



Dear Councillor

**CABINET - TUESDAY, 15 APRIL 2025**

I am now able to enclose for consideration at the above meeting the following reports that were unavailable/updated when the agenda was printed.

**Agenda Item  
No.**

**1. MINUTES (Pages 3 - 6)**

Minutes of the Extraordinary Cabinet meeting held on 19th March 2025

**6. CORPORATE PLAN REFRESH 2025 (Pages 7 - 18)**

Updated Appendix 4 following Overview and Scrutiny (Performance & Growth) and updated O&S comments.

This page is intentionally left blank

## HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Extraordinary Meeting of the CABINET held in the CIVIC SUITE (LANCASTER/STIRLING ROOMS), PATHFINDER HOUSE, ST MARY'S STREET, HUNTINGDON, PE29 3TN on Wednesday, 19 March 2025

PRESENT: Councillor S J Conboy – Chair.

Councillors L Davenport-Ray, S W Ferguson, J E Harvey, S A Howell, B A Mickelburgh, T D Sanderson, S L Taylor and S Wakeford.

### **75 MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

No declarations were received.

Advice however was sought from the Monitoring Officer with regards to Councillors S Ferguson and T D Sanderson who were both County Council Members. A debate on Local Government Reorganisation in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough had already been had at Cambridgeshire County Council on 18th March 2025 and clarity was sought on predetermination. The advice received was that if both were able to maintain an open mind then they were able to contribute to the Cabinet's discussions. Councillors S Ferguson and T D Sanderson confirmed they were able to remain open minded and remained in the room for discussion and deliberation on this item.

### **76 LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH**

A report by the Chief Executive was submitted (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) providing Members with background information regarding the extensive reforms to the local government framework across England set out in the White Paper on English Devolution published on 16th December 2024. The report intended to provide Members with an update on progress with Local Government Reorganisation for the Peterborough and Cambridgeshire area and to consider the content of a proposed letter for submission to the Government by 21st March 2025 which had been drafted in conjunction with other authorities in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough following discussions between the Councils Leaders and Chief Executives.

By way of introduction, the Executive Leader reported that this would be an opportunity for Cabinet Members to reflect back on the debate which had just been held at the Extraordinary Meeting of the Council prior to taking a decision on the matter.

The Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Waste and Street Scene commented that the concerns which had been raised at the Extraordinary Council meeting echoed her own concerns and that ultimately any decision to be made should be right for the District's residents. Whilst little time had been given for the letter to be produced, it was imperative that discussions continue over the next 7-8

months with the other Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Leaders and Chief Executive Officers.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources then took the opportunity to state that the District were not in the devolution priority programme and that any elements of angst in this respect should be set aside. He then went on to express his view that the letter intended to portray to the Government that Huntingdonshire wished to be in charge of its own destiny and to be mindful that other authorities were in different positions and therefore responding as appropriate to the Government. The example referred to at the meeting was Lincolnshire. Finally, he made comment upon the risk associated with unitary authorities which would see the dilution of local representation within communities and that efforts should be made over the next few months to prevent that from happening.

In concurring with the comments which had already been made, the Executive Councillor for Planning highlighted the potential risk of being too remote if the unitary authority covered a large area. He then expressed his contentment with the content of the proposed letter.

Having reflected upon the debate at the Extraordinary Meeting of Council, the Executive Councillor for Economy, Regeneration and Housing expressed his view that a full and helpful discussion had been held. Points which had been raised at that meeting related to the complexities around reorganisation, challenges to the Government's approach which were outside of the Council's control, the differences in local responses across the country and recognition that the proposed approach across the Peterborough and Cambridgeshire area was deemed appropriate for Huntingdonshire. He then went on to commend the Executive Leader for her diligent work on briefing all cross-party groups on the proposals as they developed and for her personal efforts in working with all Leaders across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. The Executive Councillor for Resident Services and Corporate Performance echoed these views and thanked the Executive Leader for her hard work and efforts to date.

The Executive Councillor for Resident Services and Corporate Performance then commented upon the contradictions made at the Extraordinary Meeting of the Council regarding the pace of the proposals. Views had been expressed that matters were either moving too fast or that the Council should be at the forefront of the proposals. He also concurred with the comments already made in respect of the potential loss of local representation in unitary authorities but was hopeful that innovative solutions would emerge over the coming months once the relevant data/evidence was available. He then expressed his personal view to support the content of the proposed letter.

