

A meeting of the **CABINET** will be held in **CIVIC SUITE 0.1A, PATHFINDER HOUSE, ST MARY'S STREET, HUNTINGDON, PE29 3TN** on **THURSDAY, 19 APRIL 2012** at **7:00 PM** and you are requested to attend for the transaction of the following business:-

**Contact  
(01480)**

## **APOLOGIES**

**1. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 4)**

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 22nd March 2012.

**Mrs H Taylor  
388008**

**2. MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

To receive from Members declarations as to personal and/or prejudicial interests and the nature of those interests in relation to any Agenda Item. Please see Notes 1 and 2 below.

**3. CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SCOPING REPORT (Pages 5 - 20)**

By way of a report by the Head of Planning Services to consider the draft scoping report and to approve it as the basis for the sustainability appraisal of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036.

**P Bland  
388430**

**4. STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (Pages 21 - 26)**

To consider a report by the Head of Planning Services seeking approval for a new Statement of Community Involvement.

**P Bland  
388430**

The views of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Environmental Well-Being) are attached at page 19.

**5. HUNTINGDONSHIRE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY CHARGING SCHEDULE 2012 (Pages 27 - 38)**

To consider a report by the Head of Planning Services seeking the Cabinet's endorsement of the Huntingdonshire Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule, the related Instalment Policy, and the Regulation 123 Infrastructure List for submission to Council.

**S Ingram  
388400**

**6. FINANCIAL MONITORING - CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2011/12 (Pages 39 - 42)**

To receive a report by the Head of Financial Services monitoring progress against the Council's Capital Programme 2011/12.

**S Couper  
388103**

**7. FINANCIAL MONITORING - REVENUE BUDGET 2011/12** (Pages 43 - 48)

To receive a report from the Head of Financial Services monitoring progress against the Council's revenue budget 2011/12.

**S Couper  
388103**

Figures for Annex B will be **"TO FOLLOW"**.

**8. NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUMS WORKING GROUP** (Pages 49 - 68)

To consider the report of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being).

**Miss H Ali  
388006**

**9. SAFETY ADVISORY GROUP** (Pages 69 - 76)

To consider the report of the Safety Advisory Group meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> March 2012.

**Mrs A Jerrom  
388009**

**10. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

To resolve:-

that the public be excluded from the meeting because the business to be transacted contains exempt information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

**11. DEVELOPMENT OF ONE LEISURE ST IVES** (Pages 77 - 96)

To consider a report by the General Manager, One Leisure.

**S Bell  
388049**

**12. HUMAN RESOURCES REVIEW** (Pages 97 - 118)

To consider a report by the Managing Director (Resources).

**T Parker  
388100**

Dated this 11 day of April 2012



Head of Paid Service

**Notes**

1. *A personal interest exists where a decision on a matter would affect to a greater extent than other people in the District –*
  - (a) *the well-being, financial position, employment or business of the Councillor, their family or any person with whom they had a close association;*
  - (b) *a body employing those persons, any firm in which they are a partner and any company of which they are directors;*
  - (c) *any corporate body in which those persons have a beneficial interest in a class of securities exceeding the nominal value of £25,000; or*
  - (d) *the Councillor's registerable financial and other interests.*

2. *A personal interest becomes a prejudicial interest where a member of the public (who has knowledge of the circumstances) would reasonably regard the Member's personal interest as being so significant that it is likely to prejudice the Councillor's judgement of the public interest.*

**Please contact Mrs H Taylor, Senior Democratic Services Officer, Tel No. 01480 388008/e-mail [Helen.Taylor@huntingdonshire.gov.uk](mailto:Helen.Taylor@huntingdonshire.gov.uk) if you have a general query on any Agenda Item, wish to tender your apologies for absence from the meeting, or would like information on any decision taken by the Cabinet.**

**Specific enquiries with regard to items on the Agenda should be directed towards the Contact Officer.**

**Members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting as observers except during consideration of confidential or exempt items of business.**

Agenda and enclosures can be viewed on the District Council's website – [www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk](http://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk) (*under Councils and Democracy*).

If you would like a translation of Agenda/Minutes/Reports or would like a large text version or an audio version please contact the Democratic Services Manager and we will try to accommodate your needs.

***Emergency Procedure***

*In the event of the fire alarm being sounded and on the instruction of the Meeting Administrator, all attendees are requested to vacate the building via the closest emergency exit.*

This page is intentionally left blank

## HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of the CABINET held in the Civic Suite 0.1A Pathfinder House, St Mary's Street, Huntingdon, PE29 3TN on Thursday, 22 March 2012.

PRESENT: Councillor J D Ablewhite – Chairman.  
Councillors B S Chapman, J A Gray,  
N J Guyatt, T D Sanderson and D M Tysoe.

### 98. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 16<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> February 2012 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 99. MEMBERS' INTERESTS

No declarations were received.

### 100. CAMBRIDGESHIRE RENEWABLES INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK (CRIF) AND CAMBRIDGESHIRE COMMUNITY ENERGY FUND (CEF)

With the aid of a joint report by the Heads of Environmental Management and of Planning (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) the Cabinet gave consideration to the Cambridgeshire Renewables Infrastructure Framework (CRIF) and the Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund (CEF). In introducing the report, the Executive Councillor for Environment confirmed that 1169 solar panels had been installed at Eastfield House which would provide the Council with significant energy efficiencies.

The Head of Environmental Management, in the course of a presentation to the Cabinet, clarified a number of matters on what was a complex and technical subject.

Executive Councillors were advised that the CRIF Project aimed to provide a robust evidence base to promote and increase the implementation of renewable energy projects for the benefit of the public sector, community and business. It was designed to help Cambridgeshire meet carbon and climate change targets by maximising energy opportunities. The Cabinet were reminded that Cambridgeshire was required to deliver 28% of its energy from onshore renewable by 2030.

