Key Decision Details

Decision Name Huntingdon Bus Station

Date of Decision 03 February 2005

Decision maker Cabinet

The findings of the consultant's study were noted.

Whilst the importance to Huntingdon in the long term of the development of a transportation interchange was recognised, in the meantime the retention of the bus station on its existing site was approved.

Describe the Decision taken

A feasibility study into an improved bus station layout was approved.

The draft MTP was varied as set out in paragraph 4.5 of the report submitted to enable the feasibility study to be completed in 2005/06.

What were the reasons for taking the Decision?

What alternative options were considered and rejected?

Conflict of interest and dispensation none

Is the decision a Key Decision?

Was the decision included in the Forward Yes Plan

Was the decision subject to the urgency No proceedings?

List the background papers to any report considered by the Decision Taker

050203 Huntingdon Bus Station final

Person Making this report

Date upon which the Decision will come into

11 February 2005

force, subject to no call-in

Accompanying Documents

Accompanying 050203 Huntingdon Bus Station final

Key Decision Details

Decision Name

Public Conveniences Arrangements

with Town Councils

Date of Decision 03 February 2005

Decision maker Cabinet

It was

RESOLVED

Describe the Decision

taken

that consideration of the report by the Head of Environment and Transport on this matter be deferred pending the submission of a report by the Advisory Group for Public Conveniences to a future meeting.

What were the reasons for taking the Decision?

What alternative options were considered and rejected?

Conflict of interest and dispensation

Is the decision a Key Yes

Was the decision included in the Forward Yes Plan

Was the decision subject to the urgency No proceedings?

List the background

papers to any report considered by the Decision Taker

050203 Pub Cons Agency final

Person Making this

report

Date upon which the Decision will come into force, subject to no call-in

> Accompanying Documents

Accompanying 050203 Pub Cons Agency final

Key Decision Details

Decision Name Alconbury Flood Alleviation Scheme

Date of Decision 03 February 2005

Decision maker Cabinet

The inability of the Environment Agency to advance a Flood Alleviation Scheme for Alconbury Weston was noted.

The preferred option for the alleviation of flooding in Alconbury as detailed in the Environment Agency's consultation document was supported in principle.

Describe the Decision taken

That the proposal would be considered by the Council as the local Planning Authority later in the year was noted.

The Head of Environment and Transport was requested to inform the Environment Agency that the scheme should be sympathetic in its design and the materials used in keeping with the character of the area.

What were the reasons for taking the Decision?

What alternative options were considered and rejected?

Conflict of interest and dispensation

N J Guyatt

Is the decision a Key Decision? Was the decision included in the Forward Yes Plan

Was the decision subject to the urgency No proceedings?

List the background

papers to any report 050203 Alconbury Flood Alleviation

considered by the Scheme final Decision Taker

Person Making this report

Date upon which the Decision will come into

force, subject to no

11 February 2005

call-in

Accompanying 050203 Alconbury Flood Alleviation

Documents Scheme final

Key Decision Details

Decision Name SMALL SCALE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS

Date of Decision 03 February 2005

Decision maker

The contents of the report were

noted.

Describe the Decision The programme of schemes for **taken** 2005/06, as set out in paragraph 4.1

of the report were approved and funding released from the MTP

accordingly.

What were the reasons for taking the Decision?

What alternative options were considered and rejected?

Conflict of interest and dispensation none

Is the decision a Key Decision?

Was the decision included in the Forward No

Was the decision subject to the urgency No proceedings?

List the background

papers to any report 050203 small scale schemes 0506

considered by the V3 **Decision Taker**

Person Making this report

Date upon which the Decision will come into force, subject to no

11 February 2005

Documents V3

Accompanying 050203 small scale schemes 0506

call-in

Key Decision Details

Decision Name

Budget and Medium Term Plan 2006

- 2010

Date of Decision 03 February 2005

Decision maker Cabinet

Subject to adjustments for the decision on the Huntingdon bus station scheme, the £8,000 reduction in Government grant and the resulting impact on interest receipts and the funding of all of these from revenue reserves, the spending proposals summarised in Annex C to the report were approved.

Describe the Decision taken

A Council Tax of £106.54 for a Band D property for 2005/06 and the indicative levels for 2006/07 onwards as shown in Annex C to the report were approved.

Subject to any necessary variations relating to the adjustments referred to above, the Prudential Indicators at Annex F to the report were approved.

Subject to the fact that there is limited certainty that the efficiency savings target can be achieved but that the revenue reserves are sufficiently large for this not to be an issue in 2005, the Director of Commerce and Technology's comments on the Reserves on the Robustness of the budget at Annex G of the report were approved.

The 2005/06 and 2006/07 capital programmes were approved to increase opportunities for lower tender prices.

What were the reasons for taking the Decision?

> What alternative options were considered and rejected?

Conflict of interest and dispensation

none

Is the decision a Key Decision?

Yes

Was the decision included in the Forward Yes Plan

Was the decision subject to the urgency No proceedings?

> MTP Cabinet February 2005 After pensions

MTP schemes Annex A Cabinet Feb 2005

MTP Cabinet February 2005 After pensions ANNEX B

List the background MTP Cabinet February 2005 After papers to any report pensions ANNEX C considered by the

Decision Taker MTP ANNEX D

MTP Cabinet February 2005 After pensions ANNEX E

MTP Cabinet February 2005 After pensions ANNEX F

MTP Cabinet February 2005 After pensions ANNEX G

Person Making this

report

Date upon which the Decision will come into force, subject to no call-in

11 February 2005

Documents pensions

Accompanying MTP Cabinet February 2005 After

MTP schemes Annex A Cabinet Feb 2005

MTP Cabinet February 2005 After pensions ANNEX B

MTP Cabinet February 2005 After pensions ANNEX C

MTP ANNEX D

MTP Cabinet February 2005 After pensions ANNEX E

MTP Cabinet February 2005 After pensions ANNEX F

MTP Cabinet February 2005 After pensions ANNEX G

Key Decision Details

2005/06 Treasury Management **Decision Name**

Strategy

Date of Decision 03 February 2005

Decision maker Cabinet

Full Council were invited to approve **Describe the Decision** the 2005/06 Treasury Management

taken Strategy as appended to the report

submitted.

What were the reasons for taking the Decision?

> What alternative options were considered and rejected?

Conflict of interest and none dispensation

Is the decision a Key Decision?

Was the decision included in the Forward Yes Plan

Was the decision subject to the urgency No proceedings?

List the background papers to any report

papers to any report Treasury Mgt Strategy report draftconsidered by the 2005.6

Person Making this report

Decision Taker

Date upon which the Decision will come into force, subject to no call-in

11 February 2005

Accompanying Treasury Mgt Strategy report draft **Documents** 2005.6

Key Decision Details

Decision NameQUARTERLY SUMMARY OF DEBTS WRITTEN-OFF

Date of Decision 03 February 2005

taken

Decision maker

A report by the Head of Revenue Services summarising debts which had been written off during the quarter October – September 2004, the cumulative total for the current year and comparisons with previous

years was noted.

What were the reasons for taking the Decision?

Describe the Decision

What alternative options were considered and rejected?

Conflict of interest and dispensation none

Is the decision a Key No

Decision?

Was the decision included in the Forward No Plan

Was the decision subject to the urgency No proceedings?

List the background

papers to any report IRRECOVERABLE ITEMS FOR considered by the CABINET JAN05

Decision Taker
Person Making this

report

Date upon which the

Date upon which the Decision will come into force, subject to no

11 February 2005

Accompanying IRRECOVERABLE ITEMS FOR Documents CABINET JAN05

Key Decision Details

Decision Name Chequers Court Urban Design Framework

Date of Decision 03 February 2005

Decision maker Cabinet

taken

Subject to the inclusion of the words "and through an increase in the quantity and quality of floor space add to the viability and vitality of the Town Centre and" after the word "regenerated" in paragraph 2.5, the revised Urban Design Framework as amended to reflect the content of the Annex to the report was approved as

Interim Planning Guidance to the

Huntingdonshire Local Plan.

What were the reasons for taking the Decision?

Describe the Decision

What alternative options were considered and rejected?

Conflict of interest and none

dispensation

Is the decision a Key Decision?

Was the decision included in the Forward Yes Plan

Was the decision subject to the urgency No proceedings?

List the background CHEQUERS COURT RPT

papers to any report

considered by the CHEQUERS COURT summary of

Decision Taker responses

Person Making this report

Date upon which the Decision will come into force, subject to no call-in

11 February 2005

nanvina

Documents

Accompanying CHEQUERS COURT RPT

CHEQUERS COURT summary of

responses

Key Decision Details

Decision Name Review of Tourism Services Section

Date of Decision 03 February 2005

Decision maker Cabinet

Option 3 in paragraph 3. 9 of the report was approved as the preferred solution for the provision of Tourist **Describe the Decision** Information Services in Huntingdon.

Describe the Decision taken

iken

The revised structure of the Tourism Services section contained in Annex D to the report was approved.

What were the reasons for taking the Decision?

What alternative options were considered and rejected?

Conflict of interest and dispensation

Is the decision a Key Decision?

Was the decision included in the Forward Yes Plan

Was the decision subject to the urgency No proceedings?

List the background papers to any report considered by the **Decision Taker**

Tourism Services Review Nov 04

Person Making this report

Date upon which the **Decision will come into** force, subject to no

11 February 2005

Documents

call-in

Accompanying Tourism Services Review Nov 04

Key Decision Details

Business Generation at Leisure Decision Name

Centres

Date of Decision 03 February 2005

Decision maker Cabinet

The contents of the report were

noted.

The decision by the Employment Panel replace the post of Business Generation Manager with the post of Leisure Centres Promotions Officer

taken was noted.

Describe the Decision

The Leisure Centre Management

Committees were requested monitor the performance of the Business Generation Team.

What were the reasons for taking the Decision? What alternative options were considered and rejected?

Conflict of interest and dispensation

Is the decision a Key Decision?

Was the decision included in the Forward Yes Plan

Was the decision subject to the urgency No proceedings?

business generation scrutiny feb 05

List the background

papers to any report business generation SCRUTINY considered by the ANNEX feb 05

Decision Taker

business generation scrutiny annex2

Person Making this report

Date upon which the **Decision will come into** force, subject to no

11 February 2005

Documents

call-in

Accompanying business generation scrutiny feb 05

business generation SCRUTINY ANNEX feb 05

business generation scrutiny annex2