

Dear Councillor

**COUNCIL - WEDNESDAY, 23 FEBRUARY 2011**

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

**Agenda Item  
No.**

**6. MEDIUM TERM PLAN, 2011/12 BUDGET AND ASSOCIATED MATTERS (Pages 1 - 8)**

To consider the Cabinet's recommendations on the Medium Term Plan for 2012/16, the 2011/12 Budget, related Prudential Indicators and the Treasury Management Strategy (see also the Report of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 17th February 2011) and, in accordance with Section 30 (2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, to approve resolutions as to the levels of council tax in 2011/12 for the various parts of Huntingdonshire District.

A report by the Head of Financial Services is enclosed.

(Members are requested to note that the information contained in Appendix C should be treated as confidential at this stage. The formal resolution which forms part of Appendix C is to follow.)

**7. HEAD OF PAID SERVICE AND CHIEF OFFICER - DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES (Pages 9 - 26)**

To consider a report by the Head of Democratic and Central Services on refinements to the disciplinary arrangements for senior officers and consequential arrangements to the Council's Constitution - to follow.

(a) Cabinet (Pages 27 - 64)

Report of the meeting to be held on 17th February 2011 - to follow.

This page is intentionally left blank

## UPDATE – BUDGET 2011/12 AND MEDIUM TERM PLAN 2012 to 2016

### Government Formula Grant (RSG)

The figures contained in the published report were based on the consultation figures issued by the Government. Having considered the comments made during the consultation period the Government has made some changes:

	Included in Report	Revised Figure	Difference
2011/12 Actual	£10,449k	£10,522k	<b>£73k gain</b>
2012/13 Provisional	£9,296k	£9,288k	<b>£8k loss</b>

### New Homes Reward Grant

The consultation period ended on Christmas Eve and the proposed allocation was announced on the 17 February. The reduction is due to the Government not including the social housing supplement for year one because they wish to use more contemporary data which requires a delay to year two.

	Included in Report	Revised Figure	Difference
2011/12	£940k	£832k	<b>£108k loss</b>

### Surplus on Collection Fund

The surplus is greater than expected:

	Included in Report	Revised Figure	Difference
2011/12	£53k	£105k	<b>£52k gain</b>

**It is proposed that the minor net variations to the budget are balanced by adjusting the use of Revenue Reserves.**

The recommendations to the report should therefore be modified as follows:

#### The Cabinet is asked to recommend to Council:

- That the budget and MTP be adjusted to reflect the above changes by adjusting the use of Revenue Reserves and that the Director of Commerce and Technology be authorised to carry out these adjustments following the Council meeting.
- Approval of the proposed MTP, budget and Financial Plan (Annexes B, C & D) subject to the adjustments referred to above.

This page is intentionally left blank

## FORMAL 2011/12 COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTIONS

- a) That the following amounts be calculated by the Council for 2011/12 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992 (the Act):-

	£
(i) the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2) (a) to (e) of the Act <b>Gross revenue expenditure including benefits and Town/Parish Precepts</b>	<b>86,989,423</b>
(ii) the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32 (3) (a) to (c) of the Act <b>Gross revenue income including reimbursement of benefits, special grants and use of reserves</b>	<b>64,446,217</b>
(iii) the amount by which the aggregate at (a) (i) above exceeds the aggregate at (a) (ii) above in accordance with Section 32 (4) of the Act <b>Budget requirement plus Parish/Town Precepts (item i minus item ii)</b>	<b>22,543,206</b>
(iv) the aggregate of the amounts payable into the General Fund for the items set out in Section 33 (1) of the Act. <b>Government support</b>	<b>10,522,100</b>
(v) the aggregate of the amounts payable from the General Fund for the items set out in Section 33 (3) of the Act <b>Collection Fund surplus</b>	<b>104,903</b>
(vi) the basic amount of Council Tax for 2011/12 in accordance with Section 33 (1) <b>District plus average Town/Parish Council Tax</b>	<b>200.41</b>
(vii) the aggregate of special items referred to in Section 34 (1) <b>Total Town and Parish Council precepts</b>	<b>4,533,055</b>
(viii) the basic amount of Council Tax for 2011/12 for those parts of the District to which no special item relates <b>District Council Tax</b>	<b>124.17 per band D property</b>

- (ix) the basic amounts of Council Tax for 2011/12 for those parts of the District to which one or more special items relate in accordance with Section 34 (3) of the Act are shown by adding the Huntingdonshire District Council amount to the appropriate Parish Council amount in column "band D" set out in table 1 attached.
  - (x) the amounts to be taken into account for 2011/12 in respect of categories of dwellings listed in the different valuation bands in accordance with Section 36 (1) of the Act are shown by adding the Huntingdonshire District Council amount to the appropriate Parish Council amount for each of the valuation bands in the columns "bands A to H" set out in table 1 attached.
- (b) That the amounts of precept issued to the Council by Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridgeshire Police Authority and Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Fire Authority for each of the categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands in accordance with Section 40 of the Act shown in table 1 attached be noted.
- (c) That, having regard to the calculations above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30 (2) of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the figures shown in table 2 as the amounts of Council Tax for 2011/12 for each of the categories of dwelling shown.

<b>TABLE 1</b>	<b>BAND A £</b>	<b>BAND B £</b>	<b>BAND C £</b>	<b>BAND D £</b>	<b>BAND E £</b>	<b>BAND F £</b>	<b>BAND G £</b>	<b>BAND H £</b>
Cambridgeshire County Council	698.52	814.94	931.36	1047.78	1280.62	1513.46	1746.30	2095.56
Cambridgeshire Police Authority	113.04	131.88	150.72	169.56	207.24	244.92	282.60	339.12
Huntingdonshire District Council	82.78	96.58	110.37	124.17	151.76	179.36	206.95	248.34
Cambridgeshire Fire Authority	38.58	45.01	51.44	57.87	70.73	83.59	96.45	115.74
<b>PARISH COUNCILS :-</b>								
Abbotsley	36.46	42.54	48.61	54.69	66.84	79.00	91.15	109.38
Abbots Ripton	48.72	56.84	64.96	73.08	89.32	105.56	121.80	146.16
Alconbury	36.30	42.35	48.40	54.45	66.55	78.65	90.75	108.90
Alconbury Weston	24.15	28.18	32.20	36.23	44.28	52.33	60.38	72.46
Alwalton	13.33	15.56	17.78	20.00	24.44	28.89	33.33	40.00
Barham & Woolley	13.33	15.56	17.78	20.00	24.44	28.89	33.33	40.00
Bluntisham	76.70	89.48	102.27	115.05	140.62	166.18	191.75	230.10
Brampton	63.32	73.87	84.43	94.98	116.09	137.19	158.30	189.96
Brinton & Molesworth	17.86	20.84	23.81	26.79	32.74	38.70	44.65	53.58
Broughton	21.96	25.62	29.28	32.94	40.26	47.58	54.90	65.88
Buckden	43.03	50.21	57.38	64.55	78.89	93.24	107.58	129.10
Buckworth	34.17	39.87	45.56	51.26	62.65	74.04	85.43	102.52
Bury	30.20	35.23	40.27	45.30	55.37	65.43	75.50	90.60
Bythorn & Keyston	2.82	3.29	3.76	4.23	5.17	6.11	7.05	8.46
Catworth	35.93	41.92	47.91	53.90	65.88	77.86	89.83	107.80
Chesterton	5.75	6.70	7.66	8.62	10.54	12.45	14.37	17.24
Colne	38.09	44.44	50.79	57.14	69.84	82.54	95.23	114.28
Conington	12.79	14.92	17.05	19.18	23.44	27.70	31.97	38.36
Covington	22.77	26.56	30.36	34.15	41.74	49.33	56.92	68.30
Denton & Caldecote	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Diddington	23.81	27.77	31.74	35.71	43.65	51.58	59.52	71.42
Earith	42.53	49.61	56.70	63.79	77.97	92.14	106.32	127.58
Easton	29.33	34.22	39.11	44.00	53.78	63.56	73.33	88.00
Ellington	25.86	30.17	34.48	38.79	47.41	56.03	64.65	77.58
Elton	24.94	29.10	33.25	37.41	45.72	54.04	62.35	74.82
Farcet	68.91	80.39	91.88	103.36	126.33	149.30	172.27	206.72
Fenstanton	30.83	35.96	41.10	46.24	56.52	66.79	77.07	92.48
Folksworth & Washingley	45.99	53.66	61.32	68.99	84.32	99.65	114.98	137.98
Glatton	12.44	14.51	16.59	18.66	22.81	26.95	31.10	37.32
Godmanchester	38.06	44.40	50.75	57.09	69.78	82.46	95.15	114.18
Grafham	30.94	36.10	41.25	46.41	56.72	67.04	77.35	92.82
Great & Little Gidding	57.56	67.15	76.75	86.34	105.53	124.71	143.90	172.68
Great Gransden	26.37	30.77	35.16	39.56	48.35	57.14	65.93	79.12
Great Paxton	26.13	30.48	34.84	39.19	47.90	56.61	65.32	78.38
Great Staughton	24.61	28.72	32.82	36.92	45.12	53.33	61.53	73.84
Haddon	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hail Weston	43.40	50.63	57.87	65.10	79.57	94.03	108.50	130.20
Hamerton & Steeple Gidding	6.41	7.48	8.55	9.62	11.76	13.90	16.03	19.24

<b>TABLE 1 Cont.</b>	<b>BAND A £</b>	<b>BAND B £</b>	<b>BAND C £</b>	<b>BAND D £</b>	<b>BAND E £</b>	<b>BAND F £</b>	<b>BAND G £</b>	<b>BAND H £</b>
Hemingford Abbots	31.31	36.53	41.75	46.97	57.41	67.85	78.28	93.94
Hemingford Grey	28.09	32.77	37.45	42.13	51.49	60.85	70.22	84.26
Hilton	30.37	35.44	40.50	45.56	55.68	65.81	75.93	91.12
Holme	22.41	26.14	29.88	33.61	41.08	48.55	56.02	67.22
Holywell-cum-Needingworth	68.71	80.16	91.61	103.06	125.96	148.86	171.77	206.12
Houghton & Wyton	46.91	54.73	62.55	70.37	86.01	101.65	117.28	140.74
Huntingdon	72.65	84.75	96.86	108.97	133.19	157.40	181.62	217.94
Kimbolton & Stonely	55.63	64.91	74.18	83.45	101.99	120.54	139.08	166.90
Kings Ripton	32.13	37.48	42.84	48.19	58.90	69.61	80.32	96.38
Leighton Bromswold	32.10	37.45	42.80	48.15	58.85	69.55	80.25	96.30
Little Paxton	38.37	44.76	51.16	57.55	70.34	83.13	95.92	115.10
Morborne	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offord Cluny & Offord D'Arcy	47.53	55.45	63.37	71.29	87.13	102.97	118.82	142.58
Old Hurst	29.51	34.43	39.35	44.27	54.11	63.95	73.78	88.54
Old Weston	15.69	18.30	20.92	23.53	28.76	33.99	39.22	47.06
Perry	25.45	29.69	33.93	38.17	46.65	55.13	63.62	76.34
Pidley-cum-Fenton	20.00	23.33	26.67	30.00	36.67	43.33	50.00	60.00
Ramsey	36.78	42.91	49.04	55.17	67.43	79.69	91.95	110.34
St.Ives	70.17	81.87	93.56	105.26	128.65	152.04	175.43	210.52
St.Neots	56.15	65.51	74.87	84.23	102.95	121.67	140.38	168.46
Sawtry	49.13	57.31	65.50	73.69	90.07	106.44	122.82	147.38
Sibson-cum-Stibbington	34.92	40.74	46.56	52.38	64.02	75.66	87.30	104.76
Somersham	58.82	68.62	78.43	88.23	107.84	127.44	147.05	176.46
Southoe & Midloe	50.00	58.33	66.67	75.00	91.67	108.33	125.00	150.00
Spaldwick	28.69	33.48	38.26	43.04	52.60	62.17	71.73	86.08
Stilton	42.46	49.54	56.61	63.69	77.84	92.00	106.15	127.38
Stow Longa	30.77	35.89	41.02	46.15	56.41	66.66	76.92	92.30
The Stukeleys	23.93	27.91	31.90	35.89	43.87	51.84	59.82	71.78
Tilbrook	18.18	21.21	24.24	27.27	33.33	39.39	45.45	54.54
Toseland	13.51	15.77	18.02	20.27	24.77	29.28	33.78	40.54
Upton & Coppingford	19.61	22.87	26.14	29.41	35.95	42.48	49.02	58.82
Upwood & the Raveleys	26.13	30.48	34.84	39.19	47.90	56.61	65.32	78.38
Warboys	39.41	45.98	52.55	59.12	72.26	85.40	98.53	118.24
Waresley-cum-Tetworth	13.70	15.98	18.27	20.55	25.12	29.68	34.25	41.10
Water Newton	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Winwick	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wistow	31.01	36.17	41.34	46.51	56.85	67.18	77.52	93.02
Woodhurst	21.27	24.82	28.36	31.91	39.00	46.09	53.18	63.82
Woodwalton	29.41	34.32	39.22	44.12	53.92	63.73	73.53	88.24
Wyton-On-The-Hill	31.33	36.55	41.77	46.99	57.43	67.87	78.32	93.98
Yaxley	54.29	63.34	72.39	81.44	99.54	117.64	135.73	162.88
Yelling	9.39	10.95	12.52	14.08	17.21	20.34	23.47	28.16