Members' attention was drawn to the CEF project, a mechanism to support developers to achieve their zero carbon obligations, which was being explored as an option for Cambridgeshire by the CRIF/CEF Steering Group. It was reported that developers would be able to offset the balance of their emissions by contributing into a fund. The money would then be invested into low carbon

infrastructure projects to deliver carbon emissions savings. The Cabinet stressed the need to ensure that CEF income is retained locally through appropriate planning policy provision.

In discussing planned renewable energy capacity, Members' attention was drawn to the conclusions reached by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Environmental Well-Being). In that respect, Members concurred with the Panel that the Council should try to influence where wind turbines were located given that some wind farms work better in some locations than in others. Furthermore, the Cabinet were of the opinion that the delivery of wind farms should not be restricted to private developers and that CRIF should recognise the commercial opportunities for public sector organisations.

Having thanked officers for their comprehensive presentation, the Cabinet

RESOLVED

- (a) that the Cambridgeshire Renewables Infrastructure Framework (CRIF) and the Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund (CEF) be supported and the future approach to energy and renewables outlined in the report now submitted endorsed;
- (b) that the Managing Directors (Communities, Partnerships and Projects) and (Resources) be authorised, after consultation with the Executive Councillor for Environment, to carry forward work on energy and renewables in the District, to deliver the best possible outcomes for Business, the Community and Public Sector, within the Framework of the CRIF; and
- (c) that the Managing Directors (Communities, Partnerships and Projects) and (Resources) be requested to consider the merits of setting up a CEF.

**101. GREATER CAMBRIDGE - GREATER PETERBOROUGH LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP: INCORPORATION AS A COMPANY LIMITED BY GUARANTEE**

Further to Minute No 11/17, the Cabinet considered a report by the Managing Director (Communities, Partnerships & Projects) (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) seeking approval for the District Council to become a corporate member of the Greater Cambridge – Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) as part of its incorporation as a company limited by guarantee.

It was explained that corporate membership would expand the Board's remit and enable it to enter into contracts. Having been advised that corporate membership would formally acknowledge the role of the LEP area local authorities and would not lead to any financial commitment for the Council, the Cabinet

RESOLVED

- (a) that the incorporation of the Greater Cambridge – Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) as a Company Limited by Guarantee be supported and the District Council's involvement approved; and
- (b) that the Managing Director (Communities, Partnerships and Projects) and the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to complete the appropriate legal documentation and processes.

## **102. BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT - HUNTINGDON**

A report by the Economic Development Manager (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) was submitted detailing proposals to establish a Business Improvement District (BID) in Huntingdon. The report had been submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Economic Well-Being).

By way of background, Members were advised that a BID was a defined area within in which businesses would pay an additional levy to fund improvements within that area. For a bid to be successful the agreement of a majority of those businesses affected must be received by number and rateable value. With regard to the extent of the proposed BID area, Members were advised that the area focused on the town centre and was essentially the area circumscribed by the ring road covering 369 businesses across the retail and office sectors.

It was noted that those businesses identified within the proposed bid area had been consulted as part of a feasibility study prior to the proposal moving onto the second phase of consultation.

Executive Councillors were advised that a suggested bid levy of 1.5% of the rateable value of the businesses would raise approximately £200,000 per annum. It was reported that under this rate the Council would be subject to an annual levy of £11,320 for the 14 premises/areas under its ownership that fall within the BID boundary.

Having referred to the potential impact an additional cost could have on small businesses and charities Executive Councillors were advised that, subject to the agreement of those liable, the BID Regulations 2004 would allow for these vulnerable groups to be excluded from the charge.

In discussing issues surrounding the collection of the levy and in noting the deliberations of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel thereon, the Cabinet

### **RESOLVED**

- (a) that the Head of Customer Services be authorised to enter into the BID Levy Operating Agreement required in order to meet the Council's obligations under the Local Government Act 2003; and
- (b) that the Managing Director (Communities, Partnerships

& Projects) after consultation with the Executive Leader, be authorised to cast any votes to which the District Council is entitled in the ballot.

**103. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

RESOLVED

that the public be excluded from the meeting because the business to be transacted contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of a particular person (including the authority holding that information).

**104. LOCATION OF THE CALL CENTRE**

Further to Minute No. 11/44, consideration was given to a report by the Managing Director (Communities, Partnerships & Projects) (a copy of which is appended in the Annex to the Minute Book) summarising a range of options for the future location of the District Council's Call Centre. The report had been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Economic Well-Being) whose comments were relayed to the Cabinet.

In discussing the options available, Executive Councillors were reminded that the Council was a full partner in the Making Assets Count Project which guides asset management planning across the partnership.

With regard to the technically and financial impact of any move, the Cabinet concurred with the Panel that the Call Centre currently worked well and that there were no apparent advantages to changing the current arrangements and that it would therefore be appropriate to negotiate a new lease for Speke House for up to 5 years with a break after 3 years. Whereupon, it was

RESOLVED

- (a) that the Call Centre be retained at Speke House; and
- (b) that the Managing Director (Communities, Partnerships and Projects) be authorised to negotiate the best terms available for a new lease for Speke House, before its expiry in June 2013.

Chairman



COMT  
OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY (Environmental Wellbeing)  
CABINET

26<sup>th</sup> March 2012  
10<sup>th</sup> April 2012  
19<sup>th</sup> April 2012

## **Consultation on the draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (Report by Head of Planning Services)**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This report recommends that the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (the Scoping Report) is approved as the basis for Sustainability Appraisal of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036. A draft Scoping Report has been prepared and consulted on. Taking into account comments received, and any additional comments from the Overview and Scrutiny (Environmental Wellbeing) Panel, the document can be approved with any necessary amendments.

### **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 When drawing up new planning documents the effects they will have on the environment and people's quality of life, both now and in the future are some of the most important things to consider. To be sure that the plan does not cause environmental, social or economic problems there is a system of appraisal known as Sustainability Appraisal (SA). This appraisal system is at the heart of the plan production process and is set out in European and British law.
- 2.2 SA, as a legally required process, has been the focus of a number of recent legal challenges where people who are opposed to particular local plans have successfully challenged how the SA process had been undertaken. A recent court decision concerning the Joint Core Strategy for Norwich will require the authorities there to return to the plan production process with significant impacts on resources both financially and in terms of the time involved with going through stages of plan production again. It is therefore clear that it is worthwhile ensuring that the SA process is completed in a robust manner, in line with the relevant legislation and guidance.
- 2.3 The SA process is divided into five stages. The Scoping Report and consultation on it make up the first stage. There are three roles for the Scoping Report: it needs to determine what environmental, social or economic issues should be tackled by looking at influencing factors including existing plans and programmes that the Local Plan will need to work with and data about the existing situation; secondly it needs to come up with a system for appraising the alternative options for the Local Plan to see how they could impact upon the issues identified; the final role is to establish a methodology for applying the appraisal system.

### **3. CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT SCOPING REPORT**

- 3.1 The Council is required to consult on the Scoping Report with the Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage. These bodies are known as the SA bodies. In the interests of openness and to encourage engagement with production of the Local Plan the consultation has been open to anyone to make comments. The period for consultation is statutorily set at five weeks.

- 3.2 At the time of writing the consultation is still open and is due to close on 30 March 2012. There have only been a very small number of comments received so far and as such it is considered that to summarise them in this report may give undue emphasis to these early comments. Instead a full summary will be presented to Members at the meetings of Overview and Scrutiny and Cabinet as they will take place after the close of the consultation period.

#### **4. RECOMMENDATION**

- 4.1 It is recommended that Cabinet authorises the Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning and Housing, in conjunction with the Head of Planning Services, to finalise and approve the Scoping Report.

#### **Background Information**

The consultation document and full comments are available on the Council's consultation portal: <http://consult.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/portal>

**CONTACT OFFICER** - enquiries about this report to Paul Bland, Planning Services Manager (Policy) on 01480 388430

## Comments on Draft Sustainability Scoping Report

In total 34 comments were made by 11 consultees, including two of the three SA Bodies. The comments were wide ranging but can be summarised as being concerned with:

- Recent national developments that have implications for planning, including the National Planning Policy Framework, the Localism Act and the Community Infrastructure Levy
- Plans or programmes that were not referenced
- Public engagement in the Sustainability Appraisal and plan making process
- Links with other aspects of the plan making process, including the Habitats Regulations Assessment
- Economic development, including the Alconbury Airfield Enterprise Zone
- Coverage of topics including ancient woodland, heritage assets, flooding, crime and community facilities
- Minor textual changes to aid clarity

The following table gives all comments in full, organised in document order. Where the 'Section/ Paragraph Number' is blank the comment is on the whole document. SA bodies are identified in the table.

Name, Organisation	Section/ Paragraph Number	Comment ID	Type of comment	Comment
Ms J Bowd Holywell-cum- Needingworth Parish Council		<a href="#">SASR3</a>	Have Observations	The contents of the document had been noted and that the Council wished to be kept informed
Rose Freeman The Theatres Trust		<a href="#">SASR13</a>	Have Observations	We support this tidy comprehensive Scoping Report especially for its cultural content under the sub-heading Health and Well-being to promote the accessibility of cultural activities, but have a few quibbles. (See comments against relevant consultation points)
Janet Nuttall Natural England (SA Body)		<a href="#">SASR14</a>	Have Observations	<p>We are pleased to be able to provide comments.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England promotes the use of our guidance document 'Environmental Quality in Spatial Planning', produced jointly with the Environment Agency and English Heritage, and would recommend that reference is made to this document during the preparation of the new local plan. In particular, Supplementary File 14 provides a checklist to be used during the development of local development frameworks. The guidance can be found at the following link:</p> <p><a href="http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/planningtransportlocalgov/spatialplanning/default.aspx">http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/planningtransportlocalgov/spatialplanning/default.aspx</a></p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>We welcome the efforts made by Huntingdonshire District Council in preparing the draft Scoping Report. We are satisfied at present that the Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan is proceeding in a proper, logical and comprehensive manner.</p>

Name, Organisation	Section/ Paragraph Number	Comment ID	Type of comment	Comment
				<p>Approach to SA</p> <p>We are pleased to see recognition of the Government's objectives for sustainable development.</p> <p>We welcome the reference made to the other assessments, particularly Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA); however, further discussion should be included on the separate Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) process and the integration between the SA/SEA and HRA processes.</p> <p>For example, evidence gathered for the HRA on European sites, and the conclusion of the HRA should inform the SA.</p> <p>Scoping Process</p> <p>We strongly support the topic based approach taken and are pleased to see consideration of issues of importance to Natural England including landscape character, the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and the delivery of green infrastructure. We also welcome consideration of climate change mitigation and adaptation. We would advise that consideration should also be given to the protection and enhancement of geodiversity; sites such as Warboys Claypit SSSI are designated on account of their nationally important geological interest features.</p> <p>The assessment should consider the inter-relationships between topics, for example a number of topics can have a significant influence on biodiversity, such as air quality, noise, water quality and resources. The contaminated land theme should include reference to biodiversity due to the impact that pollution could have on habitats and species and water quality due to potential for leaching of contaminants into water courses.</p> <p>We welcome reference to the local BAP and this should inform the assessment of impacts on biodiversity and help identify opportunities for enhancement.</p> <p>Natural England welcomes reference to the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy in relation to the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure through development. We are pleased to see consideration of Natural England's 'standards for accessible natural greenspace' (ANGSt); this set of benchmarks should be used to ensure new and existing residential development has access to nature. More information can be found on Natural England's publication, 'Nature Nearby, Accessible Greenspace Guidance' (March 2010), available on our website, publication reference NE265.</p> <p>A further useful evidence document in relation to green infrastructure is Natural England's Analysis of Accessible Natural Greenspace Provision for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. This identifies levels of deprivation, in terms of access to open space, across the ANGSt standards within each LPA area.</p> <p>Natural England is pleased to note reference to the Huntingdonshire Outline Water Cycle Strategy. The findings and recommendations of this important study will need to be fully considered as part of the assessment process. Consideration should be given to the deliverability of drainage infrastructure requirements ahead of, or at least in line with, development to ensure environmental impacts are minimised.</p> <p>We welcome recognition of the role of SUDS in protecting and enhancing water resources. Reference should be made to the multi-functional benefits of SUDS, for example in enhancing landscape, amenity, biodiversity, in addition to drainage and flood management.</p>

Name, Organisation	Section/ Paragraph Number	Comment ID	Type of comment	Comment
Mr John Davidson		<a href="#">SASR19</a>	Have Observations	In light of the Localism Bill 2011 giving citizens greater say with the introduction of the concept of Neighbourhood Plans more needs to be done to encourage active involvement with the process.
Urban and Civic (David Lock Associates)		<a href="#">SASR27</a>	Have Observations	<p>The publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on the 27th March 2012 represents a sea change in planning policy that will have implications for all levels of planning at policy making and development management levels. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Scoping Report should take into account the NPPF at all stages of the SA and for all topics, key aims and SA objectives to ensure that the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive are met.</p> <p>The NPPF identifies the presumption in favour of sustainable development as a 'golden thread' running through plan-making and decision-taking. The new definition of sustainable development should be incorporated into the SA Scoping.</p> <p>While sustainable development is reflected across the SA Scoping in its current form there are aspects of the NPPF that place additional emphasis on a number of elements of sustainability that, in our view, merit particular consideration in reviewing the scoping of the SA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning should proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. (paragraph 17)</li> <li>• Planning policies should recognise and seek to address potential barriers to investment, including a poor environment or any lack of infrastructure, services or housing. In drawing up Local Plans, local planning authorities should set out a clear economic vision and strategy for their area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth; and facilitates flexible working practices such as the integration of residential and commercial uses within the same unit. (paragraph 21)</li> <li>• The transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes and local planning authorities should support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport (paragraphs 29 and 30).</li> <li>• Planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities. (paragraph 37)</li> <li>• Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 49).</li> <li>• Planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. (paragraph 111)</li> <li>• In pursuing sustainable development the need to ensure careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. (paragraph 173).</li> <li>• The potential use of Local Development Orders where this would promote economic, social or environmental gains for the area, such as boosting enterprise. (paragraph 199)</li> </ul> <p>The SA Scoping would benefit from these elements of sustainability within the NPPF being more clearly articulated in the Key Aims identified in section 3, the Scoping Process within the current framework of topics and flowing through</p>

Name, Organisation	Section/ Paragraph Number	Comment ID	Type of comment	Comment
				<p>thereafter into SA framework objectives. In particular, the key aims under the topic heading Employment, Business, Retail and Tourism should expressly identify the encouragement of sustainable economic growth given the designation of part of Alconbury Airfield as an Enterprise Zone. A new key aim / key sustainability issue and problem of positively and proactively encourage sustainable economic growth should be considered, with a SA Framework Objective of Maximising inward investment into the Alconbury Enterprise Zone.</p> <p>There is clear encouragement in the NPPF for promoting the co-location of jobs and homes in terms of addressing barriers to investment, facilitating flexible working practices, facilitating the use of sustainable transport modes and minimising journey lengths. This should also be recognised more explicitly within section 3 under Employment, Business, Retail and Tourism.</p> <p>The current key aim of 'promote more sustainable patterns of growth including employment' could be replaced with promote a balance of land uses including housing and new infrastructure and services to stimulate investment, again with a SA Framework Objective of Maximising inward investment into the Alconbury Enterprise Zone.</p>
Mr Tony Chadwick The Woodland Trust		<a href="#">SASR8</a>	Object	<p>Although the Woodland Trust recognises the general principle to protect open space/green space and particularly those that have designations, we urge you to also include both ancient woodland and ancient trees. Ancient woodland (land that has been continually wooded since at least AD1600) is our richest land habitat. Ancient woods form a unique link to the primeval wildwood habitat that covered most of lowland Britain following the last Ice Age.</p> <p>Ancient woods are uniquely valuable. Their wildlife communities are generally richer than those of recent woods, having developed over long periods of time. They contain a high proportion of rare and vulnerable species, many of which require the stable conditions that ancient woodland affords. As the terrestrial habitat most representative of original, natural, stable conditions, ancient woodland is home to more threatened species than any other habitat in the UK.</p> <p>With only 2.4% of the land area in Great Britain covered by ancient woodland we cannot afford any more of this finite resource to be lost forever. It is therefore essential that this habitat be protected from development.</p> <p>Ancient woods are also treasure troves of historical features such as bronze and iron age earthworks, Saxon range boundaries, ancient park boundaries, ridge and furrow, park pales and woodbanks, all of which give a picture of past land use. Old coppice stools and pollards point to past woodland management practices, and charcoal pits, ore furnaces and kilns are clues to local industrial history. Finally, ancient woods are timeless places of great beauty and tranquillity. The importance of woodland, and especially ancient woodland, to our quality of life should not be underestimated.</p> <p>In terms of compensatory measures, it is impossible to replace ancient woodland as this habitat has evolved over centuries and it is impossible to replace hundreds of years of ecological evolution by planting a new site or attempting to translocate them. For these reasons the Trust believes ancient woodland must be given absolute protection under this plan, and any caveat to this effect should be deleted.</p> <p>Woodland has the ability to contribute to 10 of the 20 of the UK Framework Indicators of sustainable development launched in March 2005 (HM Government, 2005, One future - different paths. The UK's shared framework for sustainable development, p12). These include contributing to biodiversity, reducing air pollution, improving health, education, employment, environmental equality, wellbeing and helping the economy grow.</p> <p>The Government's policy on ancient and native woodland, outlined in Keepers of time - A statement of policy for</p>

Name, Organisation	Section/ Paragraph Number	Comment ID	Type of comment	Comment
				<p>England 's ancient and native woodland, 2005, states that "The existing area of ancient woodland should be maintained and there should be a net increase in the area of native woodland." It also states that "The cultural heritage associated with ancient woodland and veteran trees should be protected and conserved." (Keepers of time - A statement of policy for England 's ancient and native woodland, 2005 , p10)</p> <p>The Biodiversity Strategy for England (Biodiversity 2020: A Strategy for England's Wildlife &amp; Ecosystem Services, Defra 2011, see 'Forestry' para 2.16) states that – 'We are committed to providing appropriate protection to ancient woodlands and to more restoration of plantations on ancient woodland site'.</p> <p>The Government's Natural Environment White Paper – The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature (HM Government, July 2011, para 2.56) states that: 'The Government is committed to providing appropriate protection to ancient woodlands....'</p> <p>Under section 74 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, the Government has a statutory duty to publish lists of priority conservation habitats. Under section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, all public authorities now have a statutory duty to conserve biodiversity. The revised UK BAP targets includes a new Habitat Action Plan for Native Woodland which specifies a clear 'maintenance' target of no more loss of ancient woodland. It is therefore axiomatic that the council has a statutory obligation to protect ancient woodland.</p> <p>Old individual trees are an important part of our cultural and landscape heritage : ancient, veteran and notable trees resonate with the history of the landscape and form markers in the lives of individual people and communities. Ancient trees also have a special conservation value, supporting many species of epiphytes, invertebrates and fungi, whilst also providing a habitat for other animals including owls, woodpeckers, other hole nesting birds and bats. In addition, trees make a significant contribution to the urban environment both in visual terms and in helping to abate air pollution and create oxygen.</p> <p>There is a need to ensure that this ancient tree heritage continues in a sustainable way so that future generations will be able to enjoy the benefits of ancient trees after the current specimens are gone.</p> <p>It has been estimated that Britain may be home to a majority of northern Europe's ancient trees and therefore we have a great responsibility in looking after them. Some ancient/veteran/notable trees have already been identified in Huntingdonshire and there may be other ancient trees that we may not yet know about. The Ancient Tree Hunt (<a href="http://www.ancient-tree-hunt.org.uk/">http://www.ancient-tree-hunt.org.uk/</a>) is designed specifically for this purpose.</p> <p>It is important that there is no further avoidable loss of ancient trees through development pressure, mismanagement or poor practice. The Ancient Tree Forum (ATF) and the Woodland Trust would like to see all such trees recognised as historical, cultural and wildlife monuments scheduled under TPOs and highlighted in plans so they are properly valued in planning decision-making. There is also a need for policies ensuring good management of ancient trees, the development of a succession of future ancient trees through new street tree planting and new wood pasture creation, and to raise awareness and understanding of the value and importance of ancient trees.</p>
Mr John Davidson	1.8	<a href="#">SASR20</a>	Have Observations	More must be done to actively involve residents in the process.
Mr John Davidson	1.9	<a href="#">SASR21</a>	Have Observations	It should also be noted that not all communities need or desire additional growth, as that can have a significant impact on the quality of life.
Mr John	2.3	<a href="#">SASR23</a>	Object	Stage D2 add, "Actively encourage maximum public involvement."

Name, Organisation	Section/ Paragraph Number	Comment ID	Type of comment	Comment
Davidson				
Mr John Davidson	Table 2	<a href="#">SASR22</a>	Object	Add, "Take active steps to encourage maximum public involvement".
Urban and Civic (David Lock Associates)	3	<a href="#">SASR31</a>	Have Observations	There are a number of factual matters regarding Alconbury Airfield and its description that would benefit from some clarification within the SA Scoping. The non-technical summary at page vi and Chapter 3 The Scoping Process on page 16 refer to Alconbury Airfield being designated as an Enterprise Zone. This should be amended to say part of Alconbury Airfield, as correctly described in paragraph 3.11 of the SA Scoping.
Urban and Civic (David Lock Associates)	3	<a href="#">SASR34</a>	Have Observations	While it is a little unclear at this scale, a number of the figures in chapter 3: the Scoping Process suggest that parts of the northern 'peninsula' site of Alconbury Airfield (also known as the Bomb Dump) might be considered to be open space (Figure 3.1: Agricultural Land Classification across the district and Figure 3.3 Distribution of open space across the district).  For the avoidance of doubt, this area is previously developed land and should be identified as such in any mapping.
Urban and Civic (David Lock Associates)		<a href="#">SASR28</a>	Have Observations	The Alconbury Airfield Enterprise Zone bid documentation should be included within the Plans and Programmes reviewed as a source of baseline information setting out the key objectives for delivery of growth on the site.  The Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule and its supporting evidence might also be referenced as a Plan and Programme that will have effects on the environment.
Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (SA Body)	3.5	<a href="#">SASR4</a>	Have Observations	The list of key documents for heritage on page 9 (and Appendix 1) would benefit from the inclusion of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 alongside the 1979 Act, as this forms the legislative framework for listed buildings and conservation areas. At the local level, reference should be made to the district's suite of conservation area character statements, which identify issues and features to be preserved and enhanced
Mr Paul Wiltshire	3.5	<a href="#">SASR24</a>	Object	Under the topic of Health & Wellbeing, it would be good to expand on the list of community facilities to include not only sport facility and open spaces, but also meeting places, public houses and places of worship.  Also, as a topic - to take account of the health status and needs of the local population (such as for sports, recreation and places of worship), including expected future changes, and any information about relevant barriers to improving health and well-being.  This is supported by the new National Planning Policy
Miss Sinéad O'Donoghue Cambridgeshire County Council	3.5	<a href="#">SASR25</a>	Have Observations	The following documents may be useful to include under the Education section:  Childcare Act 2006  Formalised the important strategic role that Local Authorities play in the planning and commissioning of early years provision. The Act takes forward some of the key commitments from the 'Ten-year childcare strategy', published in 2004, and sets out a number of statutory duties that Local Authorities must fulfil.  The duties that accompanied the Childcare Act 2006 were further clarified in statutory guidance published in 2010,



Name, Organisation	Section/ Paragraph Number	Comment ID	Type of comment	Comment
				<p>building upon the 'Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009'.</p> <p>Education Act 1996</p> <p>Standards and Framework Act 1998</p> <p>Introduced a wide range of duties and responsibilities for Local Authorities, schools and governing bodies, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the introduction of a limit on Infant Class size, subsequently determined as being 30 pupils within a single class to one teacher;</li> <li>• the requirement to rationalise school places in line with guidance produced by the Secretary of State;</li> <li>• the introduction of the Code of Practice (Admissions Code) issued by the Secretary of State to underpin admission arrangements nationwide; and the requirement to enable parents to express a preference for the school they wished their children to attend.</li> </ul> <p>Learning and Skills Act 2000</p> <p>Introduced proposals for city academies. These were developed further in the 'Education Act 2002'. Academies, as city academies have since become known, are independent state schools which receive their funding directly from Central Government, and which have greater flexibility over curriculum, contracts of employment and staff pay than other schools in the public sector.</p> <p>Education Act 2005</p> <p>Made provision for Federations between schools and a competition process to be undertaken by Local Authorities prior to establishing new secondary schools.</p> <p>Education and Inspections Act 2006</p> <p>Subsequently placed requirements on Local Authorities to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- exercise their duties to ensure that the provision of education promotes high standards, ensures fair access to educational opportunity and promotes the fulfilment by every child of their educational potential;</li> <li>- secure diversity in the provision of schools and increase the opportunities for parental choice; and to</li> <li>- give considerations to parental representations</li> </ul> <p>It also extended the new school competition requirement to include primary and special schools.</p>
Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (SA Body)	3.41	<a href="#">SASR5</a>	Have Observations	<p>We welcome reference to the historic environment in paragraphs 3.41 and 3.42. It is helpful to refer to the buildings at risk in Huntingdonshire based on the district's own register, but it would also be good to refer the English Heritage's Heritage at Risk Register, which includes more than just listed buildings. The register for 2011 states that there are 4 listed buildings (Grade I and II* only) and 8 scheduled monuments "at risk" in the district (the register can be accessed via <a href="http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/caring/heritage-at-risk">www.english-heritage.org.uk/caring/heritage-at-risk</a>).</p>

Name, Organisation	Section/ Paragraph Number	Comment ID	Type of comment	Comment
Mr George Sykes	3.48	<a href="#">SASR2</a>	Have Observations	Please see my comment on Carbon Cost of crime in Section 3.110 of this document.
Rose Freeman The Theatres Trust	3.58	<a href="#">SASR9</a>	Have Observations	The Health and Well-being paragraphs from 3.58 to 3.60 on page 27 under section A2 Collecting Baseline Information do not mention venues or locations for cultural activities but only deal with health services and hospitals. This is inconsistent and we suggest another paragraph be added to record present access to existing cultural facilities or similar.
Mr John Davidson	3.59	<a href="#">SASR15</a>	Object	Modify to include, "A significant portion of the population live in the north of the district and are served by Peterborough and Stamford hospitals. These days that incorporates both health care and social care that have become increasingly intertwined."
Mr John Davidson	3.63	<a href="#">SASR18</a>	Have Observations	It should be noted that Yaxley is only a village that lacks the infrastructure of a town, relying on its proximity to Peterborough.
Mr John Davidson	3.67	<a href="#">SASR17</a>	Have Observations	It should be recognised that if residents are allowed to extend their properties unabated that will have a detrimental effect on the stock of affordable housing.
Mr John Davidson	3.70	<a href="#">SASR16</a>	Have Observations	The difficulty of projecting future need should be recognised. Even the Gypsy Council admit to not being able to predict need more than 3 years into the future.
Urban and Civic (David Lock Associates)	3.78	<a href="#">SASR32</a>	Have Observations	Paragraph 3.78 suggests that the Enterprise Zone (EZ) is in the western portion of the airfield. In fact the EZ is split into three elements located across the Alconbury Airfield site and including land to the east of the Airfield adjacent to the East Coast Main Line as shown on the attached plan.
Urban and Civic (David Lock Associates)	3.79	<a href="#">SASR33</a>	Have Observations	Paragraph 3.79 refers to the EZ bid. The scale of development quoted at paragraph 3.79 only related to what was considered might be delivered up to 2015 – the whole 150 hectares will contain considerably more than 37,000 sq m.
Mr George Sykes	3.110	<a href="#">SASR1</a>	Have Observations	<p>Climate change is all too prevalent and crime also has an impact on climate change and carbon cost.</p> <p>Reported crime and the loss and damage associated with crime in England &amp; Wales equates to a staggering 5.5 million tonnes of CO2 per year - with un-recorded crime taking this to over 6.5m tonnes!</p> <p>With 5.6m tonnes attributable to the consequence of crime (e.g. car journeys taken for fear of travelling on public transport, house moves because of crime suffered or perceived) the overall total carbon cost of crime equals more than 12.5m tonnes of CO2. That total roughly equates to 2% of the UK's total CO2 output.</p> <p>The report "The Carbon Cost of Crime and its Implications" by Professor Ken Pease give the research and results of a study into crime and its costs.</p> <p>It is important that the correct emphasis is given within any Local Plan to promote the aim of positive action in reducing crime, which is best achieved at the initial design stage, and acknowledged by submissions within any Design &amp; Access Statements submitted with Planning Applications.</p>
Mr Tom Gilbert-	Table 3	<a href="#">SASR6</a>	Have	We welcome the identification of the historic environment as a key issue for the district in Table 3. While the

Name, Organisation	Section/ Paragraph Number	Comment ID	Type of comment	Comment
Wooldridge English Heritage (SA Body)			Observations	recognition of the historic environment's tourism and economic role is useful, the historic environment should also be valued for its social and environmental benefits, such as defining local distinctiveness and enhancing quality of life. Our SA guidance provides further examples of issues that you may wish to highlight (see: <a href="http://www.helm.org.uk/upload/pdf/Strat-env-ass.pdf?1300094357">www.helm.org.uk/upload/pdf/Strat-env-ass.pdf?1300094357</a> ).
Rose Freeman The Theatres Trust	Table 3	<a href="#">SASR10</a>	Have Observations	The suggested objectives on page 39 for Health and Well-being under Key Sustainability Issues and Problems are ideal for well-being. However, the spelling of Well-being in the title box on page 39 should be hyphenated to be consistent with this term elsewhere in the document.
Jennifer Dean Anglian Water Services Ltd	A 4: Developing the SA Framework	<a href="#">SASR26</a>	Have Observations	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the Draft Sustainability Scoping Report. We welcome engagement with Huntingdonshire District Council on the growth proposals within the district. We have the following comments to make on the consultation draft:</p> <p>We suggest the third objective under the land, Water and Flood Risk should read 'manage and minimise all forms of flood risk (taking into account climate change)'.</p> <p>The ongoing Water Cycle Study (WCS) may identify matters to be considered within the Sustainability Appraisal. Accordingly, we recommend there is flexible approach to issues considered to ensure the final Sustainability Appraisal is fully informed by emerging evidence base documents. We are committed to working with all partners of the Huntingdonshire WCS to enable development within environmental capacity.</p>
Urban and Civic (David Lock Associates)	A 4: Developing the SA Framework	<a href="#">SASR29</a>	Have Observations	<p>Very large scale major development such as that proposed at Alconbury will deliver significant new infrastructure, services, open spaces and other positive attributes as an inherent element of the proposals. A scheme of this scale will also accommodate a range of development forms, densities and uses that do not always readily fit with the sorts of criteria identified in the Decision Aiding Questions for sites.</p> <p>Section A4 should increase the use of the category 'potentially on site' to a wider range of questions as very large scale major development sites such as Alconbury could provide for elements that smaller sites could not (for example is the site within 300m of an area of natural green space over 2ha). In connection with the 'potentially on site' category, the scoring system at paragraph 3.119 is questioned as it accords a lower 'neither positive or negative or uncertain' score, compared to a site that meets the criteria outside of the site. This is illogical as it deliberately downgrades new infrastructure and services (which will often be of a higher quality and standard) below existing infrastructure and services. There is no reason that the effects of provision on site should be more uncertain than for existing provision outside of a site to endure.</p> <p>It is suggested that it might be more useful to base the likelihood of provision on site against the guidelines within the Council's Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document. If this suggests, based on scale thresholds, that provision should be made on site, then the SA should assume on site provision is made and score the effect as positive. A number of the decision aiding questions for sites also introduce criteria that are not backed up with references to recognised standards (for example is the site within 300m of a natural green space over 2ha, within 400m of a food shop, within 600m of a primary school, 400m of a bus stop). The distance of 800m is usually accepted as a reasonable walking distance to local facilities and is often used in Sustainability Appraisals as a benchmark figure for accessibility.</p> <p>The SA Framework Objective suggested above of Maximising inward investment into the Alconbury Enterprise Zone might be incorporated into SA objective 19 Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and viability of the local</p>

Name, Organisation	Section/ Paragraph Number	Comment ID	Type of comment	Comment
				<p>economy, including the rural economy and tourism and also of town centres and retail facilities and Alconbury Enterprise Zone.</p> <p>The SA objectives should also reflect the benefits of investment in the provision of infrastructure and stimulation of investment generally. The associated decision aiding questions for sites could be augmented with an additional question: Will the mix of uses promote a balance of land uses including housing and new infrastructure and services to stimulate investment and economic activity?</p>
Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge English Heritage (SA Body)	3.117	<a href="#">SASR7</a>	Have Observations	<p>We greatly welcome the inclusion of a SA objective relating to the historic environment (No. 7), following our comments on the Planning Policies DPD SA Scoping Report last year. We are happy with the wording of the SA objective, but wonder whether the decision aiding questions could be clarified. Our SA guidance might help with such questions.</p> <p>In terms of the question for the strategy, the word "sensitive" is not entirely clear. Development might be sensitive to the district's heritage but still cause harm. We feel that the phrase "will it promote development which preserves and enhances the district's heritage" would be clearer and consistent with national policy and legislation.</p> <p>In terms of the question relating to sites, the question should refer to the settings of heritage assets as well as the assets themselves. The decision as to whether the impact is positive, negative or negligible will require professional judgement (including from conservation and archaeology colleagues). This is important both in terms of assessing the impact of a site on the setting of heritage assets beyond the site boundary, but also in terms of assessing the impact on heritage assets within the site, including buried archaeology. Cumulative impact of a number of site allocations on the same heritage asset/s is important to consider, as well as the weighting given to the historic environment opposed to other factors such as flood risk or biodiversity (some sites may be fine in all other respects, but could still fail purely on historic environment grounds).</p> <p>It should be possible to rule out part or all of certain sites from the beginning if they contain nationally significant heritage assets (particularly designated heritage assets, but also nationally significant archaeology etc), as allocating them for housing, employment etc is likely to cause fundamental conflicts (although it depends on the specific site, proposed use and the heritage asset/s within the site). The more significant and extensive the heritage asset, the greater the impact is likely to be. Similarly, development within the setting of a heritage asset could be ruled out from the beginning in some cases.</p> <p>While avoiding harm to the historic environment is perhaps the primary aim of any site assessment process, opportunities to enhance the historic environment through the allocation and development of specific sites should not be overlooked. This might include redeveloping a site that currently harms the significance and setting of heritage assets, or a site that contains a heritage asset "at risk", whose future might be secured by new development.</p> <p>In terms of the question relating to development management policies, reference to enhancement should be included alongside protection, while the brackets should refer to designated and non-designated, rather than listed and non-listed (to cover all types of heritage assets).</p> <p>Indicators will need to be developed alongside the objective for the historic environment. Our SA guidance provides some advice on potentially suitable indicators.</p>
Urban and Civic (David Lock)	A 5: Consulting	<a href="#">SASR30</a>	Have Observations	The SA Scoping may also benefit from clearer reference to the duty to cooperate across administrative boundaries, particularly in considering any cross boundary effects that might be anticipated.

Name, Organisation	Section/ Paragraph Number	Comment ID	Type of comment	Comment
Associates)	on the scope of the SA			
Rose Freeman The Theatres Trust	Appendix 1:	<a href="#">SASR11</a>	Have Observations	Appendix 1 does not include the Cambridgeshire Arts and Culture Strategy which relates to the well-being element of this document. Unfortunately the Huntingdonshire Cultural Strategy 2007-2010 does not seem to have been updated although its essence may have been incorporated within the Huntingdonshire Sustainable Community Strategy, but the targets in the right hand box on page 64 do not include cultural activities. We suggest for consistency that it should.
Rose Freeman The Theatres Trust		<a href="#">SASR12</a>	Have Observations	Thank you for including cultural needs in the explanation of the term 'Community Infrastructure' in the Glossary. Museums and libraries (not mentioned in the examples given) play a key role in encouraging knowledge, experience and quality of life in its broadest sense. The information and stimulation these facilities can offer promotes a wider understanding of the world and offers individuals the opportunity to acquire new skills and knowledge to enjoy a rich and varied cultural life.

This page is intentionally left blank

**SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SCOPING REPORT AND STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**  
**(Report by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Environmental Well-Being))**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 At its meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> April 2012, the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Environmental Well-Being) considered two reports by the Head of Planning Services on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and Statement of Community Involvement. The following paragraphs contain a summary of the Panel's discussions on the reports.

**2. THE PANEL'S DISCUSSIONS**

- 2.1 Having regard to the Sustainability Appraisal process, the Panel has noted that Planning Officers have received dedicated training to enable them to carry out this work in-house. Once completed, the Sustainability Appraisal will be examined by the Council's Legal Team to ensure that it is fit for purpose and to safeguard the Council from legal challenges. The Panel recommend the Cabinet to authorise the Head of Planning Services, after consultation with the Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning and Housing, to finalise and approve the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.
- 2.2 The Panel has considered the outcome of consultation on the draft Statement of Community Involvement. Having been advised that any interested party may register with the Council to be consulted on planning policies, Members recommend the Cabinet to authorise the Head of Planning Services, after consultation with the Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning and Housing and the Chairman of the Development Management Panel, to finalise and approve the Statement of Community Involvement.

**3. CONCLUSION**

- 3.1 The Cabinet is invited to consider the discussions of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Environmental Well-Being) as part of their deliberations on these items.

**Contact Officer: Mrs J Walker, Democratic Services**  
**☎ 01480 387049**

**Background Documents** - Reports and Minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Environmental Well-Being) held on 10th April 2012.

This page is intentionally left blank



**COMT**  
**OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY (Environmental Wellbeing)**  
**DM PANEL**  
**CABINET**

**26<sup>th</sup> March 2012**  
**10<sup>th</sup> April 2012**  
**16<sup>th</sup> April 2012**  
**19<sup>th</sup> April 2012**

## **STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (Report by Head of Planning Services)**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This report recommends that a new Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) is approved to replace the existing 2006 SCI. A draft new SCI has been prepared and was consulted on between 3 February and 16 March 2012. Some 23 comments from 13 organisations and individuals have been received. Taking into account comments received, and any additional comments from the Overview and Scrutiny (Environmental Wellbeing) Panel, and the Development Management Panel, the document can be approved with any necessary amendments.

### **2. BACKGROUND**

2.1 Preparation of a Statement of Community Involvement is a requirement on Council arising from the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Initially, Councils were required to prepare a draft SCI and have it independently examined by a Planning Inspector. This Council duly prepared such an SCI which was examined and then adopted in October 2006. The requirement for independent examination was removed in 2009. However, it is still necessary to have an approved SCI.

2.2 In an Equality Impact Assessment prepared in 2009 it was noted that the 2006 SCI was becoming dated and an action was identified to update it by 2012. Given the new Local Plan process agreed by Cabinet in December 2011, now is an opportune time. The Inspector who examines the Local Plan will consider whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the SCI.

2.3 The SCI's fundamental purpose is to set out how planning matters are consulted on. The focus of the draft SCI is on the new Local Plan process, although the procedures for other policy documents and consulting on planning applications are also covered.

2.4 The SCI fits with the Council's Corporate Consultation and Engagement Strategy. That document was approved by Cabinet in February 2008 and is at a higher level such that the two do not conflict.

2.5 The draft SCI states that the Council will encourage public participation within the context of available resources and the potential for 'consultation fatigue'. The Local Plan will be prepared with consultation stages on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (which has already occurred), key principles and evidence, draft proposals and then publication. At the publication stage comments can only be made on the issues of soundness as the plan will be ready for examination. The timetable for these is set out separately in the

Local Development Scheme, approved by Cabