a decision can then be made or an action plan implemented.		
Commissions East	This should be through commuted agreements with the developer in private developments and through the public art initiatives fund on public developments.	Agreed	Para. 8.8
Countryside Properties	On the whole it would seem unreasonable to request a developer to maintain a piece of public art for a period greater than 5 years. If it is on private land then the Council will have to have confidence in the public art agenda, that if the piece of public art has proved a success then it will very likely remain in situ beyond the 5 years.	See Bidwells above	
Kettle's Yard	Maintenance should be a consideration from the outset if work is to be more or less permanent. Appropriate responsibilities should be built into contracts but beyond their term there will be a requirement for maintenance and conservation. It would be sensible to allocate a proportion of income – say 10% - as a maintenance fund to be drawn on as required. The % could be reviewed after a period and adjusted as necessary. There should also be a 'de-accessioning' policy to guard against the problems of works for which maintenance proves impossible.	Agreed Agree in principle, but premature to set a %	Paras *.3 & 8.8 Paras 8.3, 8.8 & 10.2
Marshall	Advice on maintenance payments is clearly set out in circular 05/2005. B19 provides this advice - as a general rule, however, when an asset is intended for wider public use, the cost of subsequent maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated with the developers contributions should normally be borne by the body of authority in which the asset is to be vested'.	Agree that this is what the Circular says. However, there is a longstanding commitment in Cambridge for developments to pay commuted maintenance costs for public facilities such as open space. This reflects the need for the facilities to continue to cater for the long term impacts of the development. The Council does not have alternative sources of funding to meet what would be significant new liabilities. The same principle must apply to public art.	Paras 8.3, 8.8 & 10.2
	So far as public art on private land is concerned the attitude and resources of the University and Colleges generally secure the	Agreed and noted	

Issue 12		How Will Artworks be Maintained in Future?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	wellbeing of works of art which are readily apparent to the public, albeit privately funded. One good example of this is the sculpture, which changes from time to time, at Churchill College readily viewable from Storeys Way.		
Mole Architects	If the council wants public art then it should take a role in maintaining it. However, If the art is well designed, appropriate and involved and engaged with various publics in its production, this should help its maintenance. This could also form part of the artists brief – the ongoing life/sustainability of the project.	Disagree, Council cannot afford to take on long term unfunded commitments in the public realm. On private land it is the responsibility of the developer, but the Council will still expect a commitment to long term maintenance, where needed.	Paras 8.3 & 8.8
Turnstone Estates	If in a public place, the Council should maintain the art as it does other public realm facilities.	Disagree, Council cannot afford to take on long term unfunded commitments in the public realm. On private land it is the responsibility of the developer, but the Council will still expect a commitment to long term maintenance, where needed.	Paras 8.3 & 8.8
Cambridge Artist 1	Ephemerality shouldn't be part of the deal; maintenance has to be built in or else you get erosion – sometimes to the point of meaninglessness, as in the case of the compass-hub paving feature (Quinn Hollick?) at the junction of Fitzroy & Burleigh Streets. I don't know when the S106 contributors should hand over to the City; but perhaps a management company (with other City services & products) could keep up with any perceived wear and tear; quinquennial surveys etc.	Agreed The Council is exploring how best existing resources can be used to manage public art	Paras 8.3 & 8.8
Individual 1	Maintenance or sinking fund should be set aside at the beginning- for cleaning and repairs grant. Who responsible. The owner- The City Council? Grants should be available to owners.	Agreed, maintenance important Council cannot afford to take on long term unfunded commitments in the public realm. On private land it	Paras 8.3 & 8.8 cover these points

Issue 12		How Will Artworks be Maintained in Future?	
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
		is the responsibility of the developer, but the Council will still expect a commitment to long term maintenance, where needed.	
Cambridge Artist 2	I'm not really qualified to comment on the budgetary issues implied by this question. Clearly artworks in public spaces will need to be maintained – unless the effect of the passage of time etc is part of the artwork's process and purpose. However there are times when even a permanent work is no longer relevant to its context or has "had its time". The onward life of a public art work will always be in part the responsibility of the artist who created it and its commissioner – so whilst its maintenance may transfer to depts with the practical skills to "maintain" – the involvement of a Public art group would be important.	Agreed	Paras 8.3 & 8.8
Cambridge Resident 1	This is difficult but essential. The original donation would have to have provision for this or a separate fund established. Commissioned work should be selected with robustness as one of the criteria.	Agreed	Paras 8.3 & 8.8
Individual 2	The economics of this should be fully costed for this at the time of its commission and could take a variety of forms. There is no reason why works which are designed to last forever should take priority over those which might involve more temporal interventions into public places and perhaps the subsequent setting up of digital networks / documentation of the work which might involve the public in another participatory level of inclusion. Documentation and maintenance should be considered from the outset and might take a variety of forms.	Agreed	Paras 8.3 & 8.8
Individual 3	Both the Council and the relevant freeholders should be responsible and any neglect should be rectifiable with legal action being a last resort.	Council cannot afford to take on long term unfunded commitments in the public realm. On private land it is the responsibility of the developer, but the Council will still expect a commitment to long term maintenance, where needed.	Paras 8.3 & 8.8
Cambridge Resident 2	Before finally agreeing to a work maintenance needs to be fully understood & agreed and the responsibility for this clearly	Agreed	Paras 8.3 & 8.8

Issue 12			
How Will Artworks be Maintained in Future?			
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	allocated and agreed.		
Anon 1	Some will remain in ownership of the developer/purchaser of the development. The Council to take responsibility for off-development site projects through S106	Agreed Council cannot afford to take on long term unfunded commitments in the public realm. On private land it is the responsibility of the developer, but the Council will still expect a commitment to long term maintenance, where needed.	Paras 8.3 & 8.8 cover these points
Anon 2	Each piece should be approved only when a maintenance provision is included. In some cases the developer/owners will be responsible.	Agreed	Paras 8.3 & 8.8
Anon 3	Out of a revenue fund accruing interest from non-expended capital fund	Interesting option requires further study	
Anon 4	Money could be set aside in a fund to be used for future art work maintenance.	Agreed	Paras 8.3, 8.8 & 10.2
Anon 5	If possible a sinking fund should be established with part of the S106 receipts. Quality <i>and</i> sustainability count far more than sheer quality.	Agreed, S106 money will contribute to maintenance	Paras 8.3, 8.8 & 10.2

Other Issues			
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Addenbrooke's	A significant proportion of the hospital is open to the "public" but, equally, access is restricted to some parts of the hospital, particularly patient treatment areas and in-patient wards etc. The Trust recognises the importance of providing art within its facilities and is well aware of the benefits that art provides for patients, visitors and staff. The Trust is committed to maximising the contribution that art can make in creating a genuinely healing environment for patients and improving the experience of all who	Noted Noted	

Other Issues			
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	<p>use the Addenbrooke's campus.</p> <p>The Trust has an active arts programme within the hospital that commissions and oversees site specific integrated works of art, a thriving visual arts programme as well as encouraging performing arts and participatory arts activities for patients and staff. The Trust employs two members of staff to co-ordinate the Trust Art programme to promote art within the premises and has plans to recruit a further member of staff to develop this programme further.</p> <p>The Trust is hoping to reach an agreement with your Council for more close co-operation and interaction between our organisations on matters of art and looks forward to reaching agreement on a more flexible approach to the provision of Percent for Art in new clinical developments promoted by the Trust.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>Paras 7.6. 7.6 & 8.4</p>
Arts Council	It is important to document and evaluate at each stage. There is also the need to build skills and capacity with artists, clients and professionals alike.	Agreed, underpins philosophy of whole SPD	
Bidwells	<p>There is an increasingly large overlap between public art and public realm payments which when taken together result in a considerable financial amount. A number of the reasons for seeking public art appear to be public realm rather than public art. Perhaps it is now time to amalgamate the two elements to prevent duplication and to create a clearer position from the Council; in particular off site public art provision duplicates very heavily with off site public realm contributions. There needs to be a much clearer rationale on why public art is needed for each case, why it requires 1% of the construction costs and why the public realm requirements require separate payments.</p> <p>Viability is becoming more and more crucial and the demands of Cambridge City Council are preventing, at times, development coming forward through the planning application process. The demands of public art, public realm, affordable housing, code for sustainable homes, renewable energy are becoming onerous and preventative to development. The Council needs to reconsider all</p>	<p>The SPD sets out clearly a rational for public art and distinguishes it from other public realm works.</p> <p>These pressures are understood, however, the SPD provides a case for public art to have a high priority. The requirement is built on existing policy and is fully justified. The 1% approach is widely accepted as</p>	Issues covered by SPD as a whole

Other Issues			
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	<p>these demands, ensure public art makes a much clearer and demonstrable case for 1% of the capital construction cost and be clear as to what necessary mitigation is being sought against the public art requirements.</p> <p>Also why every development is required to provide an equivalent to 1% no matter the site's circumstances, quality of development and visual impact or planning gain achieved to the general visual amenity of the area arising through the development. For example a redevelopment of an existing, tired and ugly building to something new and attractive would require significant financial investment by a developer but whilst it would be recognised that the development creates significant visual improvement to an area, public art would still be required by the council yet it isn't clear as to why this would be and what the Council would be seeking to mitigate against.</p> <p>Clarity is also required on what the Council considers to be capital construction costs in order for a clear understanding of what the 1% amount would be.</p>	<p>being reasonable and cannot be varied arbitrarily depending on how other externally driven cost factors affect construction costs. However, the Council recognises that there is scope for negotiation in the case of large developments.</p> <p>Capital construction cost, excluding land and revenue/process costs</p>	
CABE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design is now well established in planning policy at national and regional levels, and LDFs offer an opportunity to secure high- quality development, of the tight type, in the right place, at the right time. 2. Robust design policies should be included in all LDF documents and the Community Strategy, embedding design as a priority from strategic frameworks to site-specific scales. 3. To take aspiration to implementation, local planning authorities' officers and members should champion good design. 4. Treat design as a cross-cutting issue – consider how other policy areas relate to urban design, open space management, architectural quality, roads and highways, social infrastructure and the public realm. 5. Design should reflect understanding of local context, character and aspirations. 6. You should include adequate wording or 'hooks' within your policies that enable you to develop and use other design tools 	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Design generally helps to underpin the case for public art in the SPD. See Sections 3 & 6</p>

Other Issues			
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	and mechanisms, such as design guides, site briefs, and design codes.		
Countryside Properties	<p>There is an increasingly large overlap between public art and public realm payments which when taken together result in a considerable financial amount. A number of the reasons for seeking public art appear to be public realm rather than public art. Perhaps it is now time to amalgamate the two elements to prevent duplication and to create a clearer position from the Council; in particular off site public art provision (which is not supported in any event) duplicates very heavily with off site public realm contributions. There needs to be a much clearer rationale on why public art is needed for each case, why it requires 1% of the construction costs and why the public realm requirements require separate payments.</p> <p>Viability is becoming more and more crucial and the demands of Cambridge City Council are preventing, at times, development coming forward through the planning application process. The demands of public art, public realm, affordable housing, code for sustainable homes, renewable energy are becoming onerous and preventative to development. The Council needs to reconsider all these demands, ensure public art makes a much clearer and demonstrable case for 1% of the capital construction cost and be clear as to what necessary mitigation is being sought against the public art requirements.</p> <p>Also why every development is required to provide an equivalent to 1% no matter the site's circumstances, quality of development and visual impact or planning gain achieved to the general visual amenity of the area arising through the development. For example a redevelopment of an existing, tired and ugly building to something new and attractive would require significant financial investment by a developer but whilst it would be recognised that the development creates significant visual improvement to an area, public art would still be required by the council yet it isn't clear as to why this would be and what the Council would be seeking to mitigate against.</p> <p>Whilst the 1% policy is not supported, unless flexibility is built in,</p>	See Bidwells above	

Other Issues			
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
	with consideration being given to other S106 requirements, a clear definition is required as to what the Council considers 'capital construction costs' to be.		
Turnstone Estates	The SPD should make it clear to developers the requirements of the Council, including the precise financial formula which will be applied by the Council in adjudging the appropriate arts contribution (e.g.1% for art).	Agreed	Section 8 & Appendix 2
Cambridge Artist 1	<p>The necessity of a programme creating good, city-wide, signage, proper decisions about lighting – city-wide; a special case to be made for the Richardson 'candles', which were savagely treated in the 80s and 90s. S106 recasting?</p> <p>Skyline restoration and enhancement; Zion Chapel cornice, Henry Martin Hall oriel top, St Andrew's St Baptist Church & St Clements's spires, Castle End Mission chimneys etc. Damaged and depleted monuments: Mill Road Bridge, the truncated column at Chesterton Lane.</p>	<p>Only covered as public art if artist designed.</p> <p>A good point, but would not be public art generally; could be considered on case by case basis</p>	Section 3 covers these points
Individual 1	<p>Make a list/audit of public art in Cambridge. Location, costs, commission dates etc. There could be a photographic database of all the projects so far.</p> <p>The council could put on an exhibition? Advertise, promote, celebrate, educate. Provide tours. Get debate with public attendance. Use Friends of Museums to join the debate. There is a huge untapped resource of people who love Cambridge and have huge knowledge.</p> <p>Educate and convert the County & Highways authority to resist placing any more signs, bollards and street junk that defaces our city at present.</p> <p>Get rid of the blue signs.</p>	<p>Points to be addressed in implementation stage; further work needed, e.g. through Public Art Action Plan and public art framework</p> <p>Noted, not a matter for this SPD</p> <p>The City Council works with the County Council to reduce unnecessary signs</p>	Sections 10 & 11
Cambridge Artist 2	Very pleased to have been invited to contribute my views and that these kinds of questions are being asked and considered. Please keep me in the loop.	Noted	

Other Issues			
Organisation	Comment	Response	Action
Cambridge Resident 1	This is a very important area to demonstrate that Cambridge is a modern city but must be in sympathy with the existing environment when they overlap.	Agreed	Sections 1, 3 & 6
Cambridge Resident 2	'Excellence' has to be a priority both of concept and of production. Must always be first consideration & experts always consulted.	Agreed	Section 3
Anon 1	Planning officers need to be alerted to the importance of PA – we need to aim to achieve the excellence to be seen in many European cities. More training for officers on arts.	Agreed, part of the purpose of the SPD Agreed, to be addressed in implementation stage; further work needed, e.g. through Public Art Action Plan and public art framework	Appendix 4
Anon 2	Only in a very few cases, e.g. Snowy Farr, should there be a vox pop input. Quality of advice and election process essential.	Agree this has to be treated with care. Consider each case on its merits.	Section 9
Anon 3	No more statues like those at St Pancras!	Noted	

Appendix 4

KEY ISSUE 1	VIABILITY
<p>Concerns</p> <p>Rep 4921 (Para 2.1)</p> <p>Rep 4990 (Para 2.1) Rep 4988 (Para 2.1) and Rep 4993 (Benefits of Public Art)</p>	<p>University of Cambridge raised concern that, ‘the recession has had a significant impact on the implementation of development. The implementation of the public art policy, with the draft guidance, will have the effect of making development less viable. The City Council should give serious consideration to relaxing or suspending implementation of the policy until such time that economic recovery is achieved and developments can sustain a 1% increase on costs’.</p> <p>Home Builders Federation (HBF) are concerned that if they, ‘fail to prioritise S106 demands placed on developments, then we place housing delivery at risk. This will disadvantage mostly the poor and those on more modest incomes. We need not remind you that without an adequate supply of housing there will be precious little opportunity to raise cultural expectations. Would it not be better to ensure, first and foremost, that we can deliver the housing we need as a society first by encouraging development, and not by placing additional obstacles in its way? As a society we can then attempt to address our cultural needs and aspirations through the education system’.</p> <p>The HBF goes on to say that they are, ‘surprised to see that the Council has chosen to issue this SPD at a time when many housing schemes are either unviable or else at the limits of viability. We are also surprised given all the other public sector claims made upon the uplift in the development value of schemes to subsidise a range of activities. Is this really the council's foremost priority? We would be interested to learn where this requirement sits within the Council's wish list of activities to be funded out of the uplift in development values? Is this more important to the Council than helping the industry achieve higher levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes or the delivery of affordable housing?’</p> <p>The HBF also makes a point that it is, ‘easier for some council’s to rely on s106 to subsidise</p>