TABLE 2	TOTAL CHARGES							
	BAND	BAND	BAND	BAND	BAND	BAND	BAND	BAND
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Abbotsley	969.38	1130.95	1292.50	1454.07	1777.19	2100.33	2423.45	2908.14
Abbots Ripton	981.64	1145.25	1308.85	1472.46	1799.67	2126.89	2454.10	2944.92
Alconbury	969.22	1130.76	1292.29	1453.83	1776.90	2099.98	2423.05	2907.66
Alconbury Weston	957.07	1116.59	1276.09	1435.61	1754.63	2073.66	2392.68	2871.22
Alwalton	946.25	1103.97	1261.67	1419.38	1734.79	2050.22	2365.63	2838.76
Barham & Woolley	946.25	1103.97	1261.67	1419.38	1734.79	2050.22	2365.63	2838.76
Bluntisham	1009.62	1177.89	1346.16	1514.43	1850.97	2187.51	2524.05	3028.86
Brampton	996.24	1162.28	1328.32	1494.36	1826.44	2158.52	2490.60	2988.72
Brington & Molesworth	950.78	1109.25	1267.70	1426.17	1743.09	2060.03	2376.95	2852.34
Broughton	954.88	1114.03	1273.17	1432.32	1750.61	2068.91	2387.20	2864.64
Buckden	975.95	1138.62	1301.27	1463.93	1789.24	2114.57	2439.88	2927.86
Buckworth	967.09	1128.28	1289.45	1450.64	1773.00	2095.37	2417.73	2901.28
Bury	963.12	1123.64	1284.16	1444.68	1765.72	2086.76	2407.80	2889.36
Bythorn & Keyston	935.74	1091.70	1247.65	1403.61	1715.52	2027.44	2339.35	2807.22
Catworth	968.85	1130.33	1291.80	1453.28	1776.23	2099.19	2422.13	2906.56
Chesterton	938.67	1095.11	1251.55	1408.00	1720.89	2033.78	2346.67	2816.00
Colne	971.01	1132.85	1294.68	1456.52	1780.19	2103.87	2427.53	2913.04
Conington	945.71	1103.33	1260.94	1418.56	1733.79	2049.03	2364.27	2837.12
Covington	955.69	1114.97	1274.25	1433.53	1752.09	2070.66	2389.22	2867.06
Denton & Caldecote	932.92	1088.41	1243.89	1399.38	1710.35	2021.33	2332.30	2798.76
Diddington	956.73	1116.18	1275.63	1435.09	1754.00	2072.91	2391.82	2870.18
Earith	975.45	1138.02	1300.59	1463.17	1788.32	2113.47	2438.62	2926.34
Easton	962.25	1122.63	1283.00	1443.38	1764.13	2084.89	2405.63	2886.76
Ellington	958.78	1118.58	1278.37	1438.17	1757.76	2077.36	2396.95	2876.34
Elton	957.86	1117.51	1277.14	1436.79	1756.07	2075.37	2394.65	2873.58
Farcet	1001.83	1168.80	1335.77	1502.74	1836.68	2170.63	2504.57	3005.48
Fenstanton	963.75	1124.37	1284.99	1445.62	1766.87	2088.12	2409.37	2891.24
Folksworth & Washingley	978.91	1142.07	1305.21	1468.37	1794.67	2120.98	2447.28	2936.74
Glatton	945.36	1102.92	1260.48	1418.04	1733.16	2048.28	2363.40	2836.08
Godmanchester	970.98	1132.81	1294.64	1456.47	1780.13	2103.79	2427.45	2912.94
Grafham	963.86	1124.51	1285.14	1445.79	1767.07	2088.37	2409.65	2891.58
Great & Little Gidding	990.48	1155.56	1320.64	1485.72	1815.88	2146.04	2476.20	2971.44
Great Gransden	959.29	1119.18	1279.05	1438.94	1758.70	2078.47	2398.23	2877.88
Great Paxton	959.05	1118.89	1278.73	1438.57	1758.25	2077.94	2397.62	2877.14
Great Staughton	957.53	1117.13	1276.71	1436.30	1755.47	2074.66	2393.83	2872.60
Haddon	932.92	1088.41	1243.89	1399.38	1710.35	2021.33	2332.30	2798.76
Hail Weston	976.32	1139.04	1301.76	1464.48	1789.92	2115.36	2440.80	2928.96
Hamerton & Steeple								
Gidding	939.33	1095.89	1252.44	1409.00	1722.11	2035.23	2348.33	2818.00
Hemingford Abbots	964.23	1124.94	1285.64	1446.35	1767.76	2089.18	2410.58	2892.70
Hemingford Grey	961.01	1121.18	1281.34	1441.51	1761.84	2082.18	2402.52	2883.02
Hilton	963.29	1123.85	1284.39	1444.94	1766.03	2087.14	2408.23	2889.88

TABLE 2 Cont.	TOTAL CHARGES							
	BAND	BAND	BAND	BAND	BAND	BAND	BAND	BAND
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Holme	955.33	1114.55	1273.77	1432.99	1751.43	2069.88	2388.32	2865.98
Holywell-cum-Needingworth	1001.63	1168.57	1335.50	1502.44	1836.31	2170.19	2504.07	3004.88
Houghton & Wyton	979.83	1143.14	1306.44	1469.75	1796.36	2122.98	2449.58	2939.50
Huntingdon	1005.57	1173.16	1340.75	1508.35	1843.54	2178.73	2513.92	3016.70
Kimbolton & Stonely	988.55	1153.32	1318.07	1482.83	1812.34	2141.87	2471.38	2965.66
Kings Ripton	965.05	1125.89	1286.73	1447.57	1769.25	2090.94	2412.62	2895.14
Leighton Bromswold	965.02	1125.86	1286.69	1447.53	1769.20	2090.88	2412.55	2895.06
Little Paxton	971.29	1133.17	1295.05	1456.93	1780.69	2104.46	2428.22	2913.86
Morborne	932.92	1088.41	1243.89	1399.38	1710.35	2021.33	2332.30	2798.76
Offord Cluny & Offord								
D'Arcy	980.45	1143.86	1307.26	1470.67	1797.48	2124.30	2451.12	2941.34
Old Hurst	962.43	1122.84	1283.24	1443.65	1764.46	2085.28	2406.08	2887.30
Old Weston	948.61	1106.71	1264.81	1422.91	1739.11	2055.32	2371.52	2845.82
Perry	958.37	1118.10	1277.82	1437.55	1757.00	2076.46	2395.92	2875.10
Pidley-cum-Fenton	952.92	1111.74	1270.56	1429.38	1747.02	2064.66	2382.30	2858.76
Ramsey	969.70	1131.32	1292.93	1454.55	1777.78	2101.02	2424.25	2909.10
St.Ives	1003.09	1170.28	1337.45	1504.64	1839.00	2173.37	2507.73	3009.28
St.Neots	989.07	1153.92	1318.76	1483.61	1813.30	2143.00	2472.68	2967.22
Sawtry	982.05	1145.72	1309.39	1473.07	1800.42	2127.77	2455.12	2946.14
Sibson-cum-Stibbington	967.84	1129.15	1290.45	1451.76	1774.37	2096.99	2419.60	2903.52
Somersham	991.74	1157.03	1322.32	1487.61	1818.19	2148.77	2479.35	2975.22
Southoe & Midloe	982.92	1146.74	1310.56	1474.38	1802.02	2129.66	2457.30	2948.76
Spaldwick	961.61	1121.89	1282.15	1442.42	1762.95	2083.50	2404.03	2884.84
Stilton	975.38	1137.95	1300.50	1463.07	1788.19	2113.33	2438.45	2926.14
Stow Longa	963.69	1124.30	1284.91	1445.53	1766.76	2087.99	2409.22	2891.06
The Stukeleys	956.85	1116.32	1275.79	1435.27	1754.22	2073.17	2392.12	2870.54
Tilbrook	951.10	1109.62	1268.13	1426.65	1743.68	2060.72	2377.75	2853.30
Toseland	946.43	1104.18	1261.91	1419.65	1735.12	2050.61	2366.08	2839.30
Upton & Coppingford	952.53	1111.28	1270.03	1428.79	1746.30	2063.81	2381.32	2857.58
Upwood & the Raveleys	959.05	1118.89	1278.73	1438.57	1758.25	2077.94	2397.62	2877.14
Warboys	972.33	1134.39	1296.44	1458.50	1782.61	2106.73	2430.83	2917.00
Waresley-cum-Tetworth	946.62	1104.39	1262.16	1419.93	1735.47	2051.01	2366.55	2839.86
Water Newton	932.92	1088.41	1243.89	1399.38	1710.35	2021.33	2332.30	2798.76
Winwick	932.92	1088.41	1243.89	1399.38	1710.35	2021.33	2332.30	2798.76
Wistow	963.93	1124.58	1285.23	1445.89	1767.20	2088.51	2409.82	2891.78
Woodhurst	954.19	1113.23	1272.25	1431.29	1749.35	2067.42	2385.48	2862.58
Woodwalton	962.33	1122.73	1283.11	1443.50	1764.27	2085.06	2405.83	2887.00
Wyton-On-The-Hill	964.25	1124.96	1285.66	1446.37	1767.78	2089.20	2410.62	2892.74
Yaxley	987.21	1151.75	1316.28	1480.82	1809.89	2138.97	2468.03	2961.64
Yelling	942.31	1099.36	1256.41	1413.46	1727.56	2041.67	2355.77	2826.92

---

## **Head of Paid Service and Chief Officers Disciplinary Procedures**

### **Report by the Head of Democratic and Central Services**

---

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Arising from the adoption by the Employment Panel of a redundancy scheme and voluntary release scheme on 27th September 2010, a number of decisions were taken by the Panel and by the Council on 3rd November 2010 to amend existing procedures to deal with the implications for heads of service and above. This included revisions to the Officer Employment Procedure Rules in the Council's constitution and the broadening of the remit of the Appointments Panel and its reconstitution as the Employee Selection Panel to make provision for the dismissal of officers at these grades under the redundancy scheme.
- 1.2 The Employment Panel also made provision for an extension of the Council's grievance procedure to include the head of paid service and chief officers but no change was made in terms of disciplinary arrangements.
- 1.3 The Employment Panel approved a revised disciplinary policy and procedure at its meeting held on 25th May 2010 but this specifically excludes chief officers. As a result of the foregoing, it is apparent that further changes to the Council's rules and procedures are advisable to ensure that the appropriate procedures are in place for those officers and the head of paid service.

#### **2. DISCIPLINARY POLICY AND PROCEDURE**

- 2.1 The Council's revised policy and procedure applies to all employees at head of service level and below. Chief officers employed under the Joint Negotiating Committee for Chief Officers of Local Authorities Conditions of Service have a separate procedure and are specifically excluded from the Council's policy. Similarly the Head of Paid Service is employed under separate arrangements, in this case the Joint Negotiating Committee Conditions of Service for Local Authority Chief Executives.
- 2.2 Turning first to chief officers, their JNC conditions of service contain provisions relating to discipline, capability and redundancy. In terms of discipline, the conditions of service refer to a procedure that should be tailored to the needs of each local authority and contain a model procedure for use by individual authorities. The conditions of service and model procedure are extremely broad and do not contain the depth of detail required to deal with any incidents that may arise. Nor

does it match the provisions of the Officer Employment Procedure Rules in the constitution. The Council's own disciplinary policy and procedure is based upon the ACAS guide for discipline and grievances at work and apply the principles contained in the JNC conditions of service with a few exceptions where the latter contain special provisions for chief officers.

- 2.3 With regard to the head of paid service, the JNC conditions of service for chief executives are very detailed and specify the actions to be taken in virtually all circumstances that may arise. There is therefore no need to introduce further change. However the conditions of service do refer to the need for various delegations etc. to be in place in the event that they are needed.
- 2.4 A further anomaly has arisen in that the disciplinary policy and procedure adopted by the Employment Panel for all employees does not make provision for the protection afforded in law to certain statutory posts if these are occupied by heads of service, i.e. the chief finance officer and monitoring officer. One of those is currently filled by a head of service.
- 2.5 In the absence of a specific disciplinary policy for chief officers other than the model contained in the JNC conditions of service, it is recommended that the Council's own policy and procedure be extended to apply to chief officers, subject to the amendments contained in Appendix A attached. At the same time, an opportunity should be taken to amend the policy and procedure to incorporate the special provisions that apply to statutory post holders (with the exception of the head of paid service) which again are specified in Appendix A.
- 2.6 To ensure that the necessary processes are in place to deal with the application of the disciplinary arrangements for the head of paid service, various delegations are required and these are explained in Appendix B.

### **3. OFFICER EMPLOYMENT PROCEDURE RULES**

- 3.1 Closer examination of the disciplinary arrangements for chief officers and heads of service has demonstrated that there are anomalies between those policies and procedures and the provisions of the Officer Employment Procedure Rules. The latter, for example, state that disciplinary action in respect of chief officers and heads of service may be taken by the Employment Panel whereas the disciplinary policy and procedure specify other arrangements. In order to ensure consistency, it is proposed that the Officer Employment Procedure Rules be amended in accordance with the proposals contained in Appendix C attached.
- 3.2 The changes proposed will necessitate a further extension of the role of the Employee Selection Panel and its re-designation with the suggested name of Senior Officers Panel. Similar changes will be required to the role of the Appeals Sub Group. These are explained in Appendix C.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

- 4.1 It has become apparent that a number of decisions of a procedural nature need to be taken by the Council to ensure that the appropriate disciplinary arrangements are in place for the senior management of the Council. These are itemised in the attached appendices.

#### **5. RECOMMENDATION**

- 5.1 It is therefore

#### **RECOMMENDED**

**that the recommendations contained in Appendices A to C attached to this report be approved.**

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The Council's disciplinary policy and procedure

The model disciplinary procedure and guidance to the procedure contained in the Joint Negotiating Committee terms and conditions of service for Chief Executives

The Joint Negotiation Committee for Chief Officers constitution, conditions of service and salaries.

The Council's constitution.

The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations 2001.