The Executive Councillor for Climate, Transformation and Workforce reported that the debate at the Extraordinary Meeting of Council reflected her own concerns which demonstrated that the Council was moving in the right direction. She did however comment that there would be some merit in slowing down the momentum for the reorganisation but nevertheless accepted the current position.

Other points that were raised by Executive Members included a suggestion to communicate and engage with local residents on the proposals as they developed, concerns around a potential lack of diversity in the unitary authority

and the unique position Huntingdonshire and all other Cambridgeshire authorities found itself in with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.

The Executive Leader stated that she had been impressed by how much thought had gone into the proposals given the short timescales given. This included the high levels of engagement and understanding of the numerous complexities surrounding the proposals. Having expressed her wish to continue engaging with all Members and in acknowledging the challenge which remained to find the best solution for Huntingdonshire, the Executive Leader then placed on record her thanks to Officers for their forbearance.

Whereupon, the Cabinet unanimously

#### RESOLVED

- a) to consider the background to the English Devolution White Paper and its implications for residents of the District and Huntingdonshire District Council; and
- b) to delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Executive Leader of the Council, to finalise the proposed letter to Government along with other Council Leaders, as the interim submission, to indicate our commitment to work towards achieving a consensus proposal by November 2025. It should be noted, it is the Executive Leader of the Council who will sign this letter.

*The meeting concluded at 9:32pm.*

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

# 2025-26 KPI Amendment Proposals

Performance and Insights Team  
January 2025

# Foreword



This appendix is to highlight all of the key performance indicators (KPIs) that the Business Performance and Insights team recommend are tracked in the 2025-26 financial year.

Page 8 of 18

All metrics not mentioned here have had no changes made to their wording, target or tolerance since the 2024-25 financial year.

If you have any questions, please direct them to:

[performance@huntingdonshire.gov.uk](mailto:performance@huntingdonshire.gov.uk)

# Proposed KPI Changes



Performance Indicator	PI Holder	Proposed Change	Proposed Change Details	Justification
1. Number of Attendances at Active Lifestyle Programmes  And  Number of Attendances at Sport Development Activities and Programmes	Jo Peadon	Alteration	Proposed Target: 54,714	Both metrics are now under the control of the Active Lifestyles manager, so the new combined metric would show overall health of the service, rather than the health of its constituent parts.
			Proposed Tolerance: 49,243	
2. Number of One Leisure Facilities Admissions (excluding Burgess Hall and School Admissions)	Leigh Allaker & Gregg Holland	More Difficult Target	Current Target: 1,483,123	This new target is a 3% growth on the forecasted performance seen this year. This growth is expected due to the recent renovations across One Leisure sites.
			Proposed Target: 1,518,380	
			Current Tolerance: 1,334,811	
			Proposed Tolerance: 1,442,461	

# Director for People – Proposed KPI Changes



Performance Indicator	PI Holder	Proposed Change	Proposed Change Details	Justification
4. Average time (weeks) between date of referral and practical completion of jobs funded through Disabled Facilities Grants	Melanie Barnes & Claudia Deeth	More Lenient Target	Current Target: 22 Weeks	The target and tolerance would be increased to reflect the significant delays faced due to issues with our Social Landlord partners. Previous performance indicates that no targets below 28 weeks have been met in the last three years.
			Proposed Target: 28 Weeks	
			Current Tolerance: 30 Weeks	
			Proposed Tolerance: 32 Weeks	
6. Average number of days to process changes of circumstances for Housing Benefit and Council Tax support	Katie Kelly & Barnes Huggins	More Difficult Target	Current Target: 5 Days	This metric has significantly exceeded its target all year and is the best actual performance for the last three years by a significant margin. Therefore, a target change is proposed.
			Proposed Target: 4 Days	
			Current Tolerance: 7 Days	
			Proposed Tolerance: 6 Days	
7. Number of Homeless Preventions Achieved	Jon Collen	Subject to Change	Current Target: 480	* A target and tolerance for this metric cannot be predicted at this time, so while no change is currently reported, this is subject to change.
			Proposed Target: 480	
			Current Tolerance: 445	
			Proposed Tolerance: 445	