<p>Rep 5014 (Para 8.4) and Rep 4999 (Para 8.6)</p> <p>Rep 4945 (Para 8.4) and Rep 4946 (DC Guidance 2)</p> <p>Rep 4972 (DC Guidance 2)</p>	<p>activities that it might find more difficult to justify through the political arena. However, if we insist on using housing developments to fund such non-essentials then there are consequences for those in housing need: that this policy, along with other s106 demands, place housing delivery at risk of becoming unviable. Ergo fewer homes will be built, and the existing housing stock will become more expensive. Such policies make it more difficult to build homes, adding to the crisis of undersupply in the East of England’.</p> <p>Bidwell’s suggest the viability of contributions should be considered in all schemes. Bidwell’s notes that, when the Percent for Art was adopted in 1991, the 'percent' meant 1% of the capital construction costs. CCC indicates that the 1% is for capital construction cost, excluding revenue/process costs. Viability is becoming crucial for delivery. The demands on development have increased from the time of the original 1% policy. Also the increased costs of construction for the Code for Sustainable Homes should be factored in as a reduction in to the overall planning obligation equation. Planning Obligations should be open to negotiation. This should be clearly stated’.</p> <p>Berkeley homes have concerns that the, ‘document identifies certain instances where on-site provision may not be viable owing to the site constraints or limited size of development and where imposition of the standard 1% levy may indeed be too onerous given the overall capital costs of certain major development opportunities. It is the lack of scope to negotiate an appropriate level of Public Art Contribution for schemes falling between these two categories and where scheme viability is threatened due to market or site-specific conditions that we believe require specific consideration at this point in time’.</p> <p>The University’s’, Bursars' Environment and Planning Sub-Committee asks that, ‘the negotiation of the 1% Public Art contribution should be extended to landowners who propose major developments within the Central Conservation Area. Developments which are put forward already have to factor in additional costs for specialist craftsmen and materials (to abide with conservation/listed building constraints) and basing 1% on what are already relatively expensive capital cost is unfair (especially when compared for development outside of this area, within the city centre). The SPD should include opportunity for pragmatic negotiation in such cases’.</p>
---	--

<p>Example of a Response for the Issue of Viability</p>	<p>The order of the Sections in the document has changed in response to representations. In response to representations about the process for delivering public art being too complicated, we have merged Sections 6 and 7 together and removed text, which was a repetition of that contained within Section 5, to simplify the document. Section 8 Development Control Guidance has now become Section 7. This is relevant to the following response and subsequent changes to the document.</p> <p>The policy is not a new policy, as outlined in paragraph 4.4 of the SPD.</p> <p>The Council recognises that there can be viability issues on sites and if a developer considers the overall level of the S106 obligation package required, would render their development unviable, then the developer will be expected to provide full financial details to the Council for consideration. The Council does not see the various requirements that may be sought through S106 agreements, as comprising components for viability, what it will be seeking is the best overall package that will help to ensure the future construction of sustainable communities. This is at the heart of the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth to which the Council is committed. Section 106 agreements will therefore be the subject of negotiation as they have been in the past and the Council will expect to see public art feature in this. However, 1% remains the starting point for any public art negotiations, for any site.</p> <p>The Council will add three new paragraphs after 7.6 to Development Control Guidance, which clarifies the Council's position around the issue of viability.</p>
<p>Change to Plan</p>	<p>Add a three new paragraphs after 7.6 to Development Control Guidance, which clarifies the Council's position around the issue of viability, as follows,</p> <p>7.7 The Council recognises that there can be viability issues on sites, but there will be a presumption that new development will be required to provide S106 contributions, which includes the 1% of capital construction costs for the provision of public art. The onus is therefore on the developer to demonstrate that the overall level of the S106 package would jeopardise viability. This will require a full economic appraisal of the costs of development and of returns from the sale of</p>

	<p>housing and other properties to show what sum could be made available for the provision of public art. In all cases, 1% remains the starting point for any negotiations for any site.</p> <p>7.8 The appraisal should be presented on a residual land value basis taking into account all the costs of development, including contributions to local infrastructure and services and the profit margin required by the developer. It should also include a valuation of the site in its existing use, not its purchase price or hope value. The appraisal should be part of the pre-application negotiations and subsequently accompany the planning application.</p> <p>7.9 Where the Council needs independent advice to validate a viability appraisal, the Council will expect reasonable costs to be borne by the developer. The detailed figures in the appraisal will be treated in confidence, but the conclusions will need to be reported to the Council and will be made public.</p>
<p>Key Issue 2 Compliance with ODPM Circular 05/05 Planning Obligations</p>	
<p>Concerns</p> <p>Rep 5007 (Appropriate Artworks)</p> <p>Rep 5008 (Para 5.2)</p> <p>Rep 5010 (Para 5.9)</p>	<p>Bidwell’s raised concern around several areas of the SPD and compliance with Circular 05/05, as follows:</p> <p>‘Table 3.1 identifies 'local training initiatives' as possible public art and therefore a point that s106 Public Art monies could be put towards. It is very difficult to see how such an activity would directly mitigate against a particular new development in the City. This would not comply with Circular 05/05’.</p> <p>‘Part of the policy background is Circular 5/05. Bidwells request this should be cited’.</p> <p>‘At 5.9 it details that where off site provision is not achievable in the geographical area then expenditure will be on projects that form part of a wider public art strategy. Such an approach cannot be considered to provide 'mitigation' that would be reasonably related to the development in hand. The clarity already sought on what harm is being mitigated against through public art must</p>

	<p>inform what and where the public art must go. The approach directed by 5.9 does not comply with circular 05/05’.</p>
<p>Rep 5015 (Para 8.4)</p>	<p>‘We respectively draw the Council's attention to the letter from Communities and Local Government, dated 12th May 2009, to Chief Planning Officers about Planning for Housing and Economic Recovery under the Section: Section 106 and Viability, that planning authorities should carefully review whether obligations accord with the five principles of B5 of Planning Circular 05/05’.</p>
<p>Rep 5017 (Para 8.7)</p>	<p>‘Circular 5/05 is clear that the five principles set out must be adhered to. How is off-site provision of public art ‘iii) directly related to the development?’</p>
<p>Rep 5019 (Para 8.7)</p>	<p>‘The reference to an applicable use of the s106 monies to be towards general promotion and development of public art is not reasonably related to the development in hand and does not comply with circular 05/05’.</p>
<p>Rep 4996 (Para 10.1)</p>	<p>‘Any planning obligation should be flexible and comply with Circular 5/05. We draw your attention particularly to Paragraph B5, that planning obligations are only sought when they meet all of the tests. We feel that there are aspects where the draft SPD does not comply with Circular 5/05 and particularly the requirement to be directly related to the proposed development. The purpose of public art must be to provide necessary mitigation against the development in hand. This is the only basis on which public art can be sought through the planning system. It is therefore difficult to see the relevance of a list and how the requirements of Circular 5/05 is met’.</p>
<p>Rep 4928 (Para 5.1)</p>	<p>The University of Cambridge asks that, ‘reference should be made in this section of the SPD to the guidance set out in Circular 5/2005. It goes on to raise on to say, ‘This guidance indicates that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all the tests set out in the Circular. The University does not believe that the public art obligation meets the test set out in the Circular in so far as it is ‘necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms. The SPD should justify the public art obligation in terms of the circular advice’.</p>

<p>Example of a Response to the Lack of Reference to Circular 05/05 Within the SPD</p>	<p>The policy background in Section 3 is intended to reinforce the case for public art, not to rehearse the legal background for the use of S106 contributions, which is the role of the Planning Obligations Strategy. Section 9 of the draft Public Art SPD (previously Section 10) - Section 106 Agreements, paragraphs 9.1 - 9.3 outlines the use of Circular 5/05. However, the City Council recognises the importance of both the policy and legal contexts for securing public art as part of new development and will amend this section to explain the importance of the five tests of Circular 5/05. We will also add text to Section 3, which references the Circular in the National policy context and outlines a succinct justification for the role public art can play in mitigating the impacts of new development.</p>
<p>Example of a Response to References of Non Compliance With Circular 05/05</p>	<p>The order of the Sections in the document will change in response to this and other representations. There were a number of representations, in regards to policy issues, whilst reviewing these representations it became clear that additions to the policy Section were required and also that the policy Section itself should be moved forward in the document, in response to its importance for securing S106 contributions. The Policy Section will now become Section 3.</p> <p>The Circular states that 'The principle objective of the planning system is to deliver sustainable development, through which key government social, environmental and economic objectives are achieved' (Circular 05/05 paragraph B1). National and local policies indicate that public art has a part to play in the development of sustainable communities. The City Council strongly supports this position, as the SPD sets out. The Council believes that it is appropriate to seek contributions from development to public art through S106 agreements consistent with the concepts of prescribing, compensating and mitigating the impact of development as set out in paragraph B3. The application of such a policy to all major developments is consistent with the flexibility allowed under paragraph B4.</p> <p>Nowhere within the SPD and its supporting Development Plan/Local Development Framework is there any suggestion that unacceptable development would be permitted purely by the provision of public art, nor that there is any attempt to secure a betterment levy paras B6 and B7. The provision</p>

of public art through S106 agreements as described in the SPD is consistent with the Secretary of State's five tests (paragraph B5).

Policy Tests

(i) Relevant to Planning

The requirement for development to provide public art is established through the national, regional and local planning policies described in Section 5 of the SPD. This confirms that it is relevant to sound planning as set out in statutory and other policies, which have been the subject of public debate. The SPD is consistent with paragraph B8.

(ii) Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms

In so far as the provision of public art is a requirement of policy its inclusion is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. However, this is in itself based on the need to deal with the impacts of development through compensation or mitigation. All development will have in varying degrees a number of impacts, not all of which it is possible to identify in abstraction from specific schemes, but they may include:

- the loss of existing habitat or built fabric;
- changes to the appearance of an area;
- changes to the social and economic character;
- changes to the overall identity and sense of place; and
- adverse changes to the area through less sympathetic buildings and primary impacts such as traffic generation.

Such impacts will be felt on the site, in the neighbourhood and more generally across the City, especially through cumulative effects. The concept of planning for cumulative impacts is included in paragraph B22.

Public art can compensate for these changes, e.g. through the creation of works giving visual pleasure; and mitigate the impacts, e.g. through works that help to re-establish local identity and sense of place. This is consistent with the concepts set out in paragraph B16. In these cases public art can also be considered a form of community infrastructure, especially in the case of facilities for artists (including the provision of workshops for artists to work, as provided for other professions on

site), local training initiatives (under a lead artist) and promotional and educational programmes (in the very largest district scale developments), that should be funded and this is consistent with paragraph B15. Compensation and mitigation of this kind cannot be achieved by any other means than support by S106 contributions. This is consistent with paragraph B9.

(iii) Directly related to the proposed development

The policy requirement is applied to specific developments to provide compensation or mitigation and in most cases there will be a functional and/or geographic link between the development and the public art. For this reason the majority of public art will be provided on-site and the test is met fully. However, for reasons spelt out in the SPD there may be circumstances where this cannot be achieved and off site provision is preferred and resources are pooled to make a more effective contribution. There is also a justification for this in that development cumulatively has citywide impacts that a wider application of public art can help to mitigate. In Cambridge off-site provision, e.g. for open space and community facilities, is an established procedure. Paragraph 10.2 of the SPD says that off-site provision will wherever possible be in reasonable proximity to the contributing developments Paragraph B14 of the circular effectively endorses the principle of off-site provision where the circumstances are specified in the Local Development Framework, and the SPD provides further guidance on adopted policies.

(iv) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development

The requirement applies to all major residential and non residential development as defined for development control performance purposes; it does not apply to small schemes and in particular, not to householder applications. It is the major developments that will have impacts that need to be compensated for or mitigated. At 1% of the development cost the public art contribution is proportionate to the scale of development and the likely impacts, i.e. the larger the developments will have the greatest impact and hence make the greater absolute contributions. However, the SPD proposes negotiated amounts for a few exceptionally large schemes, which bear very significant infrastructure and other community costs. This is consistent with paragraph B9.

(v) Reasonable in all other respects

An issue here is reasonableness in relation to overall scheme viability, particularly given the overall level of S106 demands. This is a particularly sensitive issue at the present time, given the state of

	<p>the economy generally and the house building market in particular. However, it would be wrong for the SPD to base its approach on the particular circumstances at the time of drafting - it needs to be robust over an extended period during which the economic outlook is expected to improve. As is always the case, the overall package of S106 contributions will be the subject of negotiation, and flexibility will be required on all sides. The application of Development Plan policy and the SPD will ensure that the overall framework is consistent with paragraph B10.</p>
<p>Change to Plan</p>	<p>Move the Policy Section forward in the document so that it becomes the new Section 3.</p> <p>Add a new paragraph 3.3, as follows: 3.3 ODPM Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations sets out the framework for S106 obligations, including explaining the policies and providing guidance on the use of planning obligations. Public art sought through S106 agreement must be in accordance with the Circular (see also paragraph 9.1 and 9.2).</p> <p>Add new paragraphs 3.13 and 3.14, as follows:</p> <p>The Role of Public Art as a Planning Obligation</p> <p>3.13 Insofar as the provision of public art is a requirement of planning policy, its inclusion is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and the need to deal with the impacts of new development. If public art is provided through a Section 106 planning obligation, the justification for this must address the need to deal with the impacts of new development through compensation or mitigation. All development will have in varying degrees a number of impacts, not all of which it is possible to identify in abstraction from specific schemes, but they may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * the loss of existing habitat or built fabric; * changes to the appearance of an area; * changes to the social and economic character; * changes to the overall identity and sense of place; and * adverse changes to the area through less sympathetic buildings and primary impacts such as

<p>traffic generation.</p> <p>3.14 Such impacts will be felt on the site, in the neighbourhood and more generally across the City, especially through cumulative effects. Public art can compensate through the creation of works giving visual pleasure; and mitigate the impacts, through works that help to re-establish local identity and sense of place. In this way public art can also be considered a form of community infrastructure that should be funded.</p> <p>Revise paragraphs 9.1 and 9.2, as follows:</p> <p>9.1 The Draft Planning Obligation Strategy 2007 provides a framework for securing S106 Agreements and it considers planning obligation requirements in the context of tests set out in Circular 05/2005. For the purposes of this SPD the Circular allows contributions to be secured through obligations to compensate for 'loss or damage created by a development' or 'to mitigate a development's impact' (paragraph. B3). This is subject to complying with five tests (paragraphs B8-B10):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. the obligation is relevant to planning;2. what is sought or offered is necessary from a planning point of view;3. the obligation is directly related to the proposed development;4. what is sought is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; <p>and</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">5. the obligation must be reasonable in all other respects. <p>The Circular also provides advice on the role of S106 contributions and recommends that local planning authorities produce guidance for developers to ensure a consistent approach to securing those contributions. Both the draft Planning Obligation Strategy and this Public Art Supplementary Planning Document are consistent with, and a response to, these requirements.</p> <p>9.2 The Circular advises that contributions can either be in kind or in the form of a financial contribution. Where a developer commutes the S106 public art contribution to the S106 Public Art Initiative, the contributions will (wherever possible) be used to improve the visual and cultural environment within a reasonable proximity to the original development and to mitigate the impact of that new development. Where this is not appropriate or possible, the contributions will be sought for projects, which will provide a wider community benefit.</p>

Key Issue 3

Process Too Complicated and Prescriptive

Concerns

**Rep 4920
(Para 2.1)
Rep 4935
(Para 8.8)
Rep 4937
(Para 8.10)
Rep 4942
(DC Guidance 2)
Rep 4943
(Appendix 4)**

The University is of the view that the, 'proposed guidance is unnecessarily detailed and prescriptive. The City Council should be aiming to streamline its advice and guidance to applicants across all areas with the aim of simplifying submission requirements and reducing costs. The requirements of the SPD will only add to costs and complexity of applications with the introduction of more detailed submission requirements. The University is concerned that the City Council does not have the resources to provide timely support and advice to applicants on matters relating to public art'.