**Contact Officer:** Roy Reeves, Head of Democratic and Central Services  
☎ 01480 388003

This page is intentionally left blank

**CHIEF OFFICERS AND HEADS OF SERVICE IN STATUTORY POSTS  
DISCIPLINARY POLICY AND PROCEDURE**

**1. GENERAL**

- 1.1 Paragraph 3.4 of the Council’s disciplinary policy and procedure currently states that ‘Chief officers employed under the terms of the JNC for Chief Officers or other local authorities’ national agreements have separate procedures, and are excluded from this policy’.
- 1.2 **It is recommended that this paragraph be substituted by the statement ‘Chief Officers are employed under the terms of the JNC for Chief Officers conditions of service which contain provisions relating to discipline, capability and redundancy. This policy replaces the model procedure for disciplinary arrangements contained in the JNC terms and conditions, subject to the provisions contained in Appendix 7 of this policy.’**
- 1.3 Paragraph 9.3 of the Council’s disciplinary policy and procedure lists the appendices attached to the disciplinary policy. **It is recommended that ‘Appendix 7 - Special provisions for chief officers’ be added to the list.**

**2. APPENDIX 2**

- 2.1 Section 5 of Appendix 2 of the disciplinary policy deals with the suspension of an employee but omits any definition as to who has the authority to do so. **It is recommended that the following paragraph be added to that section –**

**‘5.3. The suspension of an employee may be undertaken as follows –**

<b>Employee Group</b>	<b>Responsibility for Suspension</b>
<b>Up to and including Grade 7</b>	<b>Activity Manager or designated officer</b>
<b>Activity Manager</b>	<b>Head of service or designated officer</b>
<b>Head of service</b>	<b>Director or designated officer</b>
<b>Chief officer</b>	<b>Senior Officer Panel.’</b>

- 2.2 Paragraph 6.3 of Appendix 2 of the policy specifies the arrangements for disciplinary hearings by line managers and Members. **Another row is recommended as an addition to the table to deal with the situation for chief officers –**

Employee Group	Investigatory Meetings(s)	Disciplinary Hearing	Appeal	Final Appeal
Chief Officers	Head of Paid Service	Senior Officers Panel††	Appeals Sub Group	No further appeal

2.3 A footnote will need to be added to the table as follows –

‘†† The Senior Officers Panel shall comprise 4 Members of the Council and the relevant executive councillor in relation to the post.’

2.4 Special arrangements apply to the posts of head of paid service, chief finance officer and monitoring officer under the provisions of the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations 2001. One of those positions is currently undertaken by a head of service. It is therefore recommended that the reference to heads of service in the table in paragraph 6.3 be accompanied by the symbol † and the following footnote added below the table –

‘† Special provisions apply in the case of a head of service who has been appointed as the Council’s chief finance officer or monitoring officer which are contained in Appendix 7.’

2.5 Paragraph 7.6.4 of Appendix 2 deals with the sanction levels as a result of disciplinary hearings. A further line in the table is recommended to deal with chief officers as follows –

Employee Group	Verbal & Written Warning	Final Warning	Dismissal
Chief officers†	Senior Officers Panel	Senior Officers Panel	Senior Officers Panel

2.6 It is also recommended that the head of service group in that table should have the symbol † attached and a footnote added below the table as follows –

‘† Officers filling the positions of chief finance officer or monitoring officer are subject to the special provisions contained in Appendix 7.’

### 3. APPENDIX 7

3.1 It is recommended that a new Appendix 7 be added to the policy as follows –

‘Appendix 7

#### 1.0 Application

1.1 This disciplinary policy and procedure applies to chief officers, subject to the provisions of this appendix. This



appendix also applies to heads of service who have been appointed as chief finance officer or monitoring officer.

- 1.2 In the case of chief officers, this policy replaces the model disciplinary procedure contained in the JNC for Chief Officers for Local Authorities terms and conditions. All other aspects of part 4 of those terms and conditions relating to discipline, capability and redundancy remain unaltered.

## **2.0 Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer**

- 2.1 No disciplinary action in respect of the chief finance officer or monitoring officer, except suspension, may be taken by the Council or a panel of the Council other than in accordance with a recommendation in a report made by a designated independent person under regulation 7 of the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations 2001 (investigation of alleged misconduct).

- 2.2 The designated independent person must be such person as may be agreed between the Council and the chief finance officer or monitoring officer ('the relevant officer'), or in the default of such agreement, nominated by the Secretary of State. The designated independent person –

- (i) may direct –
  - (a) that the Council terminates any suspension of the relevant officer;
  - (b) that any such suspension must continue after the expiry of the period of two months;
  - (c) that the terms on which any such suspension has taken place must be varied in accordance with the direction; or
  - (d) that no steps (whether by the Council or a panel of the Council) towards disciplinary action or further disciplinary action against the relevant officer, other than steps taken in the presence or with the agreement of the designated independent person, are to be taken before a report is made by the designated independent person;
- (ii) may inspect any documents relating to the conduct of the relevant officer which are in the possession of the Council, or which the Council has power to authorise him to inspect;
- (iii) may require any member of staff of the Council to answer questions concerning the conduct of the relevant officer;
- (iv) must make a report to the Council –

- (a) stating his opinion as to whether (and, if so, the extent to which) the evidence he has obtained supports any allegation of misconduct against the relevant officer; and
  - (b) recommending any disciplinary action which appears to him to be appropriate for the Council to take against the relevant officer; and
- (v) must, no later than the time at which he makes his report, send a copy to the relevant officer.

### **3.0 Suspension**

**3.1 A chief officer or a head of service appointed as chief finance officer or monitoring officer may be suspended for the purpose of investigating the alleged misconduct occasioning the action. Any such suspension must be on full pay and terminate no later than 2 months later than the day on which the suspension takes effect.**

### **4.0 Chief Officers**

**4.1 A chief officer will receive not less than 10 working days written notice of the meeting of the Senior Officers Panel. Before the meeting the chief officer has the right, if so requested, within a reasonable time (i) to receive further details of the complaint made and/or (ii) to a postponement of the meeting for a jointly agreed period not exceeding 14 days. The chief officer may circulate a written statement to the Senior Officers Panel before the meeting.**

**4.2 As a result of a hearing, the Senior Officers Panel can –**

- (i) exonerate the chief officer;
- (ii) state its opinion as to whether (and if so the extent to which) the evidence it has obtained supports any allegation of misconduct against the chief officer;
- (iii) determine the disciplinary action (if any) or range of actions which appear appropriate to take against the chief officer. The appropriate course of action will be drawn from the following list:-
  - (a) recorded verbal warning;
  - (b) written warning;
  - (c) final written warning;
  - (d) suspension on half pay or no pay for a specified period;
  - (e) relegation (i.e. a reduction in salary) for a specified period;
  - (f) an invitation to resign or accept retirement;
  - (g) dismissal with notice.

- 4.3 The final decision will be given to the chief officer in writing at the earliest opportunity.**
- 4.4 In the event of a decision to dismiss a chief officer, such action will be subject to the provisions of Part II of Schedule I of the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations 2001.**
- 4.5 If a warning is given, it should tell the chief officer –**
- (i) the level of improvement required;**
  - (ii) the date by which it is to be achieved;**
  - (iii) what will happen if it is not;**
  - (iv) how to appeal.**
- 4.6 Alternatively, the Panel may explore other alternatives, e.g.**
- (i) early retirement;**
  - (ii) secondment;**
  - (iii) redeployment to a more junior post where there are issues relating to capability.**
- 4.7 In the case of a chief officer submitting an appeal against a decision of the Senior Officers Panel, the appeal will be dealt with by the Appeals Sub Group in accordance with the terms of reference of that Sub-Group set out in Appendix 6 of the disciplinary policy and procedure.**
- 4.8 The decision of the Appeals Sub Group shall be final.’**

This page is intentionally left blank

**HEAD OF PAID SERVICE  
DISCIPLINARY POLICY AND PROCEDURE**

**1. GENERAL**

- 1.1 A model disciplinary procedure and guidance to the procedure forms part of the conditions of service of the Council's head of paid service, a post currently filled by the Chief Executive. It contains the principal elements of the Council's own disciplinary policy and procedure but deals with the particular circumstances of the post of head of paid service and the unique relationship that this places the post holder in with the authority.
- 1.2 Because of the extent of detail contained in the model procedure, there is no need for further change to enable it to be implemented should the occasion arise. However the model procedure itself should be adopted by the Council for the purpose of disciplinary matters in relation to the head of paid service and appropriate delegations should be in place to authorise various actions to be taken by the Council.

**2. MODEL PROCEDURE**

- 2.1 **It is recommended therefore that the model procedure contained in the JNC terms and conditions of service for Chief Executives be adopted for the officer filling the post of head of paid service and the following sentence added as paragraph 3.5 of the Council's own disciplinary policy and procedure – 'The head of paid service (Chief Executive) is employed under the terms of the Joint Negotiating Committee for Chief Executives conditions of service which contain a model procedure that has been adopted by the Council and the holder of that post is therefore excluded from this policy.**

**3. ROLE OF THE SENIOR OFFICERS PANEL**

- 3.1 The model procedure recommends that a standing committee be in place, referred to in the document as the Investigating and Disciplinary Committee, with specific terms of reference to undertake the actions provided for in the procedure.
- 3.2 **It is recommended that this role be filled by the Senior Officers Panel and that all references in the procedure to the Investigatory and Disciplinary Committee denote that panel.** In accordance with the provisions of the model procedure, **it is recommended that the terms of reference of the Senior Officers Panel be extended to include the following –**
- **To undertake the role of the Investigatory and Disciplinary Committee as set out in the JNC terms and conditions of employment for the head of paid service;**

- To appoint the Designated Independent Person to undertake an investigation and to determine the terms, remuneration and working methods for the person appointed;
- To suspend the head of paid service for a period not exceeding two months;
- To negotiate and agree a financial settlement with the head of paid service in the event of the mutual termination of the contract of employment;
- To appoint any such external advisers as may be necessary to provide professional and independent advice in the event of an investigation involving the head of paid service;
- To undertake any disciplinary action involving the head of paid service, including consideration of the report by the Designated Independent Person.

#### **4. APPEAL PROCESS**

- 4.1 Where disciplinary action is taken by the Senior Officers Panel, an appeal process must be established. In the event of disciplinary action being taken other than dismissal, the model procedure makes provision for an appeal to an Appeals Committee. **It is therefore recommended that this role be filled by the Council's existing Appeals Sub Group as set out in Appendix 6 of the Council's disciplinary policy and procedure and that all references in the model procedure to the Appeals Committee denote that Sub Group, with the decision of the Sub Group being final.**
- 4.2 If dismissal is proposed by the Senior Officers Panel, this decision can only be taken by the full Council in accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations 2001. The JNC terms and conditions state that the consideration by the Council should constitute the appeal process for the head of paid service. This course of action is already provided for in the Officer Employment Procedure Rules contained in the constitution.

#### **5. FURTHER DELEGATION**

- 5.1 The model procedure for the head of paid service also proposes that, in the event of immediate suspension being considered desirable prior to it being possible to convene a meeting of the Investigatory and Disciplinary Committee, an elected Member such as the committee chairman be authorised to take action. The model procedure itself acknowledges that disciplinary action is a council and not an executive function. As such, delegation is not permissible to an individual councillor. It would place an officer of the Council in a very invidious position if he were to be authorised to suspend the head of paid service, even if this were to be undertaken after consultation with the

chairman of the Senior Officers Panel. **It is recommended therefore that suspension remains the role of the Senior Officers Panel.**

- 5.2 Finally, the model procedure indicates that there should be a clear route into the disciplinary procedure in the case of allegations against the head of paid service. As proposed in the procedure, **it is recommended that the monitoring officer, after consultation with the Chairman of the Senior Officers Panel, be authorised to oversee referrals to the Panel in such circumstances.**

This page is intentionally left blank



**OFFICER EMPLOYMENT PROCEDURE RULES  
AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR COUNCIL FUNCTIONS**

**1. GENERAL**

- 1.1 Changes will be required to the constitution both in terms of the Officer Employment Procedure Rules and the terms of reference of the Employee Selection Panel set out in Table 2 of Part 3 which deals with the responsibility for Council functions.

**2. OFFICER EMPLOYMENT PROCEDURE RULES**

- 2.1 The Rules were amended by Council as recently as the meeting of 3rd November 2010 to extend the remit of the former Appointments Panel to provide for the dismissal of employees at head of service level and above as a result of the introduction of the redundancy and voluntary release schemes. The Panel was re-named as the Employee Selection Panel.
- 2.2 Closer examination has indicated that further minor changes are required to make provision for disciplinary action for heads of service and above.
- 2.3 The first sentence of paragraph B.1 of the Rules states that 'Disciplinary action in respect of the head of paid service, monitoring officer and chief finance officer may be taken only by the full Council or a panel of the Council appointed for that purpose. **It is recommended that the following words be added to the sentence – 'in accordance with the Council's disciplinary policy and procedure and their terms and conditions of employment'**.
- 2.4 The paragraph goes on to state that no disciplinary action, other than suspension, may be taken other than 'in accordance with' a recommendation in a report by a designated independent person. The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations 2001 require the Council to appoint an independent person to investigate alleged misconduct in the case of the head of paid service, chief finance officer and monitoring officer and for that person to report to the Council recommending any disciplinary action which appears to him to be appropriate against the relevant officer. This implies that the Council has discretion as to the appropriate course of action it may take, as opposed to the way in which the current paragraph in the Officer Employment Procedure Rules is worded which states that the disciplinary action should be 'in accordance with' the recommendation. **It is recommended therefore that the second sentence of paragraph B.1 be amended so that it states 'No disciplinary action, other than suspension, may be taken except after consideration of a recommendation in a report made by a designated independent person under Regulation 7 of the Local**

**Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations 2001 (investigation of alleged misconduct).'**

- 2.5 Paragraph B.1 also states that the head of paid service, chief finance officer and the monitoring officer may be suspended by the Council or a panel for the purpose of investigating alleged misconduct. For clarity, **it is recommended that the appropriate panel is the Senior Officers Panel and its terms of reference broadened accordingly.**
- 2.6 Paragraph B.2 of the Rules refers to disciplinary action against other chief officers and heads of service. It simply states 'Disciplinary action in respect of other chief officers and heads of service may be taken by the Employment Panel.' As the full range of sanctions in the case of disciplinary action is not available to that panel, **it is recommended that the sentence be replaced by the following – 'Disciplinary action against other chief officers and heads of service (with the exception of those to which paragraph B.1 applies) shall be dealt with under the Council's disciplinary policy and procedures and their terms and conditions of service. In the case of suspension, such action may be taken by the Senior Officers Panel.'**
- 2.7 The Council's disciplinary policy and procedure (as amended by this report) makes provision for the dismissal of chief officers and heads of service following a hearing by the Senior Officers Panel. Part C of the Rules deals with the dismissal of senior officers and makes provision for Cabinet notification in the case of the head of paid service, chief officers and heads of service (paragraph C.4). The requirement for Cabinet notification will also apply in the case of disciplinary action.

**3. PART 3, TABLE 2 – RESPONSIBILITY FOR COUNCIL FUNCTIONS**

- 3.1 The terms of reference of the Employee Selection Panel are listed in Table 2 of Part 3 of the Council's constitution. Arising from the clarification in terms of suspension of heads of service and above, **it is recommended that the Employee Selection Panel be re-named as the Senior Officers Panel and its terms of reference, as listed in Table 2, extended to include the following –**

**'To suspend chief officers and heads of service in accordance with the Officer Employment Procedure Rules and the Council's disciplinary policy and procedure'; and**

**'To undertake hearings and take any disciplinary action in the case of chief officers and heads of service as provided by the Council's disciplinary policy and procedure'.**

- 3.2 The determination of an appeal against a decision made by or on behalf of the authority is a local choice function in accordance with regulations made under the Local Government Act 2000. Table 1 of Part 3 of the constitution provides for this to be a Council as opposed to an executive function and for this to be dealt with by a politically balanced Appeals Sub Group comprising 5 Members. Its terms of reference in the context of disciplinary matters are explained in Appendix 6 of the Council's disciplinary policy and procedure.

- 3.3 For the avoidance of doubt, it would be preferable if the Appeals Sub Group were to be added to the list of committees/panels etc. in Table 2 of Part 3 which explains how the Council has delegated its functions and responsibilities. **It is therefore recommended that the following be added to Table 2 –**

<b>COMMITTEE/PANEL</b>	<b>MEMBERSHIP</b>	<b>FUNCTIONS</b>
<b>Appeals Sub Group</b>	<b>5 Members appointed by the Chief Executive from a Panel appointed by the Council (subject to no members appointed to the sub group hearing an appeal who has been involved in the decision against which the appeal has been submitted</b>	<p><b>To determine appeals by employees under the Council's disciplinary policy and procedure</b></p> <p><b>To fill the role as the appeal process for chief officers under the model disciplinary procedure contained in the JNC for Chief Officers of Local Authorities Conditions of Service</b></p> <p><b>To act as the appeal committee (in the case of disciplinary action other than dismissal) provided for in the model disciplinary procedure and guidance contained in the JNC terms and conditions for Local Authority Chief Executives</b></p>

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## **Cabinet**

### **Report of the meeting held on 17th February 2011**

---

---

#### **Matters for Decision**

---

#### **57. BUDGET 2011/12 AND MEDIUM TERM PLAN 2012/16**

The Cabinet has considered the content of the 2011/12 draft budget, Medium Term Plan for the period 2012/16 and the level of Council Tax for 2011/12. The details are contained in Appendix A to the report by the Head of Financial Services reproduced at agenda item no 6 on the Council agenda. A further update on the financial position together with the formal resolution on Council Tax levels is being circulated separately in advance of the Council meeting.

In discussing the latest government grant figures, Executive Councillors' attention was drawn to an increase in the Government Formula Grant (RSG) support of £73,000 in 2011/12 reducing to a loss of £8,000 in the 2012/13 provision. Conversely the New Homes Reward Grant for 2011/12 was £108,000 less than expected which was due to the Government not including the social housing supplement for the first year in advance of the use of more contemporary data.

With regard to the award of grants to voluntary organisations, the Cabinet has reiterated the Council's financial commitment to the voluntary sector until 2013/14. In the interim the Executive Councillor for Finance and Customer Services will be undertaking a review of the way in which the Council offers support to local voluntary organisations. In respect of CCTV, Members noted also that immediate savings for 2011/12 could be achieved whilst still maintaining a substantial service and that discussions would continue to seek to maintain the service in future years. Following representations made to the both the Council and Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Economic Well-Being), Members have been advised that by transferring resources from St Neots customer services centre it would be possible to maintain a presence in Ramsey and Yaxley on two days per week.

Having noted the conclusions reached by the Overview and Scrutiny (Economic Well-Being) Panel on the budget and the comments arising from the consultation with the business community on expenditure proposals, the Cabinet

#### **RECOMMEND**

- (a) that, subject to appropriate adjustments to Annexes B, C and D to reflect the final settlements for the Government Formula and New Homes Reward Grants, the proposed budget, Medium Term Plan, budget and Financial Plan as set out in Appendix A of the Head of Financial Services' report at agenda item 6 be approved; and
- (b) that no increase be made in Council Tax for 2011/12 i.e. the Band D charge will remain at £124.17.

**58. TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2011/12**

Reproduced at Appendix B to the Head of Financial Services report at Agenda item No. 6 is the proposed Treasury Management Strategy for 2011/2012. The strategy, which complies with the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's Code of Practice, has clear objectives for the management of the Council's borrowing and investments. Having been satisfied that the strategy meets the requirements of the Code of Practice and Government guidance, the Cabinet

**RECOMMEND**

- (a) that the 2011/12 Treasury Management Strategy reproduced at Appendix B to the report of the Head of Financial Services be approved; and
- (b) that the Treasury Management and Prudential Indicators for 2011/12 as set out in the Appendix B to the report of the Head of Financial Services be approved;

**59. HUNTINGDON WEST AREA ACTION PLAN**

In conjunction with the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Environmental Well-Being) (Item No. 38 of their Report refers) and by way of a report by the Head of Planning Services (reproduced as Appendix A) the Cabinet has considered the Inspector's conclusions regarding the soundness of the Huntingdon West Area Action Plan (AAP).

The Inspector has issued his binding report which has found the AAP to be sound and the Council therefore can now adopt the plan as part of the Development Plan for the District. Having noted that the majority of the changes to the plan had been proposed by the Council, either at the time of submission in April 2010 as a consequence of representations received or later following questions raised by the Inspector, the Cabinet

**RECOMMEND**

**that the Council approves the Huntingdon West Area Action Plan, as set out in the report now submitted, as part of the Development Plan for the District.**

## 60. NEW LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN

Following its submission to the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Environmental Well-Being) (Item No. 37 of their Report refers) the Cabinet has considered a report by the Head of Planning Services, reproduced as Appendix B, outlining the key issues of Cambridgeshire County Council's proposed Local Transport Plan for the period April 2011 onwards together with a statement specific to Huntingdonshire. The plan continues the work of the current Cambridgeshire LTP and is an indicator as to where major sources of maintenance and general transport funding will be targeted over the next five years. The draft programme keeps maintenance funding at near 2010/11 levels but the Integrated Transport has been halved which will impact significantly upon the County's ability to deliver and maintain the transport and highways infrastructure.

The Cabinet therefore

### RECOMMEND

- (a) that the Huntingdonshire District Statement as set out in the report now submitted be approved for inclusion in the Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan; and
- (b) that the Head of Planning Services be requested to inform the County Council of the District Council's concern with regard to the impact of reduced funding for the proposed LTP on the County's ability to deliver an improved transport infrastructure and of the need to pursue all possible alternative sources of funding including the Local Sustainable Transport Fund.

---

### Matters for Information

---

## 61. OPEN SPACE STRATEGY

Having regard to the views of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) (Item No. 57 of their Report refers), the Cabinet has approved the content of an Open Space Strategy for Huntingdonshire for the period 2011-2016.

The Strategy aims to provide an overview of open space provision in Huntingdonshire. Its development will enable the Council to encourage active lifestyles, protect existing open space and assist the planning process as an evidence based document when discussing Section 106 agreements and the Community Infrastructure Levy tariff with developers.

With regard to future priorities, the Executive Councillor for Environment and Information Technology has advised that officers will be seeking to maximise opportunities for renewable energy on the Council's land holdings, with the Strategy being used to inform future decisions.

**62. ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN**

The Cabinet has noted details of the Council's management of assets against national property performance management indicators. Although energy and water costs are above average, these reflect the number of swimming pools managed by the Council. Achievements during 2009/10 have included completion of the Pathfinder House redevelopment and a further increase in the number of operational properties in the good category with 95% of the council's property assets graded as satisfactory or above compared to a national average of 70%.

**63. PLANNING CONSERVATION**

Consideration has been given to the findings of a Working Group established by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Environmental Well-Being) in relation to the performance of the Council's Planning Conservation Team. The Cabinet has concurred with the Working Group that the current service is working well, while acknowledging the scope for some improvements in communication, pro-active support and, with the advent of the localism agenda, the potential roles that Members themselves and town and parish councils can play in mediation and alerting the District Council as to local circumstances. The Cabinet has therefore accepted the Panel's recommendations which are summarised in its Report on Item 39.

I C Bates  
Chairman



**HUNTINGDON WEST AREA ACTION PLAN  
THE INSPECTOR'S BINDING REPORT / ADOPTION PROCEDURES  
(Report by Head of Planning Services)**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Council that, following his examination of the submitted Huntingdon West Area Action Plan (AAP), the Inspector has now issued his binding report which has found the AAP to be sound, and therefore the Council can now adopt this AAP as part of the Development Plan.
- 1.2 A copy of the Inspector's report is attached as Appendix 1 to this report.

**2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Proposed Submission Huntingdon West AAP was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in April 2010.
- 2.2 An independent Planning Inspector, David Vickery, conducted an examination into the soundness of the AAP by way of written exchanges and public hearing sessions in July and August. The Inspector considered representations received on the Proposed Submission document, together with further statements for the hearings, and all relevant evidence including a Sustainability Appraisal.

**3. THE INSPECTOR'S REPORT**

- 3.1 The Inspector has now issued his binding report and he has found the AAP to be sound subject to a number of agreed changes being made to the Proposed Submission version. All of these changes have been proposed by Council, either at the time of Submission in April 2010 (having viewed representations received on the Proposed Submission document) or later following questions raised by the Inspector. A final set of changes was sent to the Inspectorate following the October Spending Review to update the Plan further to the withdrawal of the A14 scheme in favour of a new study.
- 3.2 Due to changes in government guidance, the process of considering this plan differed slightly from that for the Core Strategy. The Proposed Submission was a new separate stage and the Inspector sought to make his decision based on changes put forward by the Council rather than proposing any changes himself. This may also be the process for future development plan documents as it is the one outlined in the Localism Bill.
- 3.3 The Inspector's report is primarily concerned with addressing the tests of 'soundness' which include whether the plan is 'justified' by evidence and 'effective' in that it is able to be implemented.
- 3.4 The Inspector found that with the agreed amendments:

- The AAP can effectively respond to changes to the related transport schemes
  - The AAP appropriately details requirements for mixed use development to the west of the town centre
  - A limited amount of development is likely to the west of the railway line and in the Hinchingsbrooke area
  - The proposed extension to Hinchingsbrooke Country Park can occur
  - The infrastructure requirements are founded on a robust evidence base
  - The AAP can be monitored in an effective manner
- 3.5 Therefore he concluded that the AAP met the overall criteria for soundness and complied with all the legal requirements. The sustainability appraisal is also adopted through this process.

#### **4. ADOPTION OF THE AREA ACTION PLAN**

- 4.1 Adoption of the Huntingdon West Area Action Plan will ensure that the most up to date policies are applied in respect of the planning proposals for this area, and its status will help to facilitate positive change and redevelopment.
- 4.2 The west of town centre area offers an opportunity for appropriately increasing the retail offer within Huntingdon whilst supporting the town centre and appropriate redevelopment of Chequers Court. The precise details of this requirement were discussed at length during the hearings. New housing and offices, as well as an additional public car park and other town centre uses are also envisaged to come forward on this previously developed land.
- 4.3 The AAP allocates land currently temporarily used for car parking opposite the railway station for the development of employment activities, together with Cambridgeshire Constabulary land in Hinchingsbrooke. It was clarified during the hearings that the two parcels which currently have permission for the Regional College and the Water Tower can be allocated for alternative uses should those permissions not be implemented. However, the intention in the Proposed Submission document to allow for some redevelopment on the hospital site, possibly with additional road access, was not pursued on the basis that the hospital management did not have an agreed plan to release any land.
- 4.4 In respect of open space, within a year of adopting the AAP it is intended that progress will be made to extend Hinchingsbrooke Country Park using Higher Level Stewardship funding. The Plan also sets out how land can be added to Views Common should the further A14 Study decide that the viaduct across the railway will be removed.

#### **5. RECOMMENDATION**

- 5.1 **It is therefore recommended that Council:**
- a. **Adopts the Huntingdon West Area Action Plan as part of the Development Plan for the district.**

**Appendix 1:** The Inspector's letter to the Chief Executive and his report on the Examination into the Huntingdon West Area Action Plan

**CONTACT OFFICER:** Steve Ingram, Head of Planning Services,  
☎ 01480 388400



## The Planning Inspectorate

4/03 Kite Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0117 372 8128  
Customer Services: 0117 372 6372  
Fax No: 0117 372 8782  
e-mail: Allison.ingham@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Mr. Monks  
Huntingdonshire District Council  
Pathfinder House  
St. Mary's Street  
Huntingdon  
PE29 3TN

Our Ref: PINS/H0520/429/6

Date: 23 December 2010

Dear Mr Monks

### **Huntingdonshire District Council Huntingdon West Area Action Plan DPD**

1. As you know I was appointed by the Secretary of State to carry out an independent examination of the Huntingdon West Area Action Plan Development Plan Document, which was submitted on 9 April 2010 under section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. My overall conclusion is that, with the changes recommended in my Report, this DPD satisfies the requirements of Section 20 (5) (a) and (b) of the 2004 Act and the associated 2004 Regulations (as amended), and also meets the soundness criteria set out in Planning Policy Statement 12. Thus, I find that the Huntingdon West AAP has complied with the legal requirements and is sound.
3. I held a Pre-Hearing meeting on 2 June 2010 and conducted the Examination by way of written exchanges and a series of hearings that were held between 27 July and 4 August 2010. I have also considered the representations made following the consultation on the Council's Proposed Changes and their Sustainability Appraisal in October 2010.
4. Please convey my thanks to all the Council's staff for their helpful, positive and professional response to my issues and questions. I would also like to record my grateful appreciation to my Programme Officer, Gloria Alexander - her good humour, friendliness, organisational skills, and efficiency ensured that the entire Examination ran smoothly.
5. I hope that my conclusions and recommendations in the accompanying Report will enable your Council to ensure a positive social, economic and environmental outcome for Huntingdon to benefit the local community.

Yours sincerely,

*David Vickery*



The Planning  
Inspectorate

---

# **Report to Huntingdonshire District Council**

**by David Vickery DipT&CP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**23 December 2010**

---

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

SECTION 20

## **REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION INTO THE HUNTINGDON WEST AREA ACTION PLAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT**

Document submitted for Examination on 9 April 2010

Examination hearings held between 27 July and 4 August 2010

File Ref: PINS/H0520/429/6

## **Non-technical Summary**

This report concludes that the Huntingdon West Area Action Plan (AAP) provides an appropriate basis for the planning of this part of the District over the next 15 years. The Council has sufficient evidence to support the strategy and can show that it has a reasonable chance of being delivered.

A limited number of changes are needed to meet legal and statutory requirements. These can be summarised as follows:

- Clarifying how the AAP would provide flexibility and be effective in dealing with the Government's withdrawal of the A14 road improvements in the October 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review and the possibility that the West of Town Centre Link Road might not be implemented;
- Making the AAP effective by detailing how the pedestrian and cycle links in policy HW2 would be implemented;
- Deleting a number of unnecessary Maps;
- Setting out the scale and amount of the retail and employment allocations in policy HW4, and indicating the key factors for development location and future flexibility, so that the policy is consistent with national policy, is effective, seen to be justified, and complies with the Core Strategy;
- Clarifying the access arrangements for various sites allocated in policy HW5 so that they are effective;
- Deleting an unjustified, imprecise and so ineffective alternative uses allocation for parts of Hinchingsbrooke Hospital in policy HW5;
- Making clear how the proposed Country Park extensions and its new car park would be implemented so that policy HW6 is effective;
- Deleting unjustified open space and building sustainability requirements in policies HW8 and HW9;
- Deleting unjustified references to a Hinchingsbrooke Link Road whilst still retaining the possibility of its future investigation; and
- Ensuring that the monitoring section meets Government advice.

All of the changes recommended in this report are based on suggestions put forward by the Council during the Examination in response to points raised by participants. Whilst none of the changes alter the focus of the Council's overall strategy, the main changes (in Appendix A), except PC1 and PC2, have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal. All of the consultation responses have been taken into account.

## Introduction

- i. This report contains my assessment of the Huntingdon West Area Action Plan (the AAP) Development Plan Document (DPD) in terms of Section 20 (5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It considers whether the AAP is compliant in legal terms and whether it is sound. Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 12 at paragraphs 4.51 and 4.52 makes clear that to be sound a DPD should be justified, effective and consistent with national policy.
- ii. The starting point for the Examination is the assumption that the Council has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. The basis for the Examination is the submitted AAP of December 2009. My approach to the Examination has been to work with the Council and the respondents in a positive, pragmatic and proactive manner, with the aim of resolving differences and any elements of unsoundness in the AAP.
- iii. The report deals with the changes that are needed to make the AAP sound, and they are identified in bold in the report by the letters PC (for Proposed Change) followed by a reference number identifying the exact change in Appendix A, e.g. PC11. All of these changes have ultimately been proposed by the Council. None of these changes should materially alter the substance of the AAP and its policies, or undermine the Sustainability Appraisals and participatory processes undertaken.
- iv. Some additional changes put forward by the Council before and during the Examination are factual updates, corrections of minor errors or other minor amendments in the interests of clarity. These are shown in Appendix B. As these changes are not required to make the AAP sound they are generally not referred to in this report although I endorse the Council's view that they add to the clarity and cohesiveness of the AAP. I am content for the Council to make any further necessary additional minor changes to text, page numbers, maps, paragraph numbering etc., to correct spelling, and to make factual updates which may become apparent during the final editing of the AAP before its adoption.
- v. With two exceptions, all of the changes that the Council has proposed following the submission of the AAP have been subject to public consultation<sup>1</sup>. The two exceptions are, firstly, the Council's changes made as a result of the October 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review decision by the Government to withdraw the A14 improvement scheme and, secondly, the minor changes made by the Council as a result of its consideration of the later public consultation responses. These changes have all been shown on the Council's web site. All but three of the Appendix A changes have also been subject to Sustainability Appraisal. The three exceptions (PC1, PC2 and PC15) again result from the Government's withdrawal of the A14 scheme. I have taken all of the consultation responses into account.
- vi. References in the report to documentary sources are provided in footnotes, such as the one below, using the document's reference number in the Examination's official 'Reference Documents' list.

---

<sup>1</sup> LOC52

## Assessment of Soundness

### Preamble

1. During the Examination on 6 July 2010 the Secretary of State announced the revocation of Regional Strategies with immediate effect, which included the East of England Plan. However, this was challenged by Cala Homes Ltd in the High Court and the outcome, on 10 November 2010, was to quash the 6 July revocation. The Secretary of State has decided not to appeal this decision. As a consequence, the East of England Plan as it stood on 5 July forms an ongoing part of the development plan.
2. At the time of the 6 July revocation the Council said at the Pre-Hearing Meeting that the absence of the East of England Plan would not alter the major component of housing land supply for the AAP, namely the adopted Core Strategy. Moreover, the Council was of the opinion that housing allocations in the AAP were minimal and were not so significant that the absence of the Regional Strategy would have major consequences for the AAP's soundness. There were no other implications of the revocation that might affect the AAP. There were no contrary views from respondents. Thus it makes no difference to the AAP's soundness whether the East of England Plan is revoked or not. However, the AAP complies with the Core Strategy which, in turn, complies with the East of England Plan.

### Main Issues

3. Taking account of all the representations, written evidence and the discussions that took place at the Examination hearings, there are six main issues upon which the soundness of the AAP depends. It will be recalled that the soundness criteria are whether the AAP is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

#### **Issue 1 – Do the transport schemes in the AAP's proposals have a justified basis, and does the AAP deal adequately with any uncertainty about them so that it is effective?**

4. On 10 June 2010 the Inquiry into the A14 road diversion improvements which would have affected Huntingdon and the AAP area was postponed pending the result of the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review.
5. The Government decided in that Spending Review on 20 October 2010 to withdraw the proposed A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton road improvement scheme. Instead, the Department of Transport will undertake a study to identify cost effective and practical proposals which bring benefits and relieve congestion. The withdrawal of the A14 improvements was a possibility which had been fully canvassed and explored during the Examination at the hearing sessions.
6. The evidence shows that the AAP's proposals could still proceed without the A14 improvements, apart from the reinstatement of the Views Common land (part of policy HW7) and that part of site B in policy HW5 b. which are both presently covered by the A14 viaduct. The Council suggested a number of changes to take account of the Government's A14 decision, which I endorse and which are included in the recommended changes in the Appendices (see below).
7. Those suggestions are: alterations to policy HW1 to delete references to the A14 changes and add the Department of Transport's new A14 study (**PC1**); the deletion of Map 3 showing the now withdrawn A14 changes (the Link Road is



shown on other Maps in the AAP) (**PC2**); an addition to the beginning of the AAP's Appendix 2 (Phasing) (**PC3**); an alteration to its paragraph 2.7 (**PC4**); and the deletion of Map 9 (**PC15**). Without these changes the AAP would be unsound as it would not reflect the fact that the A14 improvements will not take place.

8. The proposed West of Town Centre Link Road is more fundamental to the AAP's proposals, especially those in policy HW4. It is designed to provide access to many of the policy HW4 parcels of development land and the Council said that the Traffic Assessment<sup>2</sup> indicated it would result in a traffic flow reduction of about one third around the nearest part of the town's ring road, thereby enabling better pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. This will improve accessibility and integration with surrounding areas, which is an Objective of the AAP.

9. The Council stated that it was confident that the Link Road will be constructed and it provided a detailed budget<sup>3</sup> to show that it had the monies available from various reliable and robust sources in order to pay for it. In particular, it was said that the Link Road is Cambridge Horizons' top priority across Cambridgeshire Districts so far as Housing Growth Fund monies are concerned, and that that money is available for the Council to claim. The Council has clearly worked hard with public partners to do all it can to secure funds. Therefore, there is a more than reasonable chance that the Link Road will be constructed within the timescale in the AAP, thereby providing the main necessary infrastructure to implement the proposed development.

10. However, the Council was prudent and right to suggest a change to Appendix 2 to deal with the possibility, however unlikely, that the Link Road might not be built for whatever reason. This change (**PC5**) allows for the possibility of some small scale development in parts of the AAP, the safeguarding of the Link Road route, and the option for the Council to trigger a review of the AAP to deal with the changed situation. Without this change the AAP would be unsound as it would not say how the possible absence of the Link Road would be handled.

11. As submitted the AAP is not effective because it does not clearly explain how the proposed pedestrian and cycle links in policy HW2 are to be implemented, and so it would be unsound. So I endorse the Council's suggested change (**PC6**) to Appendix 2 which corrects this by saying that these links would be provided as part of development and with proposals in the Huntingdon & Godmanchester Market Town Transport Strategy<sup>4</sup>. Despite some respondents' concerns about the effectiveness of these links, I consider that they are understandable and logical, and would improve accessibility in the area. No other alternatives were suggested, but if some are subsequently identified there is no reason why they could not be incorporated into any review of the Market Town Transport Strategy.

12. Policy HW3 is a generalised facilities and transport links enhancement policy for the railway station. Map 5 as submitted is confusing as the new car park nearest the station and the possible temporary car park have now been implemented; it does not explain or aid understanding of the policy; and its other features are covered elsewhere in the AAP. Map 5 should therefore be deleted as the Council suggest because it harms policy HW3's effectiveness (**PC7**).

---

<sup>2</sup> INF22

<sup>3</sup> LOC51

<sup>4</sup> INF15

**Issue 2 – Is policy HW4 (George St/Ermine St) consistent with national policy, clear in its requirements so that it is effective, and in conformity with the Core Strategy?**

13. The underlying principles for the HW4 site are laid out in the Core Strategy. Policy CS8 sets out the mixed use nature of the site's development that is to be implemented in this AAP; the minimum ("at least") amount of retail development to be achieved; and the requirement that retail development here should be complementary and appropriate so that it does not jeopardise the delivery of the further redevelopment of Chequers Court in the town centre.

14. HW4 is the key policy in the AAP as it covers the largest and most complex AAP allocation of over 6 hectares of land to the north-west of the town centre through which the Link Road will run. It is to be redeveloped for a variety of mixed uses such as residential, retail and employment. The policy wording as submitted is vague in its intentions, and the concept map, by its very nature, does not purport to set out in detail the policy's implementation. Although the policy sets out the range of dwelling numbers to be achieved (and specifies other uses), it does not indicate the quantum of employment or retail development – and it is this last failing which is the root cause of why the policy is unsound without amendment. The next four paragraphs set out the key reasons for the policy's unsoundness when judged against the PPS12 criteria.

15. Policy HW4 (and its associated text) as submitted is not consistent with national policies because it:

- does not identify the appropriate scale of development for the employment and retail elements of this mixed use site (PPS12 and PPS4);
- fails to specify the amount and type of retail floorspace and so does not take account of the quantitative need for additional floorspace for different types of retail development in Huntingdon (PPS4);
- appears to leave the identification by sequential assessment of a suitable site for retail development to a future planning application (PPS4);
- the lack of retail detail leaves uncertain its impact on the Core Strategy prioritised redevelopment of Chequers Court in the town centre (PPS4); and
- leaves to a masterplan the task of allocating the principal development uses of the various parcels of land within this mixed use site (PPS12).

16. The policy is not justified because:

- the amount and type of retail development in the Chequers Court town centre redevelopment has not been quantified and so the impact of the retail element of this policy upon it cannot be properly assessed; and
- the traffic modelling for the Link Road assumes a quantum of development which was not quantified in the policy, and so its favourable traffic impact conclusions were not assured.

17. The policy is not effective because of the above concerns, and so it is unlikely to be delivered in accordance with the requirements of Core Strategy policy CS8.

18. The policy is not in conformity with the Core Strategy as there is no reasonable certainty what employment and retail developments would be provided, and a judgement cannot be made as to whether it would jeopardise the delivery of the Chequers Court town centre development.

19. However, the Council commendably recognised these unsoundness issues and addressed them by suggesting changes (**PC8**) which primarily specified the proposed retail and employment allocations and set out an explanation of the methodology of calculating the retail floorspace. The changes did not alter the policy's principles, but used existing evidence and information produced by respondents to provide clearer details of its intentions.

20. The employment floorspace suggested figure has been guided by the area shown on the concept map (Map 6e) which is approximately 0.57 hectares. This is not a certain figure as there may also be employment uses mixed in with other uses elsewhere, and vice versa. The Link Road's Transport Assessment<sup>5</sup> model for employment traffic generation would not be exceeded as it assumed a similar employment area of around 0.57 hectares. This level of employment floorspace would be in conformity with the Core Strategy in its policy CS7. To allow for flexibility in the amount of employment, the Council's suggested change sensibly indicates in a footnote that this is a maximum figure, and outlines the factors which would need to be considered for any proposed higher figure.

21. The derivation of the suggested retail floorspace figure is more complex. Put simply, the latest information from the main landowners (Sainsbury's and Churchmanor Estates) on the size of the Chequers Court redevelopment has been subtracted from the total potential need figure for retail development in Huntingdon from the March 2010 retail study<sup>6</sup>. The Council produced a table showing this calculation<sup>7</sup>, which gave a maximum figure of 5,350 square metres [m<sup>2</sup>] of new comparison and convenience floorspace for the HW4 site. This would be below the assumed traffic modelling figure of 9,000 m<sup>2</sup> of retail development on this site, and so it would not affect the Transport Assessment's favourable outcome.

22. As with the employment figure, to allow for flexibility the Council's suggested change indicates in a footnote that this is a maximum retail floorspace figure, and outlines the factors which would need to be considered for any proposed higher figure. All this is necessary for soundness in order to prevent larger amounts of employment or retail development having unforeseen harmful consequences on the town and its shopping centre.

23. The Council's retail study is up-to-date and assesses quantitative and qualitative needs up to 2021 and, more indicatively, up to 2026. For comparison goods the study estimated a potential for around 17,400 m<sup>2</sup> in Huntingdon up to 2026. The study explained that it had recommended concentrating this amount of development in Huntingdon due to a lack of suitable sites in and around St Neots' town centre. This higher figure would still be in conformity with the Core Strategy as the floorspace areas mentioned in policy CS8 are minimum figures only, and that policy does not stipulate a specific proportionate split or exact amount to be shared between each of these two settlements. It is up to the Council in other DPDs to meet the requirement for St Neots' retail provision set out in policy CS8, or conversely to explain why this cannot be achieved.