Page 10 of 18

# Director for People – Proposed KPI Changes



Performance Indicator	PI Holder	Proposed Change	Proposed Change Details	Justification
8. Number of households housed through the housing register and Home-link scheme. (cumulative)	Jon Collen	Subject to Change	Current Target: 685	* A target and tolerance for this metric cannot be predicted at this time, so while no change is currently reported, this is subject to change.
			Proposed Target:	
			Current Tolerance: 616	
			Proposed Tolerance:	
9. Number of households in Temporary Accommodation. (cumulative)	Jon Collen	Subject to Change	Current Target: 135	* A target and tolerance for this metric cannot be predicted at this time, so while no change is currently reported, this is subject to change.
			Proposed Target:	
			Current Tolerance: 148	
			Proposed Tolerance:	
12. Number of new affordable houses delivered	Frank Mastrandrea & Pamela Scott	More Difficult Target	Current Target: 292 Houses	The Local Plan and latest Housing Needs Assessment indicate that we need to build 444 affordable houses a year to meet demand, therefore this is the proposed target.
			Proposed Target: 444 Houses	
			Current Tolerance: 219 Houses	
			Proposed Tolerance: 356 Houses	

# Director for People – Proposed KPI Additions



Proposed Performance Indicator	Proposed PI Holder	Proposed Addition Justification	Proposed Details
17. Cumulative footfall in market towns (Monthly)	Rebecca Tomlin	ADDITION - This metric will highlight how attractive our market towns are and how this changes over time. This metric is also correlated to the success of the economic development team and will allow members to track the effects of their initiatives.	Target: 15,719,143 Tolerance: 14,933,185
18. Total number of business engagements by the Economic Development Team (cumulative)	Rebecca Tomlin	ADDITION - This metric will highlight to members how many local businesses are receiving advice or support from the Economic Development team. This metric will be inclusive of LinkedIn growth, newsletter signups, the number of events attended by the econ dev team and the number of businesses receiving support monthly.	Target: 420 Engagements Tolerance: 378 Engagements

Page 10



10

# Director for People – Proposed KPI Changes



Performance Indicator	PI Holder	Proposed Change	Proposed Change Details	Justification
25. Sanctions against environmental crimes and anti-social behaviour.	Robert Mitchell & Anthony Hayes	Alteration	Current Target: 12 Fines	It is proposed that this metric replaces PI 24 (enforcements against Fly-tips). This change better reflects the role of the service and will highlight their activity in countering environmental crime and anti-social behaviour.
			Proposed Target: 100 Sanctions	
			Current Tolerance: 10 Fines	
			Proposed Tolerance: 90 Sanctions	
26. The number of programmed food safety inspections undertaken (cumulative)	Kate Penn & Claudia Deeth	Subject to Change	Current Target: 612	* A target and tolerance for this metric cannot be predicted at this time, so while no change is currently reported, this is subject to change.
			Proposed Target:	
			Current Tolerance: 581	
			Proposed Tolerance:	
27. Percentage of calls to Contact Centre answered (cumulative)	Michelle Greet & Cedric Gough-Goodman	More Difficult Target	Current Target: 80%	The percentage of calls answered has not dipped below 86% since June 2023 and the Call Centre has gained many new full time staff members. This new target also brings us closer in line with our peers.
			Proposed Target: 85%	
			Current Tolerance: 72%	
			Proposed Tolerance: 80%	

# Director for People – Proposed KPI Changes



Performance Indicator	PI Holder	Proposed Change	Proposed Change Details	Justification
28. Average wait time for customers calling the Contact Centre (cumulative)	Michelle Greet & Cedric Gough-Goodman	More Difficult Target	Current Target: 600 Seconds	Previous performance significantly exceeds the current target (by 150 seconds) and the tolerance (by 450 seconds). This target would also bring us closer in line with the targets of our peers.
			Proposed Target: 300 Seconds	
			Current Tolerance: 240 Seconds	
			Proposed Tolerance: 180 Seconds	