The University goes on to say that, 'it is unreasonable to require the applicant to go to the lengths required by this SPD to prepare public art proposals without the certainty that planning permission will be granted for the development proposed. If permission is to be granted for a particular development then the Council can require the subsequent submission of public art proposals. This can continue to be the subject of a S 106 agreement between applicant and LPA'.

The University comment that the, 'guidance is unnecessarily lengthy, detailed and burdensome on applicants at a time when the government is seeking to streamline the planning system and is concerned that the City Council does not have the resources to provide timely support and advice to applicants on matters relating to public art. This process is too prescriptive and detailed being both time-consuming and adding significantly to the costs and complexity of planning application submissions'.

**Rep 4947
(Guidelines for
Delivering Public Art)**

Berkeley Homes make an observation relating to the, 'perceived elevation of the artist and their role within a design team to something rather akin to that of the architect, landscape architect or urban design specialists. We believe the public art budget could be seriously eroded in the event that abortive artist's fees and consultancy costs are incurred too early on in the design evolution. The involvement of an arts consultant to guide the overarching principles at an early stage of the

<p>Rep 4918 (Contents of a Public Art Strategy) Rep 4919 (Appendix 4)</p> <p>Rep 5027 (Contents of a Public Art Strategy) Rep 5028 (Appendix 4) Rep 5029 (Appendix 4) Rep 5031 (Appendix 4)</p>	<p>development process is not contested’.</p> <p>Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust states that, ‘this appendix suggest that "major" sites will be required to prepare an Art Strategy. If this means all sites over 1,000 m² this is unnecessarily complex and unreasonable. This section should be reworded to make is clear that a Public Art Strategy as set out in this section will only be required for extra large projects or complex sites - and perhaps setting out a definition of "major" in this context’.</p> <p>The Trust goes on to comment that, ‘Appendix 4. Development Control Process for Planning Applications incredibly detailed and very prescriptive, these processes should allow more flexibility to deal with different levels of details at different stages of different proposals’.</p> <p>Bidwell’s are concerned about the,’ requirement for a lead artist to be instructed prior to the submission of an outline application and that this is unreasonable and unduly onerous. They go on to say, he requirement for a lead artist to prepare the public art strategy for an outline application is also unreasonable and unduly onerous upon the applicant’. They do not consider it necessary for the lead artist or arts consultant to prepare the Public Art Strategy.</p> <p>Bidwell’s are of the view that the, ‘development control process for Planning Applications is particularly onerous to the developer in terms of time and expense. It raises the question of whether the process can be dealt with within the prescribed time for determination. The additional expense of primary consultation should also be factored in to the overall contribution’.</p> <p>Bidwell’s are concerned that the, ‘requirement for a Public Art Delivery Plan advised by the draft SPD is most onerous in the application process where there is no certainty of a planning permission. The extent of work will slow down the process, add to the front loading of the planning application and add to the financial demands of the developer of undertaking a Full or Reserved Matters planning application. A Public Art Strategy for the site is sufficient to release planning permission; whereupon there will be greater certainty to the acceptability of the development and the developer will be more able to commit funds towards public art’.</p>
---	---

Example of a Responses to the Issue That the Process is Too Complicated and Prescriptive

The order of the Section's in the document has changed in response to this and other representations about the process for delivering public being too complicated or prescriptive. We will merge Sections 6 and 7 together and remove text, which is a repetition of that contained within Section 5, to simplify the document. We will change the title of Section 5, to Public Art - Definition, Benefits and Roles and also change the title of Section 6, to Strategic Objectives and a Spatial Strategy for Public Art In Cambridge and amend the rest of the document accordingly. Section 8 Development Control Guidance will become Section 7. This is all relevant to the following response and subsequent changes to the document.

The SPD aims to integrate the arts into development and promote the benefits of combining good design and architecture, urban planning and public art. Without this process the aims will not be achieved. The SPD sets out what is expected and how the process will work to streamline the process and to provide fully integrated public art proposals. The costs are bourn from the contribution so they are not additional costs.

Experience shows that the procurement and delivery of projects through section 106 agreements can be a challenging process involving many steps and the involvement of several agencies. Failure to get this process right at the outset can result in serious problems and considerable delay. Spelling out procedures may often make them look longer and more complex than they are in practice, but this guidance is important. The challenges in procuring public art can be greater than for some other elements of a development proposal, where the details and specification are developed through the application of clear technical guidelines as opposed to the more qualitative judgements that public art requires and also to ensure the artworks are fully integrated into the wider development. For these reasons the process requires even greater clarity in procedures.

In terms of the requirements for the submission of a Public Art Strategy with Outline Planning Applications, this is a standard requirement and reflects best practice, so that public art proposals are fully integrated into masterplans and development proposals. The City Council recognises that complex Public Art Strategies are not appropriate for smaller sites and this is outlined in Appendix 3, which deals with sites, which are not Areas of Major Change, large or complex, Outline Planning Applications. The Public Art Delivery Plan for Reserved Matters and Full Planning applications is

again a standard requirement and reflects best practice.

The provision of a clear process for the inclusion and delivery of public art within new development enables City Council Officers and developers alike to know, what is expected of them and when. This reduces the 'burden' on all those involved and ensures resources are used properly.

We do not feel it is asking for too much information. Not engaging early enough can result in public art proposals which are not integrated into a development and do not mitigate its impact. Proposals which come forward late in the design process generally lack adequate public consultation and are not accompanied by a feasibility study, which can result in abortive fees. This is the best practice approach and has been set out, for clarity, in Appendix 4

Having said the above, in responding to this representation and others on the subject, we note that in Section 7 - Development Control Guidance, we clarify how existing policies are to be applied but we do not clearly direct the reader to the Appendices, which outline what is required to deliver public art and how. We will add a new paragraph 7.21 to address this.

We have reviewed how the process is set out in Appendix 4 of the SPD and have come to the view that the format of the Appendix does not provide clarity between the processes for Outline, Reserved Matters and the Full Planning application process. We will reformat the Appendix to show a separate process for each planning application type. This will direct the reader to the correct process for his or her own planning application type.

In reviewing Appendix 4, we agree that there are elements of the process, which are prescriptive and complicated. For clarity and to simply the process for delivering public art, we have revised the process set out in each of the new Sections and noted this is the suggested process for delivering public art, because we recognise, proposals will vary. The process now has less consultation elements and also acknowledges that if an applicant has followed the process thus far, a Public Art Delivery Plan will have been submitted for approval. The Public Art Delivery Plan will have detailed information about the commission and it is the commission, which requires approval and not the final artwork. However, if the applicant has failed to submit a Public Art Delivery Plan as outlined in the process then the planning application will require a condition to ensure it is developed,

	<p>submitted and approved prior to the commencement of development. We have clarified the use of conditions in steps 13 of both the process for reserved matters and full planning applications to reflect this. We will also clarify that the process set out in the Appendix is the City Council's suggested process because we recognise that each public art proposal will be different and the process will be agreed on a case by case basis.</p>
<p>Change to Plan</p>	<p>Change the title of Section 5, to Public Art - Definition, Benefits and Roles. Change the title of Section 6, to Strategic Objectives and a Spatial Strategy for Public Art In Cambridge and amend the rest of the document accordingly.</p> <p>Remove repetitive text from Sections 6 and 7 and create a new Section 6. Delete paragraphs 6.3, 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6. Move the last three sentences from paragraph 6.5 and move to become a new paragraph 6.2. Add the text, 'for Cambridge' to the paragraph title of 'Strategic Objectives'. Add the text, 'for Cambridge' to the paragraph title of 'Spatial Strategy'. Move the previous paragraph 6.6 and insert into this Section as a new paragraph 6.5.</p> <p>Add the following text as a new paragraph 7.21 Appendices to this SPD provide detailed advice on the best way to meet the above requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Appendix 2 sets out guidelines on delivering public art, including the roles of stakeholders, commissioning, submission requirements for making planning applications, funding and project management. * Appendix 3 outlines the minimum information required to prepare a Public Art Strategy (in the form of a table of contents), where it is required as part of an outline planning application for major development. * Appendix 4 sets out a suggested process for integrating public art within new development for Outline, Reserved Matters or Full Planning applications. <p>Add a new bullet point to the Public Art Delivery Plan Section in Appendix 2, to clarify that it is the commission, which is to be approved, as follows, ' - the commission for the artist'.</p> <p>Revise Appendix 4 to provide one clear process for each type of planning application as follows and also clarify that the process is the City Council's suggested process.</p>

Outline Planning Applications:

1. At the pre - application discussion stage, the developer contacts the Council Development Control Section. The Development Control Officer will provide the developer with a link to this SPD and other guidance and suggest that more specialist advice is sought from the Urban Design Team.
2. DC officer advises the Urban Design Team that pre-application discussions are taking place for a development, which requires the provision of public art, and arrangements are made for the Urban Design Team to attend pre-application discussions and meetings. Case officers have a preview meeting each week and at this meeting case officers are reminded by the Development Control Manager to discuss the approach to public art on the sites in question with the Urban Design Team. Matters for discussion include whether on-site or off-site provision of public art is more appropriate in the context of the SPD and whether Planning Permission will be required for artworks themselves.
3. Developer may contact the Urban Design Team for advice on provision of public art.
4. Developer, DC case officer and the Urban Design team agree:
 - a. if public art should be included in the development or whether a commuted sum may be more appropriate
 - b. the initial indication of a budget for public art
 - c. the level of detail about public art that needs to be contained in the outline application and what can be covered by a subsequent Reserved Matters Application.
5. For public art provision in Areas of Major Change and large or complex sites, developers should engage an arts consultant and/or lead artist (hereafter referred to as "consultant") to be part of the design team for the scheme. The consultant should be involved as early as possible in the process.
6. Where there is a draft submission of the Public Art Strategy, the City Council's Public Art Panel may be requested to comment and the Panel will provide expert advice as to the acceptability of the proposals for public art.

7. Where there is to be a members briefing at the pre-application stage, the presentation should include the public art proposals.

8. The consultant or developer engages with the local community including providing ward councillors an opportunity to make comment on the purpose and nature of the scheme. Specific actions include:

- a. engagement with the local community; and
- b. early engagement with the County Council where the work might be on the highway is required.

9. A Public Art Strategy, which outlines the nature of the artwork to be created for the development, incorporating the themes inspired from the various consultations, is prepared. Appendix 3 provides details of the minimum information required in the Public Art Strategy.

10. The developer prepares a Design and Access Statement, which includes the Public Art Strategy.

11. A Public Art Strategy will be required as part of the Outline Planning Application. As already noted in the preceding stage, Appendix 3 provides details of the minimum information required in the Public Art Strategy.

12. The developer submits a planning application accompanied by:

- a. a Design and Access Statement incorporating a Public Art Strategy within the development
- b. a statement of the proposed Heads of Terms of the Section 106 Agreement for public art on site or a commuted sum as agreed at the pre-application stage.

13. The Public Art Strategy will be included in the consultation process of the planning application and documentation should be provided.

14. The Urban Design Team reviews the Public Art Strategy in the application.

15. The Public Art Strategy is reviewed by the Public Art Panel. The Panel will provide expert advice as to the acceptability of the proposals for public art.

16. The Urban Design Team reports on the Public Art Strategy and makes recommendations to Development Control officers.

17. The Development Control officer considers the planning application and includes the Public Art Strategy in the report for a decision by Planning Committee or under delegated powers. Planning conditions will require the preparation of a detailed "Public Art Delivery Plan (as outlined in Appendix 2) for submission with the first reserved matters application.

18. Prior to planning approval being issued, the draft Heads of Terms for Planning Obligations (S106 Agreement), which includes public art, is completed by all parties. The wording of the draft Heads of Terms should be standardised but may vary on an application by application basis.

Reserved Matters Applications:

1. A project team of developer, consultant and local authority will be formed to develop the process for commissioning public art.

2. The developer, consultant, Development Control case officer and Urban Design Team meet to consider the approach to the submission of detailed proposals for public art on site.

3. The consultant develops the Public Art Delivery Plan (The Public Art Delivery Plan requirements are explained in more detail in Appendix 2).

4. The artist engages with the local community, including providing ward councillors the opportunity to make comment on the approach and nature of the Public Art Delivery Plan. Engagement with the local community will need to be documented - this is the developer's responsibility.

5. At the discretion of the Development Control case Officer and the Urban Design Team the draft Public Art Delivery Plan may be presented to the Public Art Panel. The Plan is reviewed by the Public Art Panel and the Panel will provide expert advice to the Development Control as to the acceptability of the proposals for public art.
6. The consultant prepares concepts or examples of the artwork (or ideally the detailed proposal itself), which will be created for the development incorporating the themes inspired from the various consultations.
7. Where there is to be a members briefing at the pre-application stage, the presentation should include the Public Art Delivery Plan.
8. A Public Art Delivery Plan (in accordance with the requirements as set out in Appendix 2) is submitted as part of the Reserved Matters Planning Application. Where a Public Art Delivery Plan is not submitted with the Planning Application, the City Council may refuse the application as being contrary to the Supplementary Planning Document.
9. The Public Art Delivery Plan will be included in the consultation process of the planning application.
10. The Urban Design Team reviews the Public Art Delivery Plan in the application.
11. The Public Art Delivery Plan is reviewed by the Public Art Panel. Relevant Ward Members are notified by the Urban Design Team of the Panel date and are welcome to attend.
12. The Urban Design Team reports and makes recommendations to the Development Control Officer.
13. The Development Control Officer considers the application and includes the Public Art Delivery Plan in the report for a decision by Planning Committee or under delegated powers. Members may

call in applications subject to the Scheme of Delegation (Section I, Scheme of Delegation). Where the public art commission has yet to be developed as part of the Public Art Delivery Plan, a condition and/or S106 schedule requiring the public art commission to be approved prior to commencement of development, will be required. The Development Control Officer should discharge such conditions unless the Planning Committee determines that they should be determined by the Planning Committee itself or a member sub group nominated by Planning Committee. Section 14 (below) onwards in the process is then followed.

Prior to Commencement of Development

14. The developer is required to provide evidence of the costs of the public art commission and evidence that the cost is no less than 1% of the capital construction cost of the development. This evidence must be verified by the City Council.

15. Prior to the commencement of development on site, the public art commission must be approved by the City Council. Where necessary, the Developer will engage contractors to fabricate and safely install the artwork as advised by the artist/s and technical specialists.

16. Once public art is installed, the landowner has the responsibility for maintenance and decommissioning of the artwork, as agreed via planning condition or Section 106 obligation (refer to paragraph 7.14 Maintenance and Decommissioning).

17. Where applicable, once any site-specific artwork/art works are completed, the developer confirms that the public art works are ready to be transferred and the legal documents (including the decommissioning process and likely future ownership) will be prepared by legal representatives of the developers and reviewed by the City Council. Where public art is located on public land, a commuted sum will be required to fund future maintenance.

