

**CABINET - THURSDAY, 16 JUNE 2016**

---

**LATE AGENDA ITEM(S)**

---

- 5. HUNTINGDONSHIRE LOCAL PLAN TO 2036 QUARTERLY UPDATE AND INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING UPDATE**
- ADDENDUM TO THE REPORT
  - COMMENTS FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (ECONOMY AND GROWTH)

This page is intentionally left blank

## AGENDA ITEM NO.5

### HUNTINGDONSHIRE LOCAL PLAN TO 2036 QUARTERLY UPDATE AND INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING UPDATE

#### ADDENDUM TO THE REPORT

Please note that the following paragraph has been omitted from the report between paragraphs 5.2 - A428: Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet Improvement and 5.3 - A1: Oxford to Cambridge Expressway and East West Rail.

#### **‘A1: M25 to Peterborough.**

**The DfT and HE are taking this forward with Stakeholders, inc. HDC, as one of six Strategic Studies across England. Options and ideas are currently being developed with partners and this will culminate in a range of recommendations emerging from DfT by the end of 2016, with preferred options published for community consultation and engagement. Discussions to date have included the potential need for a new offline route, including at Buckden, to address current delays, congestion and safety issues as well as tying into the emerging Oxford to Cambridge Expressway scheme. Any final outcomes will inform the Govt. Roads Investment Strategy 2 and subject to a scheme approval, this could be delivered as part of Roads Period 2 from April 2020 onwards.’**

#### **COMMENTS FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (ECONOMY AND GROWTH) – 14th June 2016**

The Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Economy and Growth) was presented with a report updating them on the Huntingdonshire Local Plan To 2036 and Infrastructure Planning.

The Panel noted that the revalidation of the Cambridge Sub-Regional Model (CSRM) traffic model by consultants for the County Council would not be complete until the end of June 2016 and will then need further checking to test accuracy despite reassurances that it would be complete by May 2016.

Members were informed that the delay has had an adverse effect on the timetable for the delivery of the Local Plan. It has also impaired the Council’s ability at being able to predict how proposed developments would affect specific locations.

The Panel agreed that out of the two options presented to them, the Cabinet should endorse Option B of waiting for the revalidated CSRM to be made available. Members noted that it would not benefit the Council in working with a model that is flawed as the outcomes from the model would also be flawed.

Members want to advise the Cabinet that they believe that pressure should continue to be applied to the County and they must not slow progress on the revalidation of the CSRM. This must be a priority as any further delay would have a greater detrimental impact upon the delivery of the Local Plan.

This page is intentionally left blank