Proposed Performance Indicator	Proposed PI Holder	Proposed Addition Justification	Proposed Details
29. Customer Satisfaction (Contact Centre)	Michelle Greet & Cedric Gough-Goodman	ADDITION - This new metric would track the monthly satisfaction of people who call the contact centre. The average c-sat score in gov call centres is between 73-79%, therefore we propose a target of 75% and a tolerance of 65%. The target and tolerance may be subject to change once the initial data is collected and reviewed.	Target: ~75% Satisfaction
			Tolerance: ~65% Satisfaction

# Director for People – Proposed KPI Changes



Performance Indicator	PI Holder	Proposed Change	Proposed Change Details	Justification
34. Staff turnover percentage per individual month)	Leanne Harfield & Ryan Roden	More Lenient Target	Current Target: 1.2% (+/- 0.2%)	Turnover is increasing nationally and is on average between 2.0-2.8% in English local governments. Uncertainty from the LGR and expiring contracts are expected to drive turnover further. Therefore, it is proposed that the margins be widened.
			Proposed Target: 1.5 (+/- 0.25%)	
			Current Tolerance: 0.6-1.8%	
			Proposed Tolerance: 0.75-2.25%	

Proposed Performance Indicator	Proposed PI Holder	Proposed Addition Justification	Proposed Details
35. Average length of service (years)	Leanne Harfield & Ryan Roden	ADDITION - This metric would supplement KPI 34 by highlighting if we are retaining our experience. This would be especially valuable during a potentially high turnover period. This should be reported quarterly. Currently, we have an average length of service of 9.6 years, and this typically changes by about 0.5 every year. Therefore, the target will be to retain this 9.6 years of average experience and the tolerance will be 9 years.	<p>Target: 9.6 Years</p> <p>Tolerance: 9.0 Years</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

## **CORPORATE PLAN REFRESH 2025**

### **COMMENTS OF OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL (PERFORMANCE AND GROWTH)**

- 1.1 The Overview and Scrutiny (Performance & Growth) Panel discussed the report at its meeting on 2nd April 2025.
- 1.2 Councillor Pitt expressed concern over the proposed measurement of Corporate Plan Action 3 being number of business engagements achieved by the Economic Development Team, following which the Panel heard that it was acknowledged that measuring the quality of engagement was important but difficult to do, it was noted that this measurement would be reviewed prior to finalisation.
- 1.3 Councillor Martin was appreciative of the earlier timeframe of the report than in previous years. In response to a question from Councillor Martin relating to Corporate Plan Action 29, the Panel heard that this metric would be reviewed to consider futureproofing new homes to allow for changes in mobility of residents throughout their life. The Panel also heard, following a further question from Councillor Martin regarding Corporate Plan Action 39, that the Council had ambition to influence others and that the possibility of including the Alconbury Weald train station within this KPI would be investigated.
- 1.4 Councillor Jennings observed that the new target for KPI 1 was too easy when taking past figures into account. In response to which, the Panel heard that whilst the Council was reluctant to set more lenient targets, it was important that the targets be realistic, however this target would be reviewed in line with the recently available quarter 4 figures and adjusted if necessary. Councillor Jennings further questioned the target achievability and wording of KPI 27, following which the Panel heard that the team had requested the revised target in order to push themselves but it was acknowledged that pushing too hard could prove counter productive, it was noted that the wording would be reviewed.
- 1.5 The Panel heard, in response to a question from Councillor Chapman, that the Local Plan looks at ensuring a balance of identified housing needs would be met with future development and that the new Local Plan would be informed by the evidence gathered.
- 1.6 Councillor Corney expressed concern that once in place, the support for Public Space Protection orders was minimal. The Panel were assured that the PSPOs were only implemented where the Police had assured support would be available and that a breakdown in what is achieved by these orders could be included.
- 1.7 In response to a question from Councillor Catmur regarding risks that Local Government Reform may pose to KPIs, the Panel heard that a business as usual approach had been adopted and that necessary

adjustments would be made as required as LGR progressed. It was further noted that this would be managed by the Local Plan Advisory Group.

- 1.8 The Panel heard that identified points would be reviewed with the appropriate teams and that outcomes to the points raised in the meeting would be communicated back to the Panel in due course.
- 1.9 Following the discussion, the Panel were informed that their comments would be added to the Cabinet report in order for an informed decision to be made on the report recommendations.