18. Where public art is required in accordance with this SPD, it is unlikely that the City Council will support an application or submission for reserved matters without a Public Art Strategy or Public Art Delivery Plan. In the unlikely event that this occurs, and the City Council is minded to approve a planning application, a condition will be imposed (in addition to the standard S106 schedule) which

requires the preparation and approval of at least a Public Art Delivery Plan, and approval of the public art commission prior to commencement of development. The steps outlined in Appendix 2 dealing with the preparation and approval of a Public Art Delivery Plan and approval of any final, detailed public art commission as outlined in this appendix must be followed.

Full Planning Applications:

1. A project team of developer, consultant and local authority will be formed to develop the process for commissioning public art.
2. The developer, consultant, Development Control case officer and Urban Design officer meet to consider the approach to the submission of detailed proposals for public art on site or in the case of Full Planning Applications, whether it would be more appropriate to commute the public art payment to the S106 Public Art Initiative.
3. The consultant develops the Public Art Delivery Plan (The Public Art Delivery Plan requirements are explained in more detail in Appendix 2).
4. The artist engages with the local community and ward councillors regarding the approach and nature of the Public Art Delivery Plan. Engagement with the local community will need to be documented - this is the developer's responsibility.
5. At the discretion of the Development Control case officer and the Urban Design Team, the draft Public Art Delivery Plan may be presented to the Public Art Panel. The Public Art Panel reviews the Plan and the Panel will provide expert advice to the Development Control officer as to the acceptability of the proposals for public art.
6. The consultant prepares concepts or examples of the artwork (or ideally the detailed commission itself), which will be created for the development incorporating the themes inspired from the various consultations.

7. Where there is to be a members briefing at the pre-application stage, the presentation should include the Public Art Delivery Plan.
8. A Public Art Delivery Plan is submitted as part of the Full Application (in accordance with the requirements as set out in Appendix 2). The relevant Planning Committee will expect the Public Art Delivery Plan to be detailed as part of its determination of the Planning Application. Where a Public Art Delivery Plan is not submitted with the Planning Application, the City Council may refuse the application as contrary to this Supplementary Planning Document.
9. The Public Art Delivery Plan will be included in the consultation process of the planning application.
10. The Urban Design Team reviews the Public Art Delivery Plan in the application.
11. The Public Art Delivery Plan is reviewed by the Public Art Panel. Relevant Ward Members are notified by the Urban Design Team of the Panel date and are welcome to attend.
12. The Urban Design Team reports and makes recommendations to the Development Control case officer.
13. The Development Control Officer considers the application and includes the Public Art Delivery Plan in the report for a decision by Planning Committee or under delegated powers. Members may call in applications subject to the Scheme of Delegation (Section I, Scheme of Delegation). Where the public art commission has yet to be developed as part of the Public Art Delivery Plan, a condition and/or S106 schedule, requiring the commission to be approved prior to commencement of development, will be required. Such conditions should be discharged by the Development Control officer unless the Planning Committee determines that they should be determined by the Planning Committee itself or a member sub group nominated by Planning Committee. Section 14 (below) onwards in the process is then followed.

Prior to Commencement of Development

14. The developer is required to provide evidence of the costs of the public artwork and evidence that the cost is no less than 1% of the capital construction cost of the development. This evidence must be verified by the City Council.

15. Prior to the commencement of development on site, the public art commission must be approved by the City Council.

Where necessary, the Developer will engage contractors to fabricate and safely install the artwork as advised by the artist/s and technical specialists.

16. Once public art is installed, the landowner has the responsibility for maintenance and decommissioning of the artwork, as agreed via planning condition or Section 106 obligation (refer to paragraph 7.14, Maintenance and Decommissioning).

17. Where applicable, once any site-specific artwork/art works are completed, the developer confirms that the public art works are ready to be transferred and the legal documents (including the decommissioning process and likely future ownership) will be prepared by legal representatives of the developers and reviewed by the City Council. Where public art is located on public land, a commuted sum will be required to fund future maintenance.

18. Where public art is required in accordance with this SPD, it is unlikely that the City Council will support an application or submission of a full planning application without a Public Art Delivery Plan. In the unlikely event that this occurs, and the City Council is minded to approve a planning application, a condition will be imposed (in addition to the standard S106 schedule) which requires the preparation and approval of at least a Public Art Delivery Plan, and approval of the public art commission prior to commencement of development. The steps outlined in Appendix 2 dealing with the preparation and approval of a Public Art Delivery Plan and approval of any public artwork(s) as outlined in this appendix must be followed.

Key Issue 4

What is public?

Concerns

Rep 4970 (What is Public?)

The University's, Bursars' Environment and Planning Sub-Committee suggest that the, 'Council should adopt/embrace a definition of public art that is relative to the somewhat exceptional circumstances experienced within Cambridge's city centre'.

Rep 5001 (What is Public?)

Bidwell's note that the, 'wording of 3.4 implies that public art in courtyards within college, university, commercial and business will not be considered as public art even though visitors, employees and students etc have full access to them. This provision is semi public. If the provision of such public art could benefit the environment of employees and students etc it should be considered public art for the purpose of S106'.

Rep 4944 (What is Public?) Rep 4923 (Para 3.5)

The University of Cambridge points out that it makes a 'substantial contribution to public art provision in the City through its museums and collections. The Fitzwilliam Museum houses world-class collections of works of art and antiquities. Kettles Yard houses 20th century art collections and contemporary and modern art exhibitions. Entrance to both facilities is free to members of the public. The City Council should take this into consideration when dealing with University planning applications'. The University also comments that, 'the provision of public art by the University on its major sites should be seen in the same way as public art on school sites in that it is visible to students, academics, and visitors and therefore should similarly qualify as public art'.

Rep 4951 (Para 3.4)

James Garrett notes that, 'paragraph 3.4 states that artwork provided within courtyards or enclosed spaces that are subject to discretionary access to the public may be considered 'public' in the sense of providing a wider enjoyment and appreciation of the area, but will generally not be considered public art for the purpose of public art procured through Section 106 Agreements. Where public art is semi-private it would be appropriate to allocate a smaller amount of funding than for public art which has full public access'.

<p>Example of a Response for 'What is Public?'</p>	<p>The order of the Sections in the document has changed in response to representations. There were a number of representations, in regards to policy issues, whilst reviewing these representations it became clear that additions to the policy Section were required and also that the policy Section itself should be moved forward in the document, in response to its importance for securing S106 contributions. In response to representations about the process for delivering public art being too complicated, we have merged Sections 6 and 7 together and removed text, which was a repetition of that contained within Section 3. We have also moved Section 3 and it is the new Section 5.</p> <p>Disagree. Paragraph 3.4 defines what is considered to be 'public'. It clarifies that artworks provided within courtyards or enclosed spaces that are subject to restricted or discretionary access to the public will generally not be considered 'public art' for the purpose of public art procured through Section 106 Agreements for the mitigation of development. Public art secured through S106 Agreements should be located in the public realm. The paragraph does not detail what type of development is acceptable for the provision of public art, only that for S106 it is publicly accessible. Public art proposals will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for their public accessibility.</p> <p>However, we will add the following to the end of the paragraph to illustrate that this is an issue, which the City Council will consider and agree, on a case by case basis:</p> <p>'The public accessibility of artworks will be considered on a case by case basis.'</p>
<p>Change to Plan</p>	<p>Add the following to the end of paragraph 5.5: 'The public accessibility of artworks will be considered on a case by case basis.'</p>

Key Issue 5**Appropriate Artworks****Concerns**

Rep 4971
(Appropriate Artworks)

The University's Bursars' Environment and Planning Sub-Committee comments, that 'the Council's interpretation of public art is contestable. The type of definition adopted could influence the acceptability of where the public art is located'.

Rep 4926
(Para 3.9)

The University feels that 'Architectural detail, ornamentation and decoration ought to be considered as 'public art' if it provides 'additionality' to any functional design irrespective of whether it is designed by an artist'.

Rep 4900
(Para 3.9)

The Cambridge University NHS Foundation Trust comments that, 'paragraph 3.9 describes items that will not be considered as Public Art. This includes "architectural detail, ornamentations, decoration or functional elements designed by architects, urban designers, landscape architects and interior design architects". However the list of Art schemes that are acceptable in Table 3.1 includes "Architectural detailing glass and door furniture". It is confusing that some architectural designs can be considered as Public Art whilst others cannot. If it is intended that items designed or specified by artists rather than architects are acceptable whilst the latter are not, this is not how this section reads'.

Rep 5002
(Appropriate Artworks)

Rep 5003
(Appropriate Artworks)

Rep 5004
(Appropriate Artworks)

Rep 5005

Bidwell's states the following, 'A critical requirement is that the commissioned work should be original, of high quality, designed for the community and by a professional artist or craftsperson'. No definition is given as to what a professional artist or craftsperson is. Public art can be integrated into buildings and landscapes. Artistic installations can be achieved by designers, architects, engineers, landscape architects and urban designers. There is no policy support for the exclusion of these groups. We would ask the local authority whether such exclusion constitutes a restrictive covenant in terms of trade and whether EU rules are breached?'

<p>(Appropriate Artworks)</p>	<p>They go on to comment, 'this gives examples of types of public art which are commonly undertaken by the professionals excluded in the previous paragraph, namely: Land art; Art infrastructure - studios, workshops, galleries; Architectural glass; Floor treatments; Facades and cladding; Lighting; Skyline features; Landscape schemes and trees; Street furniture; and Architectural detailing. This list confirms the use of the term 'artist' or 'craftsperson' is too restrictive'.</p> <p>Bidwell's also comment that, 'Paragraph 3.7 Table 3.1, allows architectural detailing, whereas paragraph 3.9(b) excludes it and that embellishment of the norm, such as street furniture, open spaces and footpaths should be considered appropriate for public art'.</p>
<p>Example of a Response to the Issue of Appropriate Artworks</p>	<p>The order of the Sections in the document has changed in response to representations. There were a number of representations, in regards to policy issues. Whilst reviewing these representations it became clear that additions to the policy section were required and also that the policy section itself should be moved forward in the document, in response to its importance for securing S106 contributions. In response to representations about the process for delivering public art being too complicated, we have merged Sections 6 and 7 together and removed text, which was a repetition of that contained within Section 3. We have also moved Section 3 and it is the new Section 5.</p> <p>The SPD aims to ensure that the value of the public art contribution is realised. If high quality public art is not delivered then the contribution would not mitigate the impact of new development. Works proposed by architects or landscape architects, which are general development features, are public realm/architectural works and not public art proposals. Artistic intent and input is the crucial point.</p> <p>However, the City Council recognises that not all artists are professional or trained and some have other professions or can facilitate projects rather than design them. Therefore we have revised the paragraph to reflect this. We will remove the word 'professional' from the text and add 'produced or facilitated by' before the word 'artist'.</p> <p>We will also add the word 'normally' to paragraph 5.10, which allows flexibility to bullet point (b) within the paragraph as to whom can be responsible for the public art proposal but in all cases the</p>

	art value of the contribution will need to be demonstrated and this will be agreed with the City Council on a case by case basis.
Change to Plan	<p>Revise paragraph 5.7, as follows: 'A critical requirement is that the commissioned work should be original, of high quality, designed for the community and produced or facilitated by an artist or craftsperson. '</p> <p>Add the word normally to paragraph 5.10, as follows:</p> <p>5.10 For the purpose of this SPD public art will not normally include: (a) mass produced objects, reproductions of original artworks or previously unrealised designs; and (b) architectural detail, ornamentations, decoration or functional elements designed by architects, urban designers, landscape architects and interior design architects.</p>
Key Issue 6 Maintenance and Decommissioning	
Concerns	
Rep 4909 (Para 8.3)	<p>The Cambridge University NHS Foundation Trust raises concern that, 'this paragraph makes clear that maintenance costs for items of art for 25 years can be included within the overall 1% calculations. There is no mention in this context of the need to include decommissioning costs too. It would be useful to explain that de-commissioning costs should be included with maintenance costs, either in this paragraph or elsewhere in the document (if this particular aspect was not agreed by the Arts Council in 1991). Some further examination of the proposed life-span of artworks would be helpful here too'.</p>
Rep 4959 (Para 8.3)	<p>James Garrett states, 'We would have very strong concerns that the contribution of 1% of capital construction cost of development is seen as being 'generally reasonable' for most medium to large sites. We would have concerns over the onerous impact of a commuted sum for a maintenance</p>

<p>Rep 5012 (Para 8.3)</p>	<p>period in excess of 25 years. It would seem unreasonable to request a developer to maintain a piece of public art for a period greater than 5 years’.</p> <p>Bidwell’s note, ‘the contribution will cover the creation and delivery in situ of the artwork (including project management) and a commuted sum over 25 years; it is not clear where the period of 25 years derives from and why this period of time is considered to be a reasonable financial obligation for the developer to pay’.</p>
<p>Example of a Response for the Issue of Maintenance and Decommissioning.</p>	<p>The order of the Section's in the document has changed in response to representations. And, in response to representations about the process for delivering public art being too complicated, we have merged Sections 6 and 7 together and removed text, which was a repetition of that contained within Section 3. Section 8 has now become Section 7.</p> <p>Para. 3.6 establishes that many forms of public art are intended to endure (as indeed do the impacts of the development that they are intended to mitigate). To illustrate this and justify the 25 year maintenance period, it bears pointing out that the works identified in the Public art Survey have an average age of 41 years and the works identified in the recently published Cambridge Sculpture Trails average 29 yrs. It is essential that resources are available to maintain the work, and as they cannot be removed without express consent, it is in the commercial interest of the developer/property owners to ensure that they continue to enhance the development. This is a cost that should be borne by the developer.</p> <p>The specified period for maintenance is over 25 years but the City Council recognises that the maintenance period will vary depending on the type of proposed artwork e.g. embedded artwork may require maintenance for perpetuity, where as artist designed play equipment may have a life of up to 12 years. The commissioned artist will submit a maintenance schedule as part of the artwork submission. This is a fundamental part of the artist's brief. Maintenance Plans will be agreed with the City Council on a case by case basis. Consideration of maintenance for Public Art should be set out in the context of the advice contained in paragraphs B18 - 20 in Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations, as follows:</p>

	<p>B18. Where contributions are secured through planning obligations towards the provision of facilities, which are predominantly for the benefit of the users of the associated development, it may be appropriate for the developer to make provision for subsequent maintenance (i.e. physical upkeep). Such provision may be required in perpetuity.</p> <p>B19. As a general rule, however, where an asset is intended for wider public use, the costs of subsequent maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated with the developer's contributions should normally be borne by the body or authority in which the asset is to be vested. Where contributions to the initial support ("pump priming") of new facilities are necessary, these should reflect the time lag between the provision of the new facility and its inclusion in public sector funding streams, or its ability to recover its own costs in the case of privately-run bus services, for example. Pump priming maintenance payments should be time-limited and not be required in perpetuity by planning obligations.</p> <p>B20. For all maintenance payments, local authorities and developers should agree the type of payments to be made, e.g. regular payments, or commuted sums, all with a clear audit trail.</p> <p>We will revise the Maintenance section of the SPD, to respond to this and other representations concerning maintenance and decommissioning.</p> <p>We will add a new sentence to the section, as follows: 'The specified period for maintenance is over 25 years but the City Council recognises that the maintenance period will vary depending on the type of proposed artwork e.g. embedded artwork may require maintenance for perpetuity, where as artist designed play equipment may have a life of up to 12 years. Maintenance Plans will be agreed with the City Council on a case by case.'</p>
<p>Change to Plan</p>	<p>Change the sentence of paragraph 7.19 to, 'Part of the 1% contribution for the artwork will be put aside for its maintenance, up to 25 years, or for its decommissioning'.</p> <p>Revise paragraph 7.14 -7.19, and change the title to 'Maintenance and Decommissioning'.</p> <p>Revise the text as follows:</p>

7.14 All public art is subject to the ravages of time and may be the target for vandalism. Stone and metal sculptures may be very robust, while murals and ceramic work may be fragile. In general, a public artwork should be designed to endure in a location, for as long as is appropriate, given the surrounding environment, other physical objects in the space, and the use the space is intended for. The City Council requires commissioned artworks to be as durable and maintenance light as possible.

