

**Cheltenham Borough Council**  
**Cabinet – 6<sup>th</sup> December**  
**Public Art Working Group Review**

<b>Accountable member</b>	<b>Councillor Andrew McKinlay, Cabinet Member Leisure and Culture</b>
<b>Accountable officer</b>	<b>Wilf Tomaney – Urban Design Manager</b>
<b>Accountable scrutiny committee</b>	<b>Social and Community</b>
<b>Ward(s) affected</b>	<b>All</b>
<b>Key Decision</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	At its July meeting, the Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a report from a Working Group established to consider Public Art provision in the Borough. It resolved to recommend the Groups findings to the Cabinet.
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p><b>1 That the Cabinet endorse the recommendations of the Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee in respect of the Public Art Review Working Groups findings – as set out in Appendix 2.</b></p> <p><b>2 That the Cabinet agrees the appointments method to the Public Art Panel identified in Paragraph 3.4 of this report.</b></p>

<b>Financial implications</b>	<p>As detailed throughout Appendix 2 (Public Art Working Group report 11<sup>th</sup> July 2011) with specific reference to 1.25 to 1.30 of the report. The Working Group's recommendations is that there should be a sustainable funding strategy for all public art projects. Projects should be entirely self-funding with the whole cost of a project (including "peripheral" items such as selection of art work, project management, landscape, long-term maintenance etc.) being identified early in the project and funded through a properly managed budget.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Sarah Didcote,</b>  <b>sarah.didcote@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264125</b></p>
<b>Legal implications</b>	<p>There are no direct legal implications as a result of this report. One Legal input may be required on a specific project basis.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Donna Ruck, Solicitor</b>  <b>donna.ruck@tewkesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272969</b></p>

<b>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</b>	<p>The administration of a regular cycle of Public Art Panel meetings may have implications on officer capacity. Some time is already spent on this function under the current arrangements, however clarity will be needed as to whether the new arrangements will significantly alter the current time commitment.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Amanda Attfield, amanda.attfield@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264186</b></p>
<b>Key risks</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is a risk to the Council's reputation if Public Art is either not delivered or its delivery is badly managed.</li> <li>2. There is a risk of not achieving some Civic Pride objectives if the Council cannot deliver Public Art effectively and efficiently – this may have knock on impacts on environmental quality, economic function of the town centre etc.</li> </ol>
<b>Corporate and community plan Implications</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ability to deliver Public Art impacts on a number of Corporate Strategy Improvement Actions 2010 – 2011 across a range of objectives, principally: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Environment:</b> Cheltenham's natural and built environment is enhanced and protected.</li> <li><b>Economy:</b> We attract more visitors and investors to Cheltenham.</li> <li><b>Arts and Culture:</b> Arts and culture are used as a means to strengthen communities, strengthen the economy and enhance and protect our environment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. As part of a wider strategic approach to the environment, public art can also deliver on Corporate Strategy outcomes aimed at safer communities and encourage low carbon travel.</li> </ol>
<b>Environmental and climate change implications</b>	<p>No direct impacts resulting from this report.</p>

### **3. Background**

- 3.1 At its July meeting Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a report from a the Public Art Review Working Group – which it had established to consider the processes, policies and procedures associated with delivering public art in the Borough.
- 3.2 Appendix 2 contains the report of the Working Group and details its findings – which were based around a more formalised operating procedure for the Council's long-established Public Art Panel and the appointment of a lay-chair.
- 3.3 The Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee resolved to recommend the findings to Cabinet; its Minutes are at Appendix 3.
- 3.4 At O&S Committee there was discussion of how various appointments would be made to the Panel. It is suggested that the following mechanisms are used:
  - a The core of the Panel as identified in the review report (Appendix 2, para 1.13) already exists, with individuals on the Panel representing an organisation. It is suggested that if any of these leaves the Panel, the relevant organisation is invited to nominate another representative.
  - b The Review recommends the appointment of a public art advisor. It is suggested that nominations are sought by local advert and direct approaches to suitably qualified or experienced people locally. The Public Art Panel would then shortlist, interview and appoint.
  - c Community co-optees will be sought from local community organisations (formal or informal as appropriate) – according to the nature or location of the project.
  - d The independent chair would be drawn from within the core lay-membership of the group.

### **4. Reasons for recommendations**

- 4.1 To improve the policy and delivery environment around public art in the Borough.

### **5. Alternative options considered**

- 5.1 The recommendations result from a series of wide-ranging discussions over four meetings which addressed a range of issues and considered various approaches to resolving issues.

### **6. Consultation and feedback**

- 6.1 The Working Group included a representative from the Civic Society, a lay-member of the O&S Social & Community Committee and Borough and County Councillors.

### **7. Performance management –monitoring and review**

- 7.1 The report represent the findings a review process. It included input from a Project Manager on delivery and process issues.

<b>Report author</b>	<b>Contact officer: Wilf Tomaney,</b> <b>wilf.tomaney @cheltenham.gov.uk,</b> <b>01242 264145</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Risk Assessment</li><li>2. Public Art Review Working Group – Final Report</li><li>3. Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee 11<sup>th</sup> July 2011 - Minutes</li></ol>
<b>Background information</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.</li></ol>

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk				
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Impact 1-4	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
	Reputational risk if Public Art is either not delivered or its delivery is badly managed.	Urban Design Manager	August 2010	2	3	6	Reduce	Establish proper project management and funding arrangements	To be confirmed	Urban Design Manager	
	Risk of failing on Civic Pride objectives if the Council cannot deliver Public Art effectively and efficiently	Urban Design Manager	August 2010	2	3	6	Reduce	Establish proper project management and funding arrangements	To be confirmed	Urban Design Manager	

**Explanatory notes**

**Impact** – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-4 (4 being the greatest impact)

**Likelihood** – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6 (6 being most likely)

Impact Description	Impact score	Probability	Likelihood Description	Likelihood Score
Negligible	<u>1</u>	0% - 5%	Almost impossible	<u>1</u>
Marginal	<u>2</u>	5% - 15%	Very low	<u>2</u>
Major	<u>3</u>	15% - 30%	Low	<u>3</u>
Critical	<u>4</u>	30% - 60%	Significant	<u>4</u>
		60% - 90%	High	<u>5</u>
		> 90%	Very high	<u>6</u>

**Control** - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close