---

<sup>5</sup> INF22

<sup>6</sup> RET4

<sup>7</sup> LOC51

24. For retail convenience goods the study estimated a need for 2,050 m<sup>2</sup> for Huntingdon by 2026. It also identified the need for enhanced convenience retail provision towards the south or west of Huntingdon, which it said this site could satisfy. I am satisfied that the retail study forms a reliable and credible evidence base on which floorspace requirements for this site can be based.

25. The Core Strategy requirement is that any retail development on the HW4 site should be complementary and appropriate, and not jeopardise the delivery of the Chequers Court redevelopment. The two principal land owners of the Chequers Court site took part in the Examination, and the floorspace estimate of that potential redevelopment was based on their figures. So I am satisfied that this is a credible figure so far as can be judged at the present early stage of redevelopment plans for Chequers Court. The suggested retail development floorspace figures for the policy have been calculated by taking away the floorspace estimate of Chequers Court from the retail study's floorspace estimate. Therefore, policy HW4's retail floorspace would not jeopardise Chequers Court in the plan period and so the AAP would conform with the Core Strategy in this respect.

26. Long term retail forecasting is imprecise and the forecast evidence for the last five year period up to 2026 is indicative only. Even so, Government advice in the PPS4 Practice Guidance is that forecasts for development plans should be prepared for intermediate five year intervals, as has been done here. In addition, in the medium term there is a possibility that a large retail development on this site could adversely affect the viability of the Chequers Court redevelopment. But the Core Strategy and the AAP are clear on the priority of Chequers Court, and this is the guiding principle for the AAP retail allocation. The completion of the HW4 retail development is likely to be in the middle of the AAP period (between 2012 and 2020) and so a longer term retail forecast view to 2026 is justified, tempered by the flexibility to reduce or increase floorspace. In the final analysis this, as the PPS4 Practice Guide says, is a matter of planning judgement, and I am satisfied that the policy as changed is sound. This judgement is partly based on the flexibility of the policy as recommended to be changed, as explained below.

27. On that matter of flexibility, the AAP would have sufficient built-in safeguards for the Council to be able to manage any necessary floorspace alterations as the Chequers Court redevelopment details become clearer. The new footnote makes it clear that any increase above the approximate floorspace figure would require justification. If the Council considers that a lesser floorspace figure would be more appropriate in the circumstances of the time, then that also would be possible. Thus with these changes the new retail element of the policy would be flexible and able to respond to changing economic circumstances, particularly the need to ensure the delivery of the Chequers Court redevelopment. The retail floorspace quantum is not "cast in stone".

28. The precise balance of comparison and convenience retail floorspace between the HW4 site and Chequers Court cannot be quantified at present because this depends on the retail offer in the Chequers Court redevelopment. So this, as policy HW4 indicates, is a matter which will have to be resolved during the consideration of any planning application on the HW4 site, and will be dependant on the circumstances at the time.

29. It was said at the hearings that the AAP should be changed so that planning permission for retail development would not be granted on the HW4 site until

planning permission had been granted for the Chequers Court redevelopment and, as a possible additional proviso, that the Chequers Court permission had been implemented. But this is not what the Core Strategy requires, and the AAP is a subordinate Plan whose main purpose is to implement the spatial strategy and policies of the Core Strategy as it relates to this part of Huntingdon. It is not possible to impose either a more onerous or a less restrictive requirement than that in the Core Strategy. In any event, a more restrictive policy as advocated would not be effective as it could result in none of the much needed retail development taking place in Huntingdon if Chequers Court did not obtain permission (or was not implemented). This would not be in the best interests of the people of Huntingdon as it could result in no improvement in the retail offer in the town, and it would also be an unreasonable constraint on the delivery of the HW4 site.

30. In the event of a planning application on the HW4 site for retail development being considered before any Chequers Court site application(s), then the Council will have to decide what to do in the light of the Core Strategy policy CS8 and HW4 requirements not to jeopardise the delivery of Chequers Court. This seems to me to be entirely reasonable, realistic, practical and workable. Thus I am satisfied that policy HW4 is in conformity with the Core Strategy so far as the prioritised delivery of Chequers Court is concerned.

31. The use of the term "sequential analysis" in the AAP as submitted implies that retail development on the HW4 site has not been properly considered as required in PPS4 *Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth*. The retail evidence base for the Core Strategy<sup>8</sup> came to the conclusion that the general HW4 area was "edge-of-centre" under the then similar Government retail guidance. It also concluded that this area "will represent the next sequentially preferable location for comparison sector retail development in Huntingdon" (paragraph 9.27). The Inspector's report on the Core Strategy did not disagree with this conclusion. Indeed, Core Strategy policy CS8 could not have directed "appropriate" retail development to this site unless it had been concluded that it was sequentially acceptable. Therefore, to suggest the contrary in the AAP would be unsound as this would not be in conformity with the Core Strategy which has already decided that the HW4 site is the next sequentially preferable location. And it would also result in a confusing and a less effective and deliverable policy.

32. The Council said that the phrase "sequential analysis" as used in the AAP (most notably in policy HW11, but also in paragraph 10.10 and in Appendix 2 paragraph 2.4) was meant to indicate the factors which would guide the exact location of retail development on this large site. These factors have caused the HW4 policy to prefer a probable retail location at the site's southern end near to George Street, as set out at the end of paragraph 7.4. It follows, for all the above reasons, that I support and welcome the Council's suggested changes to delete the words "sequential analysis" from the AAP, and instead to set out the AAP's key factors by which the location of any planning application for retail development would be judged, and to include that explanation in paragraph 7.4 (**PC9**). This makes the policy sound on this point, and also allows reasonable and sufficient flexibility in the future to decide on the exact location of any retail proposals.

---

<sup>8</sup> RET1

33. As proposed to be changed by the Council, policy HW4 sets out the key principles of development on this mixed use site and the approximate scale for its main developments. The policy refers to a concept map (Map 6e) which, together with the text, provides sufficient guidance for the production of a masterplan to flesh out the detail of the HW4 mixed use allocation. The concept plan and the policy wording jointly provide adequate flexibility to deal with changing circumstances and to consider the exact boundaries and disposition of its various mixed uses following a more detailed site assessment. So the Council's suggested changes in **PC8** and **PC9** make the policy sound and resolve the unsoundness concerns previously set out in the box above.

**Issue 3 – Is policy HW5 (Hinchingbrooke) clear in its requirements and thereby effective?**

34. The College and Water Tower sites within policy HW5 already have planning permissions for various uses, but the policy allocates them for alternative uses should the permissions not be implemented. The Council therefore suggested that the Proposals Map should be altered to reflect these AAP allocations, which should be done as the Proposals Map should geographically represent the policy's intentions. The Regulations do not empower me to recommend this change, but unless the Proposals Map is altered in this way inconsistency would result that would make the AAP unsound.

35. The HW5 policy as submitted is unclear about how a number of the sites would be accessed, which make it less effective as there could be problems with their deliverability. The Council resolved this unsoundness by suggesting a series of necessary changes (**PC10**) to the explanatory text and to Appendix 2 (paragraph 2.5). These set out the various access arrangements for site A and the College site (joint access to be determined), and site B and the Water Tower site (joint access).

36. The policy in part d. contemplates parts of the very large hospital site being considered for office and non-residential uses (D1). However, it does not specify which parts, the size of the potential allocation or when this might happen. This makes it unsound as it would not be effective or justified. The Council had no further information it could put into the policy on these points as this had only been a possibility which had not yet been fully resolved. The Council therefore suggested that part d., and its associated explanatory text in paragraph 7.17, be deleted (**PC11**).

37. The changes make the policy and its associated explanatory text in the AAP sound. The words and concept map (Map 7d) in the AAP provide the subsequent required masterplan with sufficient guidance to work up the detailed implementation of these proposals.

**Issue 4 – Are policies HW6 (Country Park), HW7 (Views Common), HW8 (Open Space) and HW9 (Design) clear in their requirements and thus effective?**

38. Extending the Country Park in policy HW6 is a continuation of a similar Local Plan proposal, but the AAP adds two other areas of land. The Council suggested that the way in which the Country Park would be extended in stages should be set out in the explanatory text at paragraph 8.2. I endorse this as otherwise the policy would be unsound as it would not set out how it would be implemented (**PC12**).

Similarly, the Council suggested a change to Appendix 2 in its paragraph 2.1 to show how the implementation of the County Park extension would be handled and its timing (**PC13**). I welcome this change as it makes the policy effective and so sound in its application.

39. The Council suggested a change to paragraph 8.3 to make clear the intention that a new car park will be pursued (**PC14**). I endorse this change as it makes effective an otherwise vague and uncertain part of the policy. All these changes make policy HW6 coherent, effective and sound.

40. Policy HW7 (Views Common) to retain and enhance the area as open space will not be as effective as submitted due to the Government's withdrawal of the A14 scheme (the A14 embankment currently runs across it). The Council's suggested changes to the policy and to delete Map 9 recognise that the A14 will remain in the medium term and are necessary to make the policy sound and effective (**PC15**). The open space allocation is, in any event, shown on the Proposals Map and so Map 9 is not necessary.

41. The explanatory text to policy HW8 (Open Space) in paragraph 8.9 set out a requirement for open space expressed as an area related to a specified population increase. However, there was no evidence to justify this requirement and so it is unsound. The Council explained that it is preparing a fully justified open space standard in its forthcoming Development Management DPD, and so it suggested the deletion of this open space stipulation from the AAP (**PC16**). This is the correct course of action to make the AAP sound.

42. Policy HW9 (Design) set out some standards for the sustainability of buildings in matters such as energy efficiency in its parts 1, 2 and 3. However, none of these were justified with supporting evidence as required in the PPS1 Climate Change Supplement and so they are unsound. The Council said that the standards would form part of the future Development Management DPD where the necessary evidence would be produced, and so it was not necessary to retain them in the AAP. For these reasons I endorse the Council's suggested change to delete these parts of the policy and the supporting text in paragraphs 9.2 to 9.4 (**PC17**).

**Issue 5 – Does the AAP give sufficient guidance on infrastructure; and are the phasing provisions realistic and sufficiently flexible so that they can deal with slippages in the delivery of development proposals?**

43. The Council submitted during the Examination a schedule of the AAP's infrastructure<sup>9</sup> to implement its proposals which contained an estimated timeframe, cost and the main funder(s), based on the Local Investment Framework<sup>10</sup>. Whilst some of the costs are estimates, it is not essential to be absolutely exact. What the Council's evidence shows, particularly for the Link Road, is that there is a very good and reasonable likelihood that the necessary infrastructure can be economically provided for the AAP's development proposals within the stated timescale in Appendix 2. On the basis of these figures I agree with the Council that the necessary infrastructure costs would be within the normal range of expected contributions from any development within the district.

---

<sup>9</sup> LOC51

<sup>10</sup> INF4

44. The AAP as submitted says that a local access road ("link road") into the Hinchingsbrooke area would be investigated. However, this was said to be only a possibility, and that it was not needed in order to deal with the extra traffic that would be generated by the AAP's developments. Therefore, the mention of developer contributions towards it in paragraph 1.5 of Appendix 2 is unsound as this requirement is presently unjustified and contrary to statute and Government advice. I therefore endorse the Council's suggestion to remove that requirement (**PC18**), together with necessary updating following the A14 scheme withdrawal. For the same reasons, I support the Council's suggested changes to delete references to the Hinchingsbrooke link road in the third paragraph of policy HW11 and in paragraph 10.9 (**PC19**).

45. Therefore, with these changes, the infrastructure policy HW10 and its associated Appendix 1 are sound as they are founded on robust evidence.

46. The restrictive second paragraph of policy HW11 (phasing and implementation) is contrary to the evidence which is, as previously mentioned, that most of the AAP's developments can take place without the A14 road improvements. To make the policy factually correct and thus sound I therefore endorse the Council's suggested change to delete this paragraph together with the associated and similar explanatory text in paragraph 10.8 (**PC20**), with an addition to indicate the 'nil detriment' basis for proposals' traffic flows on the A14.

47. This report has previously set out some necessary changes to Appendix 2 (Phasing) to ensure soundness for the transport aspects and the development proposals in the AAP. With those changes both policy HW11 and the fuller explanation in Appendix 2 deal clearly and effectively, and so soundly, with the proposed phasing and implementation of the AAP. The phasing timings are sufficiently flexible to deal with known possible delays in the provision of major infrastructure, such as the Link Road.

### **Issue 6 – Are the mechanisms in the AAP for monitoring sufficiently clear, detailed and meet national policy requirements?**

48. The monitoring chapter as submitted lacks detail because key indicators, timescales and targets are not clearly set for each policy. These deficiencies render the monitoring ineffective and unsound. The Council recognised this problem and submitted an amended monitoring chapter as a suggested change.

49. In line with paragraph 4.4 of PPS12, the revised monitoring chapter shows for each policy (as far as is practicable) when, where and by whom a list of identified actions will take place to ensure effective delivery. This will enable transparent and effective monitoring. 'SMART' targets (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound) have been set having regard to the availability of data and to the Council's resources.

50. This suggested change is reasonable and appropriate, and I endorse it to secure soundness in terms of effectiveness (**PC21**).

## **Legal Requirements**

51. My examination of the compliance of the AAP with the legal requirements is summarised in the table below. I conclude that the AAP meets all the legal requirements.



Local Development Scheme (LDS)	The AAP is identified within the approved LDS February 2010 which sets out an expected adoption date of January 2011. This is achievable and the AAP is generally compliant with the LDS.
Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	SA has been carried out, independently verified, and is adequate.
Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and relevant regulations	The SCI was adopted in November 2006 and consultation has been compliant with its requirements, including the consultation on the post-submission SA and suggested changes.
Appropriate Assessment (AA)	The Habitats Regulations Assessment (November 2009) put forward some recommendations for the avoidance and mitigation of a number of adverse impacts, and these were included in the submitted AAP. The AA thus concluded that the AAP would not have an adverse effect on European sites.
National Policy	The AAP complies with national policy except where indicated, and changes are recommended to correct this.
Regional Strategy (RS)	The AAP is in general conformity with the RS.
Sustainable Community Strategies (SCS)	Satisfactory regard has been paid to the District and County SCSs.
Core Strategy	The AAP conforms with the Core Strategy except where indicated, and changes are recommended to correct this.
2004 Act and Regulations (as amended)	The AAP complies with the Act and the Regulations.

## Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

**52. I conclude that, with the changes proposed by the Council set out in Appendix A, the Huntingdon West Area Action Plan DPD satisfies the requirements of section 20 (5) of the 2004 Act and meets the criteria for soundness in PPS12. Therefore I recommend that the AAP be changed accordingly. And, for the avoidance of doubt, I endorse the Council's proposed minor changes set out in Appendix B.**

*David Vickery*

Inspector

This report is accompanied by:

Appendix A (separate document); and Appendix B (separate document)

This page is intentionally left blank

**NEW LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN (LTP3)  
(Report by Head of Planning Services)**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The Local Transport Plan (LTP) is an important County-wide document which sets out transport policies and programmes for several years ahead. The current LTP is the second Cambridgeshire LTP and covers the period 2006 - 2011.
- 1.2 The County Council is required to produce a third Local Transport Plan (LTP3) for the period from April 2011. The new plan must be in place by 31st March 2011 and, as part of its formulation, the County Council is required to consult District Councils and other key stakeholders.
- 1.3 LTP3 consists of two parts:
1. Policies and Strategy
  2. Implementation Plan

**2. LTP3 POLICIES AND STRATEGY**

- 2.1 As an initial stage of LTP3 development, the County Council carried out consultation between January and July 2010. This resulted in a low response rate (0.5%), but those who responded identified improvements to public transport infrastructure and improving roads as the most important transport improvements for LTP3.
- 2.2 Following public consultation, the County Council have developed the Policies and Strategy of LTP3. Appendix A contains the Executive Summary to the LTP3 Policies and Strategy document. HDC officers have been consulted as part of this process and have contributed to the final documents.

**3. LTP3 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

- 3.1 The development of the Implementation Plan has been delayed by the late announcement (13 December) of the level of transport capital grants. Although the level of maintenance funding has not been greatly reduced, the funding for new ("integrated transport") schemes is about half the level of the last 5 years. Appendix B contains the Executive Summary to the LTP3 Implementation Plan document.
- 3.3 Appendix C summarises the County's draft programme for 2011/12. The draft programme keeps maintenance funding at near 2010/11 levels, but the Integrated Transport Block is about half of 2010/11 allocation levels. Programme funding is likely to stay at this greatly reduced level, as set out in the following table:

Programme Area	Av. funding 2006/07 – 10/11	LTP2	LTP3 funding		Indicative funding		Av. cut from LTP2
			2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	
Integrated Transport	£8.431M		£3.805M	£4.059M	£4.059M	£5.707M	-48%
Maintenance	£11.658M		£10.712M	£10.695M	£10.801M	£10.104M	-9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>£20.089M</b>		<b>£14.517M</b>	<b>£14.754M</b>	<b>£14.860M</b>	<b>£15.811M</b>	<b>-25%</b>

#### 4. IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The LTP is the County Council's major source of maintenance and general transport funding. The major reductions in the Integrated Transport funding described above will impact significantly upon the County's ability to deliver improved transport infrastructure, both generally and in Huntingdonshire. These reductions follow on from the withdrawal of over £2m of funding from Cambridgeshire's Integrated Transport allocation, as part of the Government's emergency budget of June 2010.
- 4.2 The loss of Government funding for transport schemes will be compounded by HDC's financial position. Over the past 10 years, the Council has included significant capital funding for transport related projects in its Medium Term Plan. This has delivered well in excess of £2M of District Council funded transport benefits for Huntingdonshire. For LTP3, however, the Council's draft budget does not provide such financial support. The Council will thus be wholly dependent on funding from external sources, principally from the much reduced Government allocations and development related funding.
- 4.3 In responding to the proposed LTP3, it is recommended that the Council's main comment is to express concern at the greatly reduced level of Integrated Block funding. In view of this, we would encourage the County Council to pursue all possible alternative sources of funding, including from the recently announced Local Sustainable Transport Fund.
- 4.4 In addition to commenting upon the proposals, we are required to provide a Huntingdonshire District Council Statement for inclusion in the LTP3 Appendices. A draft statement is attached, as Appendix D. This statement reflects the current funding difficulties, as well as ongoing concerns about delays in implementing schemes

#### 5. RECOMMENDATION

- 5.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet recommend to Council that:
- i) The Council supports the Huntingdonshire District Statement for inclusion in LTP3, as set out in Appendix D of this report. and forwards this to the County Council
  - ii) Expresses regret to the County Council about the greatly reduced overall funding for LTP3, but encourages the County Council to pursue all possible alternative sources of

**funding, including from the recently announced Local Sustainable Transport Fund.**

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

LTP 2 – 2006-2011

LTP3 Executive Summaries (Appendices A and B of this report)

**Contact Officers:       Stuart Bell and Barry Louth**  
**☎                           01480 388387 and 388441**

### LTP3 POLICIES AND STRATEGY EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is Cambridgeshire's Third Local Transport Plan (LTP3) and covers the period 2011-2026.

The Plan is split in to two main parts; this first part is the Policies and Strategy, which sets out the Plan's objectives, problems and challenges, the strategy to meet the challenges, and the indicators and targets we will use to monitor our performance.

The second part is the Implementation Plan, which is essentially a business plan detailing how we will deliver the LTP3 Strategy. It details our programmes for the delivery of transport improvements to the networks managed by the County Council, and also for the day-to-day management and maintenance of the network. It sets out the schemes and measures we expect to deliver in the first year of the Plan in detail, and sets out the processes by which future years' programmes will be developed.

The LTP demonstrates how our policies and plans for transport will contribute towards the County Council's vision – Creating communities where people want to live and work: now and in the future. While we must have a vision for the future, we must also be realistic and recognise that we do not have the resources to deliver all of the measures we would wish to over the lifetime of the Plan. Indeed, given the current economic climate, our ability to implement schemes in the short-term may be particularly limited, although we will try and be innovative in the way that we use funds that are available. In this respect, it is important that the LTP sets the policy framework that leaves us well prepared to take advantage of opportunities that may occur to bring in additional or alternative funding and resources.

As a flexible and dynamic document, the LTP Strategy will be updated to reflect changes in the wider local and national policy context as and when needed, and the Implementation Plan will be updated on an annual basis.

As with our previous Plans, this LTP3 has been produced in partnership with Cambridge City Council and the district councils of East Cambridgeshire, Fenland, Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire. We have had a strong working relationship for many years and have been very successful in bringing together the planning and transport responsibilities of these authorities, to ensure an integrated approach to the challenges.

LTP3 seeks to address existing transport challenges as well as setting out the policies and strategies to ensure that planned large-scale development can take place in the county in a sustainable way. In addition to working with Cambridge City and the District Councils, our Strategy and Implementation Plan have also been informed by public and stakeholder consultation, so that these documents reflect local people's views and concerns.

This LTP has been produced during a period of significant change, particularly in terms of the regional planning framework and tough financial climate. However, the County Council is committed to its overarching vision – Creating communities where people want to live and work: now and in the future - and this is reflected in this LTP by mirroring the County Council's Strategic Objectives as the core objectives of LTP3.

## Objectives and challenges

The County Council's Strategic Objectives, which form the objectives of this LTP, are:

- (a) Enabling people to thrive, achieve their potential and improve quality of life
- (b) Supporting and protecting vulnerable people
- (c) Managing and delivering the growth and development of sustainable communities
- (d) Promoting improved skills levels and economic prosperity across the county, helping people into jobs and encouraging enterprise
- (e) Meeting the challenges of climate change and enhancing the natural environment

In response to Government's priorities – the economy and climate change – and the views expressed locally in our public and stakeholder consultation, relatively greater importance will be placed on Objectives 3, 4 and 5 in this LTP. We recognise that for transport to contribute to the achievement of the County Council's Strategic Objectives there is a need for input from all Council departments and partnerships. The strategy will need to strike a balance between enabling economic growth and tackling climate change.

Key among the issues affecting Cambridgeshire is the large-scale growth planned across the county, with the associated pressure on the transport network and the environment, and the risks of increased congestion and carbon emissions and worsening air quality. In parallel, many rural areas of the county continue to suffer from poor access to key services and leisure facilities and the risk of social exclusion. We have translated the issues and problems related to each of the objectives, into a set of eight challenges for transport, under which, we have set out our strategy for addressing them. The challenges and summarised strategies are:

### **Challenge 1: Improving the reliability of journey times by managing demand for road space and maximising the capacity and efficiency of the existing network**

We will continue to investigate the potential for demand management measures using the experience we have already gained within the county where these can help to improve conditions for sustainable modes of transport and maximising the capacity of the network. Furthermore, we will support measures which encourage the transfer of more freight onto rail and continue to work with freight operators to promote the use of the most appropriate routes for road freight, particularly where that is passing through the county.

### **Challenge 2: Reducing the length of the commute and the need to travel by private car**

Our transport strategy supports the development strategy for Cambridgeshire by aiming to reduce the need to travel and by providing sustainable travel options for new developments. We will focus on securing school, workplace and residential travel plans and support and encourage employers to adopt smarter choices measures to help reduce the need to travel. We will also support and encourage journey planning tools to improve information available for journeys by sustainable modes.

### **Challenge 3: Making sustainable modes of transport a viable and attractive alternative to the private car**

Countywide, we will continue to push forward in making sustainable modes of transport more attractive by continuing to develop sustainable networks for walking and cycling, making it easier for people to change between modes of transport and working with bus operators to provide high quality bus services. In addition, our aim is to improve the environment and safety for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users, in accordance with our user hierarchy and focus on raising awareness of the transport choices available, including the health and environmental benefits of cycling and walking. This will include work with local planning authorities to ensure provision for sustainable modes that form an integral part of new developments.

### **Challenge 4: Future-proofing our maintenance strategy and new transport infrastructure to cope with the effects of climate change**

To address these issues our strategy will use a risk management approach to help determine priority areas for adapting to climate change. We have developed an adaptation action plan to set out how we will meet our objectives. We will take account of the projected impacts of climate change at the scheme design stage, make use of emerging technologies as they become available and build new infrastructure to the latest standards for withstanding the impacts of climate change.

### **Challenge 5: Ensuring people – especially those at risk of social exclusion – can access the services they need within reasonable time, cost and effort wherever they live in the county**

Our strategy focuses on access to key services for our communities to the nearest main service centre, e.g. large village or market town. We will consider the whole journey, including the interaction between different modes of transport and aiming to provide suitable transport provision for necessary journeys, whilst also recognising the importance of car borne access in many of our rural areas. We will continue to support the development and work of community transport schemes as well as investigating alternative forms of public transport where traditional bus services do not meet community needs. This will include work with service providers to be innovative in the way services are delivered locally recognising that it is not simply about providing a transport service but as much about where and how the service is provided based on need.

### **Challenge 6: Addressing the main causes of road accidents in Cambridgeshire**

To continue to reduce casualties our strategy will focus on education, training and publicity to improve road user behaviour, particularly targeting young drivers and riders, users of rural roads and children. In addition, we will progress our programme of measures aimed at reducing casualties at accident cluster sites that will give the highest casualty reduction and work with the police and other agencies through the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership.

### **Challenge 7: Protecting and enhancing the natural environment by minimising the environmental impact of transport**

Our strategy to protect and enhance the environment will focus on working with the district councils to reduce levels of air pollution in order to meet national objectives. This will be achieved through managing and reducing vehicle emissions and encouraging increased usage of sustainable modes of transport. Additional demand management measures will also be investigated where appropriate in order to manage car use and we will investigate the use of new technologies as they become available. Environmental issues such as protecting biodiversity and impacts on the landscape will be considered at the design stage of transport projects and we will



support the provision of green infrastructure. Furthermore, we will reduce carbon emissions through a programme of smarter choices measures, improvements to sustainable travel options and the management of car use.

### **Challenge 8: Influencing national and local decisions on land-use and transport planning that impact on routes through Cambridgeshire**

We will reflect national policies in our local plans, policies and strategies and continue to lobby for rail improvements as well as improvements to the trunk road network, including the A14.

While aiming to address all the challenges we have identified, the main focus of our strategy will be on measures and initiatives that maintain and enhance the economy and also those that tackle climate change. This reflects both the outcomes from public and stakeholder consultation as well as the direction of national transport policy. The strategy recognises the tensions between enabling economic growth and tackling climate change, and will aim to balance the two objectives.

### **Monitoring and performance**

Monitoring the effectiveness of our Strategy and Implementation Plan is a key part of our LTP. We want to ensure that the delivery of our Plan is as effective as possible and is providing value for money, and therefore have a robust monitoring framework of indicators and targets to check our progress towards delivering our strategy and achieving our objectives. The indicators we have chosen reflect the issues which are most important to Cambridgeshire while at the same time enabling us to compare our progress against other local authorities in the country.

### **Conclusion**

Our LTP3 Strategy and Implementation Plan set out how we will help to address existing transport related problems and meet the transport needs of the large-scale development planned for the county. It is important that our strategy provides the right balance between being aspirational, and outlining what we want to achieve against a backdrop, in the shorter term at least, of significantly less funding than during previous LTP periods whilst still being able to respond to the changing environment as and when needed .

As such, our LTP3 is a flexible and dynamic suite of documents which will respond to the changing environment, as and when needed. This LTP aims to provide maximum value for money through close partnership working, by closely integrating our Strategy and Implementation Plan and by monitoring our performance against indicators relevant to local communities.

## LTP3 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Implementation Plan is the second of the two core documents in the suite of documents that make up the Third Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan (LTP3). It shows how the Implementation Plan fits in with and draws from the LTP Policies and Strategy, and from policy guidance, key objectives and more detailed local strategies.

As the mechanism for managing our delivery of the whole LTP, the Implementation Plan is essentially a business plan detailing how we will deliver the LTP Strategy. It details our programmes for the delivery of transport improvements to the networks managed by the County Council, and also for the day-to-day management and maintenance of the network. It sets out the schemes and measures we expect to deliver over the first year of the plan in detail, and sets out the processes by which future years' programmes will be developed.

The Transport Capital Programme for 2011/12 focuses on the delivery of improvements to the transport network in Cambridgeshire, and the undertaking of major maintenance schemes. The types of measures that are funded from this programme include:

- Traffic calming schemes
- Pedestrian crossings
- Major road maintenance and structural maintenance schemes
- Cycleway schemes
- Junction improvements
- Major schemes (e.g. Guided Busway, Papworth Everard Bypass)

The Transport Revenue Programme for 2011/12 focuses on the day-to-day management and maintenance of the local transport network in Cambridgeshire. The types of measures that are funded from this programme include:

- Routine ongoing minor maintenance (e.g. pothole filling, gully emptying, grass cutting)
- Road safety education
- Winter maintenance
- Travel planning with schools and businesses
- Supported bus services / concessionary bus fares
- School crossing patrols

Funding levels for at least the first four years of this plan will be extremely challenging, with cuts to core funding of around 25% from levels seen over the period of the second Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan (LTP2). There are new opportunities such as the Regional Growth Fund and the Sustainable Transport Fund, but these are bidding funds, and cannot be relied upon to supplement our reduced core budgets.

The significant challenges that the current funding environment brings therefore requires the County Council and its partners to review not only the scope of the programmes that can be delivered, but also the organisational structures that deliver them.

We have therefore set out the process which we will undertake through 2011 to develop the detailed programme for 2012/13 onwards. A detailed programme looking a year ahead will be maintained, along with a less detailed programme setting out the expected expenditure in programme areas of the following 3-4 years. Both will be

updated on an annual basis, to ensure that the Implementation Plan remains aligned with our District Councils' Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) and the needs of partner delivery agencies, local stakeholders and the public.

The 2011/12 programme addresses the views of stakeholders and communities by reflecting their views on our LTP objectives and priority areas. For future years, work will be undertaken in 2011 to consider areas or programmes where decision making on priorities and schemes can be devolved to a more local level, but also to identify those areas where it will remain critical to maintain the strategic overview needed to ensure the safe and effective operation of the transport network.

Effective programme management and monitoring of performance is essential if the best possible outcomes are to be achieved from available resources, particularly in times when funding and resources are reducing. Cambridgeshire County Council seeks to ensure that the management of its transport programmes is effective and appropriate, and is accountable to Members of the Council, the Council's partners and the wider community in Cambridgeshire.

## DRAFT LTP3 PROGRAMME, 2011/12

<b>Integrated Transport Block Programme Area</b>	<b>LTP3 funding (£000's)</b>
<b>Countywide programmes</b>	
Accessibility Works	31
Air Quality Monitoring	15
Civil Parking Enforcement	200
Cycleway Improvements (countywide)	120
Jointly Funded Minor Improvements	200
Major Roadworks	90
Major Scheme Development	100
New Footpaths / Rural Pedestrian Improvements	50
Safety Schemes (Small and Medium size)	250
Speed Management	76
Strategy Development	100
<b>Cambridge and the Market Towns</b>	
Cambridge Access Strategy	180
Market Town Transport Strategy schemes	500
Major Project - St Neots Cycle Bridge	500
Bus Infrastructure - Huntingdon	50
<b>Smarter Travel Management</b>	
HCV Routing	40
Personalised Travel Plan	55
Travel for Work	40
Safer Routes to School	100
Traveline development	15
<b>Guided Busway Contribution</b>	<b>1,000</b>
<b>Integrated Transport Block Total</b>	<b>3,712</b>

<b>Maintenance Block Programme Area</b>	<b>LTP3 funding (£000's)</b>
<b>Carriageway / Footway Maintenance</b>	
Carriageway maintenance – Non Principal	
Carriageway maintenance – Principal	7,161
Footway Maintenance and Cycle Paths	
Rights of Way	140
<b>Street Lighting</b>	140
<b>Structural Maintenance</b>	
Strengthening of Bridges to carry 40 tonne loading	
Structural Maintenance of existing highway structures	2,448
<b>Traffic Management</b>	
Traffic Signal Replacement	600
Integrated Highways Management Centre	179
Real Time Passenger Information	137
<b>Maintenance Block Total</b>	<b>10,805</b>

## LTP3 – HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL STATEMENT

### Introduction

Transport remains a key issue for this Council. Huntingdonshire, as part of the Cambridge Sub-Region, is an area that continues to experience major housing and economic growth. This places demands on transport infrastructure and several major developments require major transport infrastructure improvements to proceed. This is particularly the case in the A14 and A428 corridors

This Council has been an active partner in the delivery of previous LTPs and in the preparation of the new LTP. We intend to remain as active a partner as possible in delivering the policies and action plans of the new LTP across Huntingdonshire. However, our ability to do this will be severely constrained by ongoing local government funding issues. Despite this, we will continue to support the provision of travel choice and the reduction of social exclusion, together with transport related improvements to the environment and local economy.

We will continue to work with a range of partners, including Cambridgeshire County Council, to deliver benefits throughout Huntingdonshire, subject to available resources. We will also continue to participate in the Huntingdonshire Strategic Partnership and to pursue the Community Plan transport objectives, which are:

- Comprehensive, affordable, safe public transport services
- Improved road safety
- Reduced congestion
- Improved access

### Key Issues

#### Funding

We have included significant capital funding for transport related projects in this Council's Medium Term Plan over the past 10 years. This has been in addition to funding from County and other partners and, for the period 2006-2011, has delivered in excess of £2M of District Council funded transport related expenditure for the benefit of Huntingdonshire. For this new LTP, however, we will not be able to deliver a similar programme to support the aims and objectives of the Plan. We will thus be wholly dependent on funding from external sources, principally Government and development related funding.

#### Prioritisation

In view of the severe funding constraints, there needs to be clear prioritisation of how LTP3 funding will be allocated. We would advocate the following approach:

- Priority should be given to distributing LTP funding throughout Cambridgeshire, according to need. Spending should be spread across the County, particularly in and around market towns which are experiencing significant growth, rather than just concentrating expenditure in growth areas around Cambridge.

- The application of a modal hierarchy, which gives priority to sustainable modes, in line with *Manual for Streets* and *Cambridgeshire Design Guide* principles. This should include prioritising revenue expenditure, particularly for maintenance, – e.g. by giving priority to bus stop, footway and cycleway maintenance, including winter maintenance.
- Balancing the amount allocated for revenue expenditure (e.g. road maintenance, public transport subsidy) with commitments to major capital expenditure. Although capital investment is necessary, this should not starve revenue funding, particularly for highway maintenance.

In setting priorities, there should be full consideration of the area specific transport needs of Huntingdonshire, including:

- Access to strategic centres such as Cambridge, Peterborough and Bedford, particularly along on the A14 and A428 corridors.
- Sustainable transport within, to, and between market towns.
- Rural transport improvements to improve the accessibility of specific areas - a different approach (and priority) may be needed for more and less prosperous areas of the District.

### **Sustainable Development**

A key role for the LTP is to address the transport needs of major development areas in Huntingdonshire and elsewhere. There is currently uncertainty about the future shape of strategic land-use planning, but we will base our strategic land use plans on our Local Development Framework Core Strategy, which was adopted in 2009. A central theme of the Core Strategy is the pursuit of sustainable development (Policy CS1), which includes linking land-use and transport planning and the need to improve access and modal choice for all.

The Core Strategy emphasises the need for contributions to transport (and other) infrastructure requirements (Policy CS10). With reducing Government funding, future transport funding may need to increasingly come from development. We will thus work in conjunction with the County Council and continue to secure as high a level of developer contributions as possible through initiatives such as Market Town Transport Strategies and other approved transport related initiatives where there is development-related impact. In support of this, we intend to pursue the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy as a basis for contributions, as well as considering wider application of area transport plans to outside Cambridge in order to give extra weight to these processes.

At a more detailed level, we welcome the support within LTP3 to *Manual for Streets* principles, including support for a modal hierarchy. With support from the County, we will require developers to design around *Manual for Streets* principles and will judge proposed designs on the basis of those principles. In support of this we will continue to make travel planning (encouraging walking, cycling and public transport use) a requirement of major development.

### **A14 Corridor**

We are extremely disappointed that the proposed A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton highway improvement scheme was deleted from the National Roads Programme in the 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review. This scheme remains crucial to

Huntingdonshire as well as the wider region and the rest of the country given its national and European strategic importance.

We are working closely with partners, including the County Council, other District Councils and the emerging Local Enterprise Partnership, to encourage the Department for Transport to initiate a study focussed on finding an affordable solution. As partners to this process the Council will need to look to have a much stronger statement of what will be done to promote improvements, including investigating alternative means of funding and delivery. There also needs to be urgent consideration of the impact on the corridor between Huntingdon and Cambridge and, particularly within Huntingdon and St. Ives (and elsewhere) if the scheme does not go ahead, including the future of the Huntingdon viaduct, the loss of development potential and air quality implications.

### **Huntingdon to Cambridge Guided Bus**

It is to be hoped that the current impasse in the opening of the guided part of the route will be resolved in the near future.

We have worked with the County Council to try and get improvements on the unguided (Huntingdon to St Ives) section but, apart from the successful bus priorities and resultant improved services between Huntingdon rail and bus stations, there have been no effective improvements. The routeing and stopping difficulties within St Ives have not yet been addressed. We are 'slightly encouraged' that priority measures remain in the plan between Huntingdon and St. Ives following representations from this Council, despite the scheme being a casualty of recent budget cuts. We remain concerned that without wider routeing issues being addressed, the effectiveness of the Busway between St. Ives and Cambridge will be prejudiced and fail to attract new passengers who otherwise may have travelled along the A14.

### **Bus Services**

Good bus services are essential to Huntingdonshire to ensure accessibility and social inclusion. We will continue to secure improvements to bus services through development, and as Local Planning Authority, will not approve major developments unless there is a high standard of bus provision. We have been committed to improving bus infrastructure, and have contributed £30K per annum to bus shelters. This increased to £100K in 2010/11. From 2011 onwards we will not be able to do this and so will look to the County and other sources for funding.

We would like to see Quality Bus Partnerships / Contracts in Huntingdonshire and continue to press the County Council on this matter. It is particularly disappointing that, despite all the assurances that much would happen as a result of LTP2, very little has actually been delivered within the District. By using these, the County can secure improvements in vehicle quality and service frequency from operators by agreeing, in return, to implement on-street bus priority and bus stop improvements measures. This seems to be supported in the new LTP, but it is not stated where this will be promoted – only "as appropriate". We wish to see a much more definite approach, which includes firm proposals for Huntingdonshire services. In particular, we wish to see real time passenger information at all our bus stops. Some stops have this facility, but the roll-out has been far too infrequent and stalled and also subject to recent budget cuts. We wish to see a programme reinstated in



Huntingdonshire so that all our bus stops are provided with real time information in the near future.

We also support the use of Quality Bus Partnerships to ensure that public transport operators use increasingly 'clean' fleets. We thus welcome the proposed inclusion of Huntingdonshire in the Quality Bus Partnership to ensure minimum emission criteria for all Public Service Vehicles, as well as targets for ongoing improvements in emissions which also assists wider, joint air quality objectives.

### **Walking and Cycling**

We have been a proactive and significant partner in working with the County to design and implement walking and cycling improvements over the past ten plus years. We value the cycling improvements that have been implemented over these years and have been pleased to provide direction and contribute £100K per annum to improvements from our Safe Cycle Route budget to support their introduction. Unfortunately, as a result of HDC budget cuts; this funding will no longer be available from 2011 onwards. Additionally, if any of the £300K currently in the cycle budget for 2010/11 that remains uncommitted this year (2010/11) will also not be carried forward.

LTP funding for walking and cycling schemes not associated with development will thus be essential in the future. We particularly need financial commitment to implementing the "Connect 2" network in St Neots, including a new cycle bridge across the Great Ouse, and to improving key routes to schools, together with key Market town and rural routes. This will support the financial commitment to the bridge, including the capital contribution to that scheme by this Council in excess of £500K in 2010/11.

### **Market Town Transport Strategies**

The District Council has worked closely with the County Council and other partners to develop and implement market town transport strategies (MTTS) for Huntingdon and Godmanchester, St Ives, St Neots and, most recently, Ramsey.

We value highly and are proud of what has been achieved through this joint working as well as funding and would want the strategies to continue to be given a high priority in any future allocation of resources, particularly because of their contribution to improving sustainable modes. We thus welcome the County's commitment to the strategies, and their ongoing review, as an essential part of the LTP Implementation Plan.

A particular priority is the West of Town Centre Link Road in Huntingdon that was included in the first MTTS approved in 2003, which unlocks vital town centre development and improves accessibility. This scheme is largely being funded from a combination of Housing Growth Fund and from development, although the County Council has agreed to forward fund in advance of developer funds being realised. Subsequent repayment will therefore be a joint priority from relevant developments in the area.

The Council has contributed financially, through its Capital programme, to the implementation of these strategies. We will no longer be able to do this for the foreseeable future, due to funding constraints. Additionally, the Council's Projects team have undertaken the design and contract work on a number of schemes in St.

Neots and Huntingdon & Godmanchester. The Council's ability to continue to provide that staffing commitment will be subject to available resources but we would look to do that as far as practicably possible given the high quality, cost-effective partnership service that has been achieved to date.

### **Rural Strategy**

Huntingdonshire is a largely rural in character and we welcome the LTP commitment to developing and implementing a Rural Transport Strategy. The Council's Medium Term Objectives include reducing economic deprivation and supporting rural communities. This includes supporting the use of public transport, including taxis, to enable people who are disadvantaged by location to gain access to employment, leisure and other essential services.

We would thus be very willing to work with the County Council to develop and implement a Rural Transport Strategy which will cover all rural parts of the county whose transport needs are not covered by the market town transport strategies. If this is to supersede the LTP2 Accessibility Strategy, we are strongly of the view that there should be a clear commitment and timescale for producing the Rural Strategy. This is required in addition to the draft Rural Strategy produced by Cambridgeshire Acre, since we have serious misgivings about the deliverability and realism of this strategy and a number of its objectives that while being 'worthy' are completely unrealistic and undeliverable.

We particularly support priority to community transport, and welcome the LTP commitment to "continue the annual funding support for Community Transport Schemes". We would like this to be a ring fenced commitment, in view of the vulnerability of this budget to future cuts. Without it, a rural transport strategy is likely to be ineffective. Currently, we support four existing schemes in the form of revenue support grants in excess of £75K in total per annum that covers such matters as staff resources, professional advice and the running of core services. At the time of writing this Statement, this funding remains in place in our Draft Budget for 2011 onwards and is a vital element in the maintenance of this service but a variety of other funding sources, including via the LTP, will however remain essential.