7.15 Consequently, all works will require a Maintenance Plan and a Decommissioning Plan and it is important to identify funding and responsibility for this.

7.16 The maintenance of public art work within the private boundary of a site provided through a S106 agreement will be the responsibility of the developer or landowner.

7.17 The maintenance of public art work in the public realm will be the responsibility of the City Council:

- * where this is a City Council initiative, maintenance will be funded by the City Council;
- * where it is funded through a S106 agreement funding must be from the developer through a commuted sum within that agreement; and
- * where the City Council supports public art works on the highway they will be the responsibility of the City Council, not the Highway Authority.

7.18 A decommissioning plan allows for changing circumstances to be taken into account, such as the change of use of a site, or user, which necessitates the decommissioning (removal, re-siting or storage) of a work. In the case of temporary artworks, the Decommissioning Plan forms an important part of the public artwork proposal submission.

7.19 The cost of maintenance and decommissioning must be taken into account for a public art proposal and submitted to the City Council for approval. Part of the 1% contribution for the artwork will be put aside for its maintenance, up to 25 years, or for its decommissioning. This applies to public art in both the public realm and on private land. The specified period for maintenance is over 25 years, but the City Council recognises that the maintenance period will vary depending on the

	<p>type of proposed artwork, e.g. embedded artwork may require maintenance in perpetuity, and whereas artist designed play equipment may have a life of up to 12 years. Maintenance Plans will be agreed with the City Council on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>We will add, 'decommissioning' to bullet point c) in DC Guidance 2.</p>
--	--

Key Issue 7	Off-site Contributions
--------------------	-------------------------------

<p>Concerns</p> <p>Rep 4934 (Para 8.7)</p> <p>Rep 4963 (Para 8.7) Rep 4964 (Para 8.7)</p> <p>Rep 4973 (DC Guidance 3)</p> <p>Rep 5017 (Para 8.7) Rep 5019 (Para 8.7)</p>	<p>The University of Cambridge does not think it, 'appropriate for contributions to be sought from such development simply to support the provision of public art in local and district centres and suburbs. There is no connection in planning terms to development in the City centre and the absence of public art in local and district centres and suburban areas.</p> <p>James Garrett does not accept, 'that a sum of £25,000 could never produce high quality work. It depends upon the site in question. It is noted that this figure has been increased from an earlier figure of £15,000, which was stated as being insufficient to fund the commissioning of an artist. The artist may be 'new' or up and coming and may be cheaper but nevertheless effective for the job'. He goes on to question, how the figure will be calculated.</p> <p>The University's Bursars' Environment and Planning Sub-Committee notes, 'the term "considered to be inappropriate" does not provide enough clarity for potential instances when contributions to the PAIF will be favoured instead of proposals for on-site public art works. The document should provide examples and/or expand the text to include reasoning as to what types of proposal will be judged to be inappropriate'.</p> <p>Bidwell's states that, 'Circular 5/05 is clear that the five principles set out must be adhered to. How is off-site provision of public art 'iii) directly related to the development?'. They go on to say, 'the reference to an applicable use of the s106 monies to be towards general promotion and development of public art is not reasonably related to the development in hand and does not</p>
--	---

<p>Rep 5021 (Para 8.8)</p>	<p>comply with circular 05/05’.</p> <p>Bidwell’s go on to question, ‘if it is physically impossible or considered to be inappropriate to provide on-site artworks, how then are the five principles in Circular 5/05 met? In particular;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms; iii) directly related to the proposed development; iv) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and v) reasonable in all other respects.’
<p>Example of a Response for the Issue of Off-site Contributions</p>	<p>The amount of money may be insufficient to commission an artist to produce a high quality piece of artwork due to the size of the development, which would probably not have public space or public access. The SPD is clear that it does not support providing second class work without public access.</p> <p>The SPD aims to be flexible on this matter to ensure that quality public art is created and it meets its objectives and mitigates development.</p> <p>Smaller budgets for public artworks are often used for temporary or process-led proposals, which in principle the City Council supports and it recognises the benefits of these type of artist practises. Our flexibility, includes, assessing each site on an individual basis; and should a quality proposal come forward which is generated from a budget below £25,000 then consideration will be given to approving the proposal. Often with a budget below £25,000 and where a permanent intervention is proposed the artist's remuneration is low and unreasonable.</p> <p>Also, experience has shown us that often proposals for permanent artworks with smaller budgets become very difficult to develop, deliver and maintain because the budget is too restrictive and does not provide for unforeseen difficulties and costs.</p> <p>The City Council consulted widely on this policy with professionals involved with the delivery of public art and it was unanimously supported. An original figure of £15,000 was suggested by the</p>

	<p>City Council, but the consultation with those experienced in delivering public art resulted in support for the City Council raising the figure to £25,000 for the reasons set out above.</p> <p>Having said the above and in response to this and other representations, we will revise paragraph 7.10 to provide clarity that the preferred option is for the delivery of public art on site, including the insertion of a footnote to define the S106 Public Art Initiative and also to expand on the exceptions to off site contributions in both this paragraph and DC Guidance 3.</p> <p>We will provide a new paragraph, which outlines examples of the types of development, which are inappropriate for the inclusion of a public art proposal and also add text to DC Guidance 3 to expand on the exceptions to off site contributions.</p> <p>After legal advice, we have changed the name of the Public Art Initiative Fund to the S106 Public Art initiative because the S106 contributions are not a fund and should be clearly identified as S106 monies.</p>
<p>Change to Plan</p>	<p>Revise paragraph 7.10, as follows:</p> <p>7.10 The City Council's preference is for the delivery of public art on site but there may be cases with smaller major developments where it would be inappropriate or physically impossible to include public art on a site (see paragraph 7.11). In other instances, if the 1% is less than £25,000, experience suggests it may be difficult to commission and deliver a high quality artwork, which will have a significant impact on the physical or social character of the locality (by mitigating the impact of the new development) and provide an appropriate sum for its maintenance. In such cases, a contribution will be made to the S106 Public Art Initiative for: the delivery of off-site artworks;; project management of the delivery of artworks; the general promotion and development of public art; and match funding of other schemes where this would achieve a significant lift in the quality of the work created. Exceptions to off-site contributions may be made where a developer can demonstrate that a public art proposal can be created, which are publicly accessible, mitigate the impact of the new development and includes an appropriate sum for maintenance. All proposals will be considered on a case by case basis.</p>

	<p>Add a new paragraph 7.11, as follows:</p> <p>7.11 The following are examples of where a public art proposal may be deemed inappropriate; they include but are not restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">* gated communities/developments with no public access;* development where there is no public space or opportunity for embedded artwork, which is publicly visible; and* proposals submitted late in the design process and which do not integrate effectively with the development nor provide on-site public benefit. <p>The decision on the inclusion of public art within new development will be dealt with, on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Add the following sentence at the end DC Guidance 3, 'except where a developer can demonstrate that a public art proposal can be created, which is publically accessible, mitigates the impact of the new development and includes an appropriate sum for maintenance'.</p> <p>Add the following footnote to paragraph 7.10 to define the S106 Public Art Initiative: '10 The S106 Public Art Initiative receives the commuted S106 contributions. The main objective of the S106 Public Art Initiative is to directly commission public artworks and is designed to enable the Council to clearly identify the best use of the contributions (See Section 9.0)'.</p> <p>Revise document to ensure that the new name for the Public Art Initiative Fund is used.</p>
--	--

Appendix 5 – Table of Changes

REP NOS	SPD SECTION, PARAGRAPH &	CHANGE TO SPD
4995	Section 1.0 Paragraph 1.2	1.2 The Cambridge Local Plan states: The vision for Cambridge is of a compact, dynamic City with a thriving historic core surrounded by attractive and accessible greenspaces. It will continue to develop as a centre of excellence and world leader in the fields of higher education and research and it will foster the dynamism, prosperity and further expansion of the knowledge-based economy. It will also grow in importance as a Sub-regional centre for a wide range of services. The Local Plan for Cambridge seeks to guide and facilitate growth in a sensitive and sustainable manner, ensuring that the high environmental quality of the City is protected and enhanced and that future developments offer a full range of opportunities to all its citizens.
4995	Section 1.0 Paragraph 1.5	1.5 The vision for public art aims to drive forward these aspirations. In doing so it must have regard to the community, the place, the technologically its innovative culture, the artists and the art itself. As part of the Council's commitment to supporting the arts in Cambridge the vision for public art in Cambridge is:
4975	Section 2.0 Paragraph 2.1	2.1 The purpose of the document is to provide further detail about adopted policies in the Cambridge Local Plan and the Cambridge East and North West Cambridge Area Action Plans as set out in paragraph 3.8. The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will be used in the determination of planning applications.
4928 5015 4996 5017 5007 5019 5008 5033 5010	Section 3.0 Title	<i>We have moved the Policy Section forward in the document to become the new Section 3.0 and Revised the title from 'Policy Background' to 'Policy Context', in response to reps about policy, highlighting its importance for securing public art contributions. We have moved back the original Section 3.0 to become the new Section 5.0</i>

4928 4996 5008 5017	Section 3.0 Paragraph 3.3	3.3 ODPM Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations sets out the framework for S106 obligations, including explaining the policies and providing guidance on the use of planning obligations. Public art sought through S106 agreement must be in accordance with the Circular (see also paragraph 9.1 and 9.2).
5008		<p>5.7 3.8 Support for public art is identified in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in citywide policy 3/7; • as a requirement of development in the urban extensions, policy 9/3; and • within the Station Area, policy 9/9; • is included as a development principle in the Cambridge East Area Action Plan (2008) Policy CE/2 and • within the North West Area Action Plan (2009) Policy NW22 <p>3.9 Public art is also included as a development principle in the Cambridge East Area Action Plan (2008) Policy CE/2 and the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan (2009) Policy NW22.</p>
5008	Section 3.0 Table 3.1	<p>Figure 53.1 Local Planning Policies</p> <p>LOCAL PLAN (2006)</p> <p>CAMBRIDGE EAST AREA ACTION PLAN (2008)</p> <p>NORTH WEST CAMBRIDGE AREA ACTION PLAN (2009) NW22</p> <p>Public art will be provided as part of the development to help generate pride in the area, increase a sense of ownership, develop cultural identity, create distinction, character and identity and contribute to quality of life. The value of public art sought within the development will be at a cost equal to 1% of the construction cost of the project. A Public Art Strategy will be required to support a planning application.</p>

5008	Section 3.0 Paragraph 3.13	5.11 — The City Council is preparing an Arts and Entertainment Strategy 2008-13 to provide a framework within which the Council's resources are targeted as effectively as possible. The Strategy and this SPD will be mutually supportive.
4928 4996 5008 5017	Section 3.0 Paragraph 3.13 and 3.14	<p>The Role of Public Art as a Planning Obligation</p> <p>3.13 Insofar as the provision of public art is a requirement of planning policy, its inclusion is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and the need to deal with the impacts of new development. If public art is provided through a Section 106 planning obligation, the justification for this must address the need to deal with the impacts of new development through compensation or mitigation. All development will have in varying degrees a number of impacts, not all of which it is possible to identify in abstraction from specific schemes, but they may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the loss of existing habitat or built fabric; • changes to the appearance of an area; • changes to the social and economic character; • changes to the overall identity and sense of place; and • adverse changes to the area through less sympathetic buildings and primary impacts such as traffic generation. <p>3.14 Such impacts will be felt on the site, in the neighbourhood and more generally across the City, especially through cumulative effects. Public art can compensate through the creation of works giving visual pleasure; and mitigate the impacts, through works that help to re-establish local identity and sense of place. In this way public art can also be considered a form of community infrastructure that should be funded.</p>
4981	Section 4.0 Paragraph 4.1	4.1 The John Taylor Clock at Corpus Christi College is the most striking recent collegiate contribution.
4903	Section 4.0 Paragraph 4.2	4.2 Recent decades have seen three four important strands of public art emerging. First, the inclusion of work in commercial developments, such as at the Cambridge–Heidelberg Twinning celebration in the Grafton Centre (1990's) and the Cambridge Retail Park (2000). Second, the inclusion of public art in the

		street scene during public sector developments and improvements, such as the fossil fence at the Madingley Road Park and Ride site (1997) and the brass marguerite insets along Magdalene Street (2001). Third, the development of community based work, such as the Millennium Mosaics in Norfolk Street and the mural at Arbury Court, and fourth, institutional interest in the inclusion of strategic approaches to delivering public art in major developments, such as the Addenbrooke's (Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust) Art Strategy and the Public Art Strategy for Anglia Ruskin University.
4928 4943 4996 4920 5007 4919 5008 5028 5010 5031 5015 5017 5019 5033	Section 5.0 Title	<i>In response to reps, the Policy Section has been moved forward and become the new Section 3.0. The original Section 3.0 has become the new Section 5.0 and its title has changed to 'Public Art – Definition, Benefits and Roles'. In response to representations about the process for delivering public being too complicated or prescriptive, Sections 6 and 7 have been merged together to become a new Section 6 and text removed which was a repetition of that contained within Section 5, to simplify the document. We have changed the title of Section 5, to 'Public Art - Definition, and Benefits and Roles', to reflect the text deletions.</i> <i>We have deleted the sub section title Definitions of Public Art</i>
4887	Section 5.0 Paragraph 5.3 and 5.4	53-3 The idea of art within a physical space of a community space for public art proposals is that some proposals are developed from or informed by social activity, where the art can often involve work that is temporary and related complemented by the opportunities that exist within areas of community activity, where the process of creating art can often involve work that is temporary and related to local stories and history, building aimed at community building or purely process-led. In this way, public art can engage with a diverse audience about issues directly relevant to people's lives. A community space offers a basis for public art projects. 5.4 Within a community space, the community is also the audience and people in the audience engage differently. Someone who lives directly on a public space with an artwork will engage and have ownership of the work differently than someone who rushes through that space on his or her daily commute. Public art is for everyone, although people will react to it in different ways, one of the challenges is to develop a shared experience of good public art.
5001	Section 5.0 Paragraph 5.5	3-4 5.5 For the art to be 'public' it should normally be in the public realm to which the public has free and easy access, including public buildings (such as hospitals and community centres), paths, streets and roads, and squares, parks and open spaces. Artwork provided within the private boundary of a site, but fully visible and can be enjoyed by the public, is also considered 'public' - it is important that the art

		interacts with the space. Artwork provided within courtyards or enclosed spaces that are subject to restricted or discretionary access to the public may be considered 'public' in the sense of providing a wider enjoyment and appreciation of the area, but will generally not be considered public art for the purpose of public art procured through Section 106 agreements. The public accessibility of artworks will be considered on a case by case basis.
4926 4952 5002	Section 5.0 Paragraph 5.7	3-7 5.7 Art and art practice continually evolve. For example, digital and web-based projects may be as valid as physical projects in-forming for inclusion within public art proposals. Consequently, it is risky to try to define what art forms and functions are appropriate, whether delivered by S106 agreements or other means. Traditional, contemporary and experimental work should be supported and the choice will depend on the context and purpose (see Sections 6 and 8 7). One of the aims of this SPD is to provide criteria and a framework for debate that can address a wide range of views. A critical requirement is that the commissioned work should be original, of high quality, designed for the community and produced or facilitated by an professional artist or craftsman. In terms of delivery, projects may focus on the process as much as the product and be community based. Appropriate art works may include a combination of the following characteristics:
4977	Section 5.0 Paragraph 5.8	3-7 5.8 Table 5.1 gives examples, though not a definitive list; of the sort of work that qualifies as public art. Public art may also perform different functions, e.g. such as commemoration or the creation of landmarks, which are explained in Section 6. The Table is intended to provide an easy to interpret list of the kind of single works that will be acceptable. It is not a list of criteria. Proposals for public art will be assessed on a case by case basis by the City Council.
4926 4979 5002		3-9 5.10 For the purpose of this SPD public art will not normally include:
4886	Section 5.0 Paragraph 5.11	Benefits and Roles of Public Art 5.11 Public art provides social, economic, environmental and cultural benefits. Public art should enhance the fundamental principles of urban design, improve the quality of the built environment and provide distinction and character. Successful public art should aim to deliver benefits through the following roles: 3-10 Successful public art should aim to deliver benefits for:

4886	Section 5.0 Paragraph 5.11	3.10 5.11 The Community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>helping people to reflect on the nature of where they live or work or socialise</i>
5036	Section 5.0 Paragraph 5.11	3.10 5.11 Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Developing and enabling formal and informal learning opportunities in, and through, the arts</i>
4905	Section 5.0 Paragraph 5.11	3.10 5.11 Wellbeing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Promoting social engagement, relaxation and encouraging public health</i>
4888 4927 4929	Section 5.0 Paragraph 5.13	Achieving Quality 3.12 5.13 If this strategy for public art is to achieve its objectives, it is important that all new projects strive for high quality in original conception and execution. Public art programmes in the City must pursue best contemporary art practice. Success here will depend on clear objectives for the works, the effectiveness of the commissioning, and putting the artist at the heart of the process. Public art projects should demonstrate that must strive to show that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the proposed work is of the highest artistic quality and of enduring merit either through the physical work or the community legacy of the experience in the case of temporary and process-led work; (b) the project supports and develops both existing artists and develops emerging artistic talent; (c) the work is innovative in its intention and impact; (d) the work is sensitive and appropriate to its location and community; (e) the art works are integrated into a broad design strategy that supports its constituent parts; (f) there is a defined public benefit for the community; (g) arrangements are in place to work with the community and stakeholders (for schools or for proposals from other city institutions, this will include site users); (h) the project is technically and financially viable and can be delivered; (i) best practice principles, such as equal opportunities and sound artist/developer/Council management, are in place; and

		(j) the local and natural environment is able to absorb any additional visitors.
4902	Section 5.0 Paragraph 5.14	3.13 5.14 There are o rganisations such as Arts and Business and Commissions East who can assist all parties in achieving the best quality public art and some of these are listed in Appendix 6. Detailed guidelines for delivering public art and planning application submission requirements are contained within Appendices 2, 3 and 4. These factors are developed more fully in the Guidelines in Appendix 2.
4898 4920 4937 4942 4943 4919 5028 5031	Section 6.0 Title	<i>In response to representations about the process for delivering public being too complicated or prescriptive, sections 6 and 7 have been merged together to become a new Section 6 and text removed which was a repetition of that contained within Section 5, to simplify the document. We have changed the title of Section 6, to 'Strategic Objectives and a Spatial Strategy for Public Art in Cambridge'. We have revised the sub section title, as follows, 'Strategic Objectives for Cambridge'.</i>
4888 4927	Section 6.0 Paragraph 6.1	6.1 Art: To create public art of the highest quality, which engages people, is relevant to places and people's lives and may inspire people to create art themselves.
4898 4920 4937 4942 4943 4919 5028 5031	Section 6.0 Paragraph 6.2	6.2 The Council's strategy for public art is that, for it to be funded through the application of this SPD, it must be able to demonstrate that it addresses the strategic objectives. Off the shelf work designed simply to occupy a space and fulfil an obligation will not normally be acceptable. Properly commissioned public art should add a creative dimension to making communities and places. (Extracted from previous paragraph 6.5)
4898 4920 4937 4942 4943 4919 5028 5031	Section 6.0 Paragraph 6.2 to 6.7	Functions and Issues 6.2 — These objectives have embedded within them various layers of complexity that influence the nature of public art and the functions that it can perform, other than being purely decorative. While there may be a case for the decorative, the aim should be to combine the sensory pleasure with some deeper meaning — this is integral to the very meaning of the word 'art'. The City Council expects public art to take on these broader meanings. 6.3 — There are five community and place-making functions that can be supported by public art: (a) — Orientation — establishing and exploring the meaning of the place and community.

		<p>(b) Connection — linking the meaning and spatial aspects of the place and navigating within the place and between places.</p> <p>(c) Animation — building the activity and uses in the place.</p> <p>(d) Community — developing community identity and cohesion.</p> <p>(e) Identity — creation of a distinctive physical identity and sense of place.</p> <p>6.4 — At the same time, throughout the range of media and forms that public art may take, it can take on cross-cutting roles:</p> <p>(a) Celebration — opening up history, memory and the understanding of change.</p> <p>(b) Revelation — interrogating and exposing the unknown, unseen and unappreciated.</p> <p>(c) Promotion — exploring important issues for the community.</p> <p>(d) Interpretation — establishing features that make the place legible.</p> <p>(e) Inspiration — supporting education and promoting engagement and challenge.</p> <p>6.5 — There are many possible individual topics within each of these functions and roles. For example, we may want to celebrate people, reveal the ecology of an area, promote diversity or clarify routes by setting down landmarks. The celebration of events can help the functions of orientation, animation, community and identity, but is less relevant to connection; similarly inspiration through people supports animation, community and identity, but may do little for orientation and connection. This is not intended to be a definitive statement of all the possible individual relationships and there is some overlap, e.g. a landmark may be a feature celebrating an event, but it serves to show that public art can readily have multiple layers of meaning. The Council's strategy for public art is that, for it to be funded through the application of this SPD, it must be able to demonstrate that it addresses a clear issue in supporting one of the place-making functions. Off the shelf work designed simply to occupy a space and fulfil an obligation will not do. Properly commissioned public art should add a creative dimension to making communities and places.</p> <p>6.6 — Within the overall direction set by the vision and the objectives the functions, roles and topics can be directed towards issues that address the needs and concerns of Cambridge. Taking into account matters such as the community development, the growth agenda, climate change, Cambridge's position at the heart of the knowledge-based economy, the diverse make up of the City and its historic character, key thematic issues linking public art across the City should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identity for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ local neighbourhoods and ○ Cambridge as a whole ● Social community building ● The environment ● Diversity ● Heritage
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Innovation. <p>Existing Art Works</p> <p>6.7 Earlier sections of this SPD have recorded the importance of existing public art in Cambridge. Some of it is old or fragile or both and in need of care and conservation if it is to survive. It is not only part of the historic fabric and heritage of the City; it is also part of its identity and sense of place. Existing works should be surveyed, and responsibility for their maintenance established.</p>
4898 4920 4937 4942 4943 4919 5028 5031	Section 6.0 Paragraph 6.3	<p><i>In response to representations about the process for delivering public being too complicated or prescriptive. Sections 6 and 7 have been merged together to become a new Section 6 and text removed which was a repetition of that contained within Section 5, to simplify the document. We have changed the title of Section 6, to 'Strategic Objectives and a Spatial Strategy for Public Art in Cambridge'. We have added a new sub section title, as follows, 'Spatial Strategy for Public Art in Cambridge' before paragraph 6.3 in replacement for the Section 7 title.</i></p>
4890	Section 6.0 Paragraph 6.5	<p>6.6 6.5 Within the overall direction set by the strategic objectives for public art in Cambridge (Section 6.1), themes for public art proposals can be directed towards addressing the needs and concerns of the residents of Cambridge. Taking into account matters such as community development, the growth agenda, climate change, Cambridge's position at the heart of the knowledge-based economy, the diverse make up of the City and its historic character, key thematic issues linking public art across the City will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identity for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ local neighbourhoods; and ○ Cambridge as a whole • SocialCommunity building • The environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Climate Change ○ Sustainable living ○ Diversity ○ Heritage • Innovation
4898 4920 4937 4942	Section 6.0	<p>7.4 6.7 In order to achieve the objectives of this SPD, public art should be located where:</p> <p>(a) it is indeed public and can be enjoyed as such (see paragraph. 2.25.5);</p>

4943 4919 5028 5031	Paragraph 6.7	<p>(b) where it can achieve the strategic objectives of the strategy, including the benefits, roles and themes and roles set out in Section 5 and 6 7;</p> <p>(c) where it can reinforce other community and environmental programmes; and</p> <p>(d) it is likely to be enjoyed by a wide range of people going about their daily business, such as in a local centre, along well-used routes and at transport interchanges.</p>
4932	Section 6.0 Paragraph 6.8 and throughout document where there was a reference to Urban Extensions	<p>Urban Extensions Areas of Major Change and the Station Area</p> <p>7.5 6.8 By their very size and mixture of uses the urban extensions Areas of Major Change (see paragraph 87.4), will provide many opportunities for the creation of public art. The aspiration to develop new communities and link them with existing ones will influence the individual strategies for public art within these areas and a significant challenge will be to engage these emerging communities in the evolution of its public art strategy over several years. General spatial principles that should apply to the urban extensions Areas of Major Change are that public art should be located where:</p>
4932	Section 6.0 Footnote 6	<p>¹ The Local Plan (2006) defines Areas of Major Change as the development of urban extensions around the edge of the existing built-up area of Cambridge as well as land around Cambridge station. These areas are shown on the proposals map in the Local Plan and include: East Cambridge, Southern Fringe, Northern Fringe, Maddingley Road / Huntingdon Road, Huntingdon Road / Histon Road and the Station Area.</p>
4907	Section 6.0 Paragraph 6.9	<p>7.6 6.9 This will ensure the aims and objectives set out in this SPD and the aforementioned spatial objectives are achieved.</p>
4932 4931 4903		<p>Other Opportunities</p> <p>7.7 6.10 Outside the urban extensions Areas of Major Change and CB1, citywide opportunities related to development that are expected to come forward over the next 5-10 years include:</p> <p>(a) consolidation of retail development in the Fitzroy-Burleigh area;</p> <p>(b) development and upgrading of the Beehive Centre and the Cambridge Retail Park;</p> <p>(c) business park refurbishment and development;</p> <p>(d) University development in:</p> <p>(i) further expansion in West Cambridge</p> <p>(ii) Old Press/Mill Lane; and</p> <p>(iii) the Sidgwick site</p>

		<p>(e) the Anglia Ruskin University Campus;</p> <p>(f) public sector service improvements, especially:</p> <p>(i) health facilities such as Addenbrooke's Hospital</p> <p>(ii) schools</p> <p>(iii) libraries</p> <p>(iv) transport infrastructure; and housing sites across the City.</p>
4915 5024	<p>Section 6.0</p> <p>Paragraph 6.11 and throughout the document where there was a reference to the Public Art Initiative Fund.</p>	S106 Public Art Initiative Fund
4957	<p>Section 6.0</p> <p>Paragraph 6.12</p>	<p>7.9 6.12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority 2 In the public realm (including parks and open space) and buildings including public highways.
4906	<p>Section 6.0</p> <p>Paragraph 6.12</p>	<p>Existing Art Works</p> <p>6.7 6.15 Earlier sections of this SPD have noted the importance of existing public art in Cambridge. Some of it is old or fragile or both and in need of care and conservation if it is to survive. It is not only part of the historic fabric and heritage of the City; it is also part of its identity and sense of place. Existing works should be surveyed, and responsibility for their maintenance established by the City Council. (Previous paragraph 6.7)</p>
4908	<p>Section 6.0</p> <p>Footnote 7</p>	<p>⁷ As defined on the Local Plan Proposals Map, e.g. Cherry Hinton, Arbury Road, Barnwell Road, Norfolk Street, etc. For the purposes of the SPD the Addenbrooke's Hospital (Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust) Concourse may be considered a local centre for patients, staff and visitors because it meets some of the criteria set out in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, which defines a Local Centre.</p>

4932 4980	Section 7.0 Paragraph 7.4	<p>§ 7.4 However, there is a good case for saying that 1% is not an appropriate measure in the case of very large developments and Areas of Major Change where the capital value runs into tens or hundreds of millions of pounds and which bear very significant costs for infrastructure and other community benefits. In such cases, it is more appropriate to negotiate the level of public art support so that it is able to meet the objectives set rather than calculated from a formula. This would apply in the case of the major urban extensions Areas of Major Change⁸. (Cambridge Ease, Cambridge Medi Park/Addenbrookes, Clay Farm Showground, North West Cambridge, NIAB and CB1 at the present time) In the event of other development schemes of similar capital value coming forward in the future their position will be reviewed.</p> <p>⁸ Trumpington Meadows, Cambridge East and North West Cambridge are partly in South Cambridgeshire. South Cambridgeshire District Council's Public Art SPD is consistent with this flexible approach, which can therefore be applied to the whole development.</p>
4909 4916 4932 4980 5000 5037	Section 7.0 Paragraph 7.6	<p><i>DC Guidance 2 All major development will dedicate 1% of the construction cost of capital projects to public art. In the case of very large and complex sites and also Areas of Major Change such as: Cambridge East, Cambridge Medi Park/ Addenbrooke's 2020, Clay Farm – Showground, North West Cambridge, Trumpington Meadows, NIAB and CB1 Cambridge Station Area the contribution will be agreed by negotiation case by case, subject to meeting the policy objectives. The contribution will cover:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>artist's fees, and fabrication and installation;</i> b. <i>specialist advice and project management;</i> c. <i>public engagement and consultation costs;</i> d. <i>long term maintenance and decommissioning plan;</i> e. <i>linked promotion, community and education programmes and</i> f. <i>project evaluation costs</i>
4921 4945 4946 4949 4988 4989 4990	Section 7.0 Paragraph 7.7 to 7.9	<p>7.7 The Council recognises that there can be viability issues on sites, but there will be a presumption that new development will be required to provide S106 contributions, which includes the 1% of capital construction costs for the provision of public art. The onus is therefore on a developer to demonstrate that the overall level of the S106 package would jeopardise viability. This will require a full economic appraisal of the costs of development and of returns from the sale of housing and other properties to show what sum could be made available for the provision of public art. In all cases, 1% remains the starting point for</p>

<p>4993 4999 5014</p>		<p>any negotiations for public art, on any site.</p> <p>7.8 The appraisal should be presented on a residual land value basis taking into account all the costs of development including contributions to local infrastructure and services and the profit margin required by the developer. It should also include a valuation of the site in its existing use, not its purchase price or hope value. The appraisal should accompany the planning application or preferably form part of pre-application negotiations.</p> <p>7.9 Where the Council needs independent advice to validate a viability appraisal, the Council will expect reasonable costs to be borne by the developer. The detailed figures in the appraisal will be treated in confidence. but the conclusions will need to be reported to the Council and will be made public</p>
<p>4934 4963 5017 5018</p>	<p>Section 7.0 Paragraph 7.10</p>	<p>87.10 The City Council's preference is for the delivery of public art on site but tThere may be cases with smaller major developments where it would be inappropriate or physically impossible to include public art on the a site. In other instances of smaller schemes, the value of the 1% may be insufficient to create high quality public work that will have a significant impact on the physical or social character of the locality.</p> <p>if the 1% equivalent is less than £25,000, experience suggests it may be difficult to commission and deliver a high quality artwork, which will mitigate the impact of the new development, as well as provide an appropriate sum for its maintenance. it is highly unlikely that an artist could be commissioned to design high quality public art for this figure.</p> <p>In such cases, a contribution will normally be made to the S106 Public Art Initiative Fund (PAIF) for: the delivery of art works off-site artworks and city-wide by others; project management of the delivery of art works; for the general promotion and development of public art; and match funding of other schemes where this would achieve a significant lift in the quality of the work created. Exceptions to off-site contributions may be made where a developer can demonstrate that a high quality public art proposal can be created, which is publically accessible, mitigates the impact of the new development and includes an appropriate sum for maintenance. All proposals will be considered on a case by case basis. in small spaces, or with smaller budgets or both.</p>
<p>4934 4963 5017 5018</p>	<p>Section 7.0 Paragraph 7.11</p>	<p>7.11 The following are examples of where a public art proposal may be deemed inappropriate; they include but are not restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gated communities or developments with no public access; • development where there is no public space or opportunity for embedded artwork, which is publicly visible; and • proposals submitted late in the design process and which do not integrate effectively with the development nor provide on-site public benefit.

		The decision on the inclusion of public art within new development will be dealt with, on a case by case basis.
4934 5017	Section 7.0 Footnote 10	10 The S106 Public Art Initiative receives the commuted S106 contributions. The main objective of the S106 Public Art Initiative is to directly commission public artworks and is designed to enable the Council to clearly identify the best use of the contributions (See Section 9.0).
	Section 7.0 Paragraph 7.12	DC Guidance 3 <i>In developments where the Development Control Officer determines (in consultation with the Urban Design Team):</i> (a) <i>that it is physically impossible or considered to be inappropriate to provide on-site art works, or through a failure to meet the criteria set out in this SPD; or</i> (b) <i>the 1% of capital construction costs is less than £25,000, except where a developer can demonstrate that a public art proposal can be created which is publically accessible, mitigates the impact of the new development and includes an appropriate sum for maintenance,</i>
4912	Section 7.0 Paragraph 7.13	Pooling Contributions 7.13 Institutions, including the Universities, the colleges, schools and Cambridge University Hospitals may have a programme for development, which will be built out over a period of time and through separate planning applications. Presently, public art proposals from these institutions are coming forward on an ad-hoc basis and are related directly to single planning applications rather than forming part of a site wide strategy. As noted in paragraph 4.2, an emerging strand of public art in the City, is from institutions interested in developing strategic approaches to delivering public art in major developments. In order to support the delivery of public art with a more strategic approach, the City Council will encourage institutions to develop Public Art Strategies, based on the future programme of development, as a whole and to ‘pool’ the S106 contributions to implement and deliver the Public Art Strategy through the future build out of the individual developments. This approach ensures the aims and objectives set out in the SPD are achieved, including the strategic objectives set out in Section 6. DC Guidance 4 <i>Public art contributions may be pooled and a wider Public Art Strategy developed where:</i> (a) <i>institutional developments have a planned programme of separate development with a build out time over several years</i>

<p>4909 4910 4948 4959 5012 5023 5037</p>	<p>Section 7.0</p> <p>Paragraph 7.14 to 7.19</p>	<p>Maintenance</p> <p>8.9 All public art is subject to the ravages of time and may be the target for vandalism. Stone and metal sculptures may be very robust, while murals and ceramic work may be quite fragile and kinetic work subject to malfunction. Consequently all works will require maintenance and conservation, often over very extended periods of time and it is important to identify funding and responsibility for this.</p> <p>(a) The maintenance of public art work within the private boundary of a site provided through a S106 agreement will be the responsibility of the developer or land owner.</p> <p>(b) The maintenance of public art work in the public realm will be the responsibility of the City Council:</p> <p>(i) where this is a Council initiative, maintenance will be funded by the Council;</p> <p>(ii) where it is funded through a S106 agreement funding must be from the developer through a commuted sum within that agreement;</p> <p>(iii) projects funded through the PAIF will be maintained through the PAIF; and</p> <p>(iv) through the PAIF for existing works where funding has not been identified.</p> <p>(b) Where the City Council supports public art works on the highway they will be the responsibility of the City Council, not the Highway Authority.</p> <p>Maintenance and Decommissioning</p> <p>7.14 All public art is subject to the ravages of time and may be the target for vandalism. Stone and metal sculptures may be very robust, while murals and ceramic work may be fragile. In general, a public artwork should be designed to endure in a location, for as long as is appropriate, given the surrounding environment, other physical objects in the space, and the use the space is intended for. The City Council requires commissioned artworks to be as durable and maintenance light as possible.</p> <p>7.15 Consequently, all works will require a Maintenance Plan and a Decommissioning Plan and it is important to identify funding and responsibility for this.</p> <p>7.16 The maintenance of public art work within the private boundary of a site provided through a S106 agreement will be the responsibility of the developer or landowner.</p> <p>7.17 The maintenance of public art work in the public realm will be the responsibility of the City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where this is a City Council initiative, maintenance will be funded by the City Council;
---	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where it is funded through a S106 agreement funding must be from the developer through a commuted sum within that agreement; and • where the City Council supports public art works on the highway they will be the responsibility of the City Council, not the Highway Authority. <p>7.18 A decommissioning plan allows for changing circumstances to be taken into account, such as the change of use of a site, or user, which necessitates the decommissioning (removal, re-siting or storage) of a work. In the case of temporary artworks, the Decommissioning Plan forms an important part of the public artwork proposal submission.</p> <p>7.19 The cost of maintenance and decommissioning must be taken into account for a public art proposal and submitted to the City Council for approval. Part of the 1% contribution for the artwork will be put aside for its maintenance, up to 25 years, or for its decommissioning. This applies to public art in both the public realm and on private land. The specified period for maintenance is over 25 years, but the City Council recognises that the maintenance period will vary depending on the type of proposed artwork, e.g. embedded artwork may require maintenance in perpetuity, whereas artist designed play equipment may have a life of up to 12 years. Maintenance Plans will be agreed with the City Council on a case-by-case basis.</p>
<p>4974 4976 4982</p>	<p>Section 7.0 Paragraph 7.20</p>	<p>Development Control Procedures</p> <p>8.10 7.20 Key requirements for the successful delivery of public art projects include:</p> <p>(a) early identification of the requirement for public art to be provided;</p> <p>(b) early establishment of a three way engagement among the Council, the developer and the artist/arts consultant for individual projects requiring a Public Art Delivery Plan/Public Art Strategy;</p> <p>(c) agreement on the principles of how the public art obligation is to be fulfilled;</p> <p>(d) early liaison with stakeholders and organisations where permissions and approvals or where an Environmental Impact Assessment will be required;</p> <p>(d) (e) agreement on what documentation is to be submitted at each stage;</p>

		<p>(e) (f) agreement on the approach to community engagement; (f) (g) agreement on the procurement and delivery of the art work; and (g) (h) clear decision making procedures in compliance with policies</p>
4898 4920 4937 4942 4943 4919 5028 5031	Section 7.0 Paragraph 7.21	<p>7.21 Appendices to this SPD provide detailed advice on the best way to meet the above requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix 2 sets out guidelines on delivering public art, including the roles of stakeholders, commissioning, submission requirements for making planning applications, funding and project management. Appendix 3 outlines the minimum information required to prepare a Public Art Strategy (in the form of a table of contents), where it is required as part of an outline planning application for major development. Appendix 4 sets out a suggested process for integrating public art within new development for Outline, Reserved Matters or Full Planning applications.
4902	Section 8.0 Paragraph 8.2	<p>9.2 8.2 Support and advice can be drawn from specialists in public art. for example, Commissions East, Wysing Arts, Arts and Business and the Arts Council. Appendix 5 6 provides further information for specialist contacts, support and advice.</p>
4913 5030	Section 8.0 Paragraph 8.6	<p>The mMembership and Terms of Reference for the Public Art Panel were agreed by the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth on March 3, 2009. The Terms of Reference for the Panel are included as Appendix 5.</p>
4914	Section 8.0 Paragraph 8.7	<p>98.7 (d) interact with local and national media in the support of art policies and developments within the City.</p>
4928	Section 9.0	<p>10.1 The Draft Planning Obligation Strategy 2007 provides a framework for</p>

<p>5008 4996</p>	<p>Paragraph 9.1 to 9.2</p>	<p>securing S106 Agreements and it considers planning obligation requirements in the context of tests set out in Circular 05/2005. The circular provides advice on the role of S106 contributions and recommends that local planning authorities produce guidance for developers to ensure a consistent approach to securing those contributions. Both the draft Planning Obligation Strategy and this draft Public Art Supplementary Planning Document are a response to this requirement.</p> <p>10.2 The circular advises that contributions can either be in kind or in the form of financial contribution. Where a developer commutes the S106 public art contribution to the Public Art Initiatives Fund, the contributions will be used to improve the visual and cultural environment of the settlement in which it is located. Where this is not appropriate or possible, the contributions will be sought for projects which may be delivered across the city.</p> <p>9.1 The Draft Planning Obligation Strategy 2007 provides a framework for securing S106 Agreements and it considers planning obligation requirements in the context of tests set out in Circular 05/2005. For the purposes of this SPD the Circular allows contributions to be secured through obligations to compensate for 'loss or damage created by a development' or 'to mitigate a development's impact' (paragraph. B3). This is subject to complying with five tests (paragraphs B8-B10):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the obligation is relevant to planning; 2. what is sought or offered is necessary from a planning point of view; 3. the obligation is directly related to the proposed development; 4. what is sought is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and 5. the obligation must be reasonable in all other respects. <p>The Circular also provides advice on the role of S106 contributions and recommends that local planning authorities produce guidance for developers to ensure a consistent approach to securing those contributions. Both the draft Planning Obligation Strategy and this Public Art Supplementary Planning Document are consistent with, and a response to, these requirements.</p> <p>9.2 The Circular advises that contributions can either be in kind or in the form of a financial contribution. Where a developer commutes the S106 public art contribution to the S106 Public Art Initiative, the contributions will (wherever possible) be used to improve the visual and cultural environment within a reasonable proximity to the original development and to mitigate the impact of that new development. Where this is not appropriate or possible, the contributions will be sought for projects, which will provide a wider community benefit.</p>
----------------------	-----------------------------	---

5024	Section 9.0 Paragraph 9.5	<p>109.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • care and maintenance of existing work.
4915	Section 9.0 Paragraph 9.8	<p>10.8 9.8 Consideration of the proposal for approval for funding from the PAIF will involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) submission of a preliminary proposal (including funding schedule) for first stage funding from the S106 Public Art Initiative PAIF (b) initial screening by officers to confirm compliance with the SPD (c) engagement with the local public (d) consultation with Ward Councillors and the Public Art Panel (e) recommendation for approval/refusal of funding provided by officers in a report to the Environment Scrutiny Committee (f) a decision to award funding from the S106 Public Art Initiative PAIF is made by the Executive Member for Climate Change and Growth and the Environment Scrutiny Committee, as necessary. Award of funding will likely involve a two-stage process. The first stage being an award of money to further develop an approved proposal (which will occur at this time) and the second stage being that, outlined in section 10.9 below. <p>10.9 If a proposal is successful with an application for funding, the development of a detailed proposal and the release of additional funds from the PAIF will involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) engagement with the local public b) consultation with Ward Councillors and the Public Art Panel c) final approval of the detailed proposal by the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth upon recommendation by the Head of the Joint Urban Design Team
4941	Section 9.0 Paragraph 9.8	<p>9.11 A more detailed programme for the Public Art S106 Initiative will be provided by the City Council as part of a separate document, which will help deliver the objectives of this SPD.</p>

4892	Section 9.0 Paragraph 9.13	<p>10.13 9.13 The Council will encourage funding sources, other than from S106 agreements to support public art in Cambridge. Sources that may be considered for funding include the Arts Council, the Lottery, the Housing Growth Fund, South Cambridgeshire District Council (from cross-boundary developments), charitable foundations supporting the arts, endowments and benefactions for the arts and other organisations with their own public art programmes.</p>
4916	Section 9.0 Paragraph 10.2 to 10.5	<p>Review</p> <p>11.2 10.2 An annual report of this SPD will be submitted to the Environment Scrutiny Committee and Public Art Panel. The report will include an analysis of qualitative project evaluations received from commissioners of artworks. The annual report will also include quantitative project evaluations, which could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) developments eligible for public art contributions; (b) applications where public art contributions were negotiated successfully; (c) applications where public art contributions were not negotiated successfully; and (d) public art schemes approved and completed. <p>11.4 10.3 A formal review of the SPD will be submitted to the Environment Scrutiny Committee in 2014.</p> <p>11.5 10.4 The Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report will report on the delivery of public art projects as supported by policies 3/7, 9/3 and 9/9.</p> <p>Action Plan</p> <p>11.3 10.5 An Action Plan will be prepared and implemented, which contains key objectives and the practical steps necessary to implement the policy contained within this document. This will support the realisation of future high quality and innovative public art projects within Cambridge. An annual review of the Action Plan will be undertaken and reported as part of the annual report.</p>

4974 4976 4985	Appendix 2 1. Roles	<p>Other Stakeholders Working within the public realm is likely to involve a range of other stakeholders, for example the Highway Authority, utility providers and land owners where the land is not owned by the developer or the City Council. Their roles will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • setting criteria, which may influence the form or location of the work; and • issuing any consents or licenses that may be required.
4974 4976 4985	Appendix 2 2. Commissioning	<p>The Brief – The process through which the artwork is expected to be delivered should be carefully planned, preferably engaging and engage all stakeholders from the outset, who may form a steering group.</p>
4974 4976 4985	Appendix 2 2. Commissioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The working context, identify permissions and approvals required from stakeholders and other bodies and also community involvement e.g. community involvement;
4974 4976 4985	Appendix 2 2. Commissioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation – Consultation will help to establish the feasibility of a project.
4974 4976 4985	Appendix 2 2. Commissioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land owners, the Highway Authority and other bodies to establish if there are any permissions and approvals required; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the City Council; and ○ other local authorities (especially the County Council if the work is on highway land) and public bodies.
4918	Appendix 2	Public Art Strategies for Outline Planning Applications

	3. Planning Application	Developers will be required to submit Public Art Strategies as part of all Outline Planning Applications for major developments. In the case of the Growth Areas Areas of Major Change, (large sites and complex sites defined in paragraph 87.4/87.5), developers will be required to submit more detailed sStrategies.
4943	Appendix 2 3. Planning Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the commission for the artist.
4974 4976 4985	Appendix 2 6. Project Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stage 1 - Pre Project Planning and Feasibility Stage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concept is promoted Project outline is developed Identify and engage with stakeholders and other bodies Identify permissions or approvals or where an Environmental Impact Assessment will be required Appoint a project manager Establish a working group Develop project outline Establish a steering group of wider stakeholders Prepare artist's brief Select artist Stage 2 – Research and Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appoint project manager Prepare artist's brief Select artist Issue artist's contract Artist to research site and engage with the public and stakeholders Plan wider audience engagement Stage 3 – Approvals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain permissions and approvals from Stakeholders and other bodies
4918	Appendix 3 Contents of a Public Art Strategy	A Public Art Strategy is required for growth-area-or-all major development sites requiring Outline Planning Permission. Major development is defined as residential developments of 10 or more dwellings or a site area of 0.5 hectares or more, or other developments where the gross floor area is 1,000 square metres or

		<p>more, including both major new build and refurbishment where planning permission is required.</p> <p>Areas of Major Change, Large and Complex Sites</p> <p>In the case of growth areas Areas of Major Change, large sites and complex sites, some of which are listed in paragraph 8.4/8.5, developers will be required to submit more detailed strategies. The Strategy should be developed with public art expertise by a consultant and/or a commissioned lead artist prior to the Outline Planning Application. The following is the minimum information required to be submitted for any Outline Planning Application.</p>
4918	<p>Appendix 3</p> <p>Contents of a Public Art Strategy</p>	<p>For non-growth area Outline Planning Applications, which are not for Areas of Major Change, large or complex sites, the following is the minimum information required for submission as part of a Public Art Strategy:</p>
<p>4898 4920</p> <p>4937 4942</p> <p>4943</p> <p>4919</p> <p>5028</p> <p>5031</p>	<p>Appendix 4</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>(The Appendix has been separated into Outline, Reserved Matters and Full Planning Applications process.)</p>	<p>The table below sets out a suggested process for integrating public art within new development at for Outline, Reserved Matters or Full planning applications and outlines the minimum amount of information required as part of the Planning Application stages-submission. The City Council requires the developer to provide a commitment to a public consultation process in developing public art proposals.</p>
<p>4898 4920</p> <p>4937 4942</p> <p>4943</p> <p>4919</p> <p>5028</p> <p>5031</p>	<p>Appendix 4</p> <p>Outline Planning Applications</p> <p>1. PRE-OUTLINE PLANNING</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At the pre – application discussion stage, the developer contacts the Council Development Control Section. The Development Control Officer will provide the developer with a link to this SPD and other guidance and suggest that more specialist advice is sought from the Urban Design Team. 2. DC officer advises the Urban Design Team that pre-application discussions are taking place for a development, which requires the provision of public art, and arrangements are made for the Urban Design Team to attend pre-application discussions and meetings. Case officers have a preview meeting each week and at this meeting case officers are reminded by the Development Control Manager to discuss the approach to public art on the sites in question with the Urban Design Team. Matters for discussion include whether on-site or off-site provision of public art is

	<p>APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS</p>	<p>more appropriate in the context of the SPD and whether Planning Permission will be required for artworks themselves.</p> <p>3. Developer may contact the Urban Design Team for advice on provision of public art.</p> <p>4. Developer, DC case officer and the Urban Design team agree:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> if public art should be included in the development or whether a commuted sum may be more appropriate the initial indication of a budget for public art the level of detail about public art that needs to be contained in the outline application and what can be covered by a subsequent Reserved Matters Application. <p>5. For public art provision in Areas of Major Change and large or complex sites, dDevelopers should engage an arts consultant and/or lead artist (hereafter referred to as “consultant”) to be part of the design team for the scheme. The consultant should be involved as early as possible in the process. In the case of Areas of Major Change and more complex sites where a Public Art Strategy must be prepared both an arts consultant and a lead artist may be required to work in collaboration to prepare the Strategy.</p> <p>6. The appointed consultant is advised to contact the Urban Design Team who will also be able to provide information and advice.</p> <p>6. Where there is a draft submission of the Public Art Strategy, the City Council’s Public Art Panel may be requested to comment and the Panel will provide expert advice as to the acceptability of the proposals for public art.</p> <p>7. Where there is to be a mMembers briefing at the pre-application stage, the presentation should include the public art proposals.</p> <p>8. The consultant or developer engages with the local community including providing ward councillors an opportunity to make comment on the purpose and nature of the scheme. More Specific actions include: purpose and nature of the Public Art scheme</p>
--	---------------------------------------	--

		<p>a. engagement with the local community will need to be documented, this is the developer's responsibility; and</p> <p>b. early engagement with the County Council where the work might be on the highway is required.</p> <p>9. The consultant prepares a A Public Art Strategy, which outlines the nature of the artwork to be created for the development, incorporating the themes inspired from the various consultations, is prepared. Appendix 3 provides details of the minimum information required to prepare a in the Public Art Strategy.</p> <p>10. Using the information and research gathered during the initial period. The developer prepares a Design and Access Statement, which includes the Public Art Strategy.</p>
	2. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMISSION AS PART OF AN OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION	<p>11. For Areas of Major Change and complex schemes, a A Public Art Strategy will be required as part of the Outline Planning Application. As already noted in the preceding stage, Appendix 3 provides details of the minimum information required to prepare a in the Public Art Strategy.</p> <p>12. The developer submits a planning application accompanied by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a Design and Access Statement incorporating a Public Art Strategy within the development a statement of the proposed Heads of Terms of the Section 106 Agreement for public art on site or a commuted sum as agreed at the pre-application stage.
	3. CONSULTATION	<p>13. The Public Art Strategy will be included in the consultation process of the planning application and documentation should be provided.</p>
	4. REVIEW OF PUBLIC ART STRATEGY	<p>14. The Urban Design Team reviews the Public Art Strategy in the application.</p> <p>15. The Public Art Strategy is reviewed by the Public Art Panel. The Panel will provide expert advice to Development Control Officers as to the acceptability of the proposals for public art.</p> <p>16. The Urban Design Team reports on the Public Art Strategy and makes recommendations to</p>

		Development Control officers.
	5. DETERMINATION OF OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION	<p>17. The Development Control officer considers the planning application and includes the Public Art Strategy in the report for a decision by Planning Committee or under delegated powers. Planning conditions should will require the preparation of a detailed "Public Art Delivery Plan (as outlined in Appendix 2) for submission and approval prior to with the first Reserved Matters Planning application. which is a detailed action plan for what public art will be delivered on site. Wording of planning conditions should be standardised but may vary on an application by application basis. Such conditions should be discharged by the Development Control officer unless the Planning Committee determines that they should be determined by the Planning Committee itself or a Member sub group. A more detailed Public Art Delivery Plan will be required at the Reserved Matters or Full Planning Application stage and this requirement will be secured by condition.</p>
	6. SIGNING OF SECTION 106 AND GRANTING OF OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION	<p>18. Prior to planning approval being issued, the draft Heads of Terms for Planning Obligations (S106 Agreement), which includes public art, is completed by all parties. The wording of the draft Heads of Terms should be standardised but may vary on an application by application basis.</p>
4898 4920 4937 4942 4943 4919 5028 5031	<p>Appendix 4</p> <p>Reserved Matters Applications</p> <p>1. PRE-RESERVED MATTERS PLANNING APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A project team of developer, consultant and local authority will be formed to develop the process for commissioning public art. 2. The developer, and/or house builder consultant, Development Control case officer and Urban Design Team meet to consider the approach to the submission of detailed proposals for public art on site. 3. The consultant develops the Public Art Delivery Plan (The Public Art Delivery Plan requirements are explained in more detail in Appendix 2). 4. The artist engages with the local community, and including providing ward councillors the opportunity to make comment regarding on the approach and nature of the Public Art Delivery Plan. Engagement with the local community will need to be documented - this is the developer's

		<p>responsibility.</p> <p>5. At the discretion of the Development Control case officer and the Urban Design Team the draft Public Art Delivery Plan may be presented to the Public Art Panel. The Plan is reviewed by the Public Art Panel and the Panel will provide expert advice to the Development Control officer as to the acceptability of the proposals for public art.</p> <p>6. The consultant prepares concepts or examples of the artwork (or ideally the detailed proposal itself), which will be created for the development incorporating the themes inspired from the various consultations.</p> <p>7. Where there is to be a mMembers briefing at the pre-application stage, the presentation should include the public art proposals Public Art Delivery Plan.</p> <p>8. Decision to be taken on whether the proposal can be dealt with under reserved matters or needs a planning approval in its own right.</p>
	2. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMISSION AS PART OF AN RESERVED MATTERS PLANNING APPLICATION	<p>8. A Public Art Delivery Plan (in accordance with the requirements as set out in Appendix 2) is submitted as part of the Reserved Matters Planning Application). The relevant Planning Committee will expect the public art. Where a Public Art Delivery Plan proposals are is not submitted with the Planning Application, the City Council may refuse the application as being contrary to the Supplementary Planning Document.</p>
	3. CONSULTATION	<p>9. The Public Art Delivery Plan will be included in the consultation process of the planning application.</p>
	4. REVIEW OF PUBLIC ART DELIVERY PLAN	<p>10. The Urban Design Team reviews the Public Art Delivery Plan in the application.</p> <p>11. The Public Art Delivery Plan is reviewed by the Public Art Panel. Relevant Ward Members are notified by the Urban Design Team of the Panel date and are welcome to attend.</p>

		12. The Urban Design Team reports and makes recommendations to the Development Control Officer.
	5. DETERMINATION OF RESERVAED MATTERS PLANNING APPLICATION	13. The Development Control Officer considers the application and includes the Public Art Delivery Plan in the report for a decision by Planning Committee or under delegated powers. Members may call in applications subject to the Scheme of Delegation (Section I, Scheme of Delegation). Where the final detailed public art proposal public art commission has yet to be developed as part of the Public Art Delivery Plan, a condition and/or S106 schedule requiring the final detailed public art proposal commission to be approved prior to commencement of development , will be required. The Development Control Officer should discharge such conditions unless the Planning Committee determines that they should be determined by the Planning Committee itself or a mMember sub group nominated by Planning Committee sub-group . Section 14 (below) onwards in the process is then followed.
		<i>Prior to Commencement of Development</i>
	6. PRE-COMMENCEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT	<p>14. The developer is required to provide evidence of the costs of the public art artwork commission and evidence that the cost is no less than 1% of the capital construction cost of the development. This evidence must be verified by the City Council.</p> <p>15. Prior to the commencement of development on site, the public art proposal commission must be approved by the City Council. This process will involve:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a) submitting the final public art proposal to the City Council for approval- b) Consultation with relevant Ward Members, Council officers and the Public Art Panel c) Approval of proposal and discharge of condition and/or S106 schedule under delegated powers by Development Control case officer</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Where necessary, tThe Developer will engage contractors to fabricate and safely install the artwork as advised by the artist/s and technical specialists.</p> <p>16. Once public art is installed, the landowner has the responsibility for maintenance and decommissioning of the artwork, as agreed via planning condition or Section 106 obligation (refer to paragraph 8.13 7.14 Maintenance and Decommissioning).</p> <p>17. Where applicable, once any site-specific artwork/art works are completed, the developer</p>

		confirms that the public art works are ready to be transferred and the legal documents (including the decommissioning process and likely future ownership) will be prepared by legal representatives of the developers and reviewed by the City Council. Where public art is located on public land, a commuted sum will be required to fund future maintenance.
	7. PROCEDURE IN THE EVENT THAT THERE IS NO PUBLIC ART STRATEGY OR DELIVERY PLAN	18. Where public art is required in accordance with this SPD, it is unlikely that the City Council will support an application or submission for reserved matters without a Public Art Strategy or Public Art Delivery Plan. In the unlikely event that this occurs, and the City Council is minded to approve a planning application, a condition will be imposed (in addition to the standard S106 schedule) which requires the preparation and approval of at least a Public Art Delivery Plan, and approval of the final public art proposal commission prior to commencement of development before any such condition can be discharged . The steps outlined in Appendix 2 dealing with the preparation and approval of a Public Art Delivery Plan and approval of any final, detailed public art proposal commission as outlined in this appendix must be followed.
4898 4920 4937 4942 4943 4919 5028 5031	Appendix 4 Full Planning Applications 1. PRE-FULL PLANNING APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A project team of developer, consultant and local authority will be formed to develop the process for commissioning public art. 2. The developer, and/or house builder consultant, Development Control case officer and Urban Design Team meet to consider the approach to the submission of detailed proposals for public art on site or in the case of Full Planning applications, whether it would be more appropriate to commute the public art payment to the S106 Public Art Initiative PAIF. 3. The consultant develops the Public Art Delivery Plan. (The Public Art Delivery Plan requirements are explained in more detail in Appendix 2). 4. The artist engages with the local community, and including providing ward councillors the opportunity to make comment regarding on the approach and nature of the Public Art Delivery Plan. Engagement with the local community will need to be documented - this is the developer's responsibility. 5. At the discretion of the Development Control case officer and the Urban Design Team the draft

		<p>Public Art Delivery Plan may be presented to the Public Art Panel. The Plan is reviewed by the Public Art Panel and the Panel will provide expert advice to the Development Control officer as to the acceptability of the proposals for public art.</p> <p>9. The consultant prepares concepts or examples of the artwork (or ideally the detailed proposal itself), which will be created for the development incorporating the themes inspired from the various consultations.</p> <p>10. Where there is to be a mMembers briefing at the pre-application stage, the presentation should include the public art proposals Public Art Delivery Plan.</p> <p>11. Decision to be taken on whether the proposal can be dealt with under reserved matters or needs a planning approval in its own right.</p>
	2. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMISSION AS PART OF A FULL PLANNING APPLICATION	<p>8. A Public Art Delivery Plan (in accordance with the requirements as set out in Appendix 2) is submitted as part of the Reserved Matters Planning Application). The relevant Planning Committee will expect the public art. Where a Public Art Delivery Plan proposals are is not submitted with the Planning Application, the City Council may refuse the application as being contrary to the Supplementary Planning Document.</p>
	3. CONSULTATION	<p>9. The Public Art Delivery Plan will be included in the consultation process of the planning application.</p>
	4. REVIEW OF PUBLIC ART DELIVERY PLAN	<p>10. The Urban Design Team reviews the Public Art Delivery Plan in the application.</p> <p>11. The Public Art Delivery Plan is reviewed by the Public Art Panel. Relevant Ward Members are notified by the Urban Design Team of the Panel date and are welcome to attend.</p> <p>12. The Urban Design Team reports and makes recommendations to the Development Control officer.</p>

	<p>5. DETERMINATION OF FULL PLANNING APPLICATION</p>	<p>13. The Development Control Officer considers the application and includes the Public Art Delivery Plan in the report for a decision by Planning Committee or under delegated powers. Members may call in applications subject to the Scheme of Delegation (Section I, Scheme of Delegation). Where the final detailed public art proposal public art commission has yet to be developed as part of the Public Art Delivery Plan, a condition and/or S106 schedule requiring the final detailed public art proposal commission to be approved prior to commencement of development, will be required. The Development Control officer should discharge such conditions unless the Planning Committee determines that they should be determined by the Planning Committee itself or a mMember sub group nominated by Planning Committee sub-group. Section 14 (below) onwards in the process is then followed.</p>
		<p><i>Prior to Commencement of Development</i></p>
	<p>6. PRE-COMMENCEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT</p>	<p>14. The developer is required to provide evidence of the costs of the public art artwork commission and evidence that the cost is no less than 1% of the capital construction cost of the development. This evidence must be verified by the City Council.</p> <p>15. Prior to the commencement of development on site, the public art proposal commission must be approved by the City Council. This process will involve:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a) submitting the final public art proposal to the City Council for approval. b) Consultation with relevant Ward Members, Council officers and the Public Art Panel c) Approval of proposal and discharge of condition and/or S106 schedule under delegated powers by Development Control case officer</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Where necessary, tThe Developer will engage contractors to fabricate and safely install the artwork as advised by the artist/s and technical specialists.</p> <p>16. Once public art is installed, the landowner has the responsibility for maintenance and decommissioning of the artwork, as agreed in via planning condition or Section 106 obligation (refer to paragraph 8.13 7.14 Maintenance and Decommissioning).</p> <p>17. Where applicable, once any site-specific artwork/art works are completed, the developer confirms that the public art works are ready to be transferred and the legal documents (including the decommissioning process and likely future ownership) will be prepared by legal representatives of the developers and reviewed by the City Council. Where public art is located on public land, a commuted sum will be required to fund future maintenance.</p>
	<p>7. PROCEDURE IN THE</p>	<p>18. Where public art is required in accordance with this SPD, it is unlikely that the City Council will</p>

	EVENT THAT THERE IS NO PUBLIC ART STRATEGY OR DELIVERY PLAN	support an application or submission for reserved matters without a Public Art Strategy or Public Art Delivery Plan. In the unlikely event that this occurs, and the City Council is minded to approve a planning application, a condition will be imposed (in addition to the standard S106 schedule) which requires the preparation and approval of at least a Public Art Delivery Plan, and approval of the final public art proposal commission prior to commencement of development before any such condition can be discharged . The steps outlined in Appendix 2 dealing with the preparation and approval of a Public Art Delivery Plan and approval of any final, detailed public art proposal commission as outlined in this appendix must be followed.
--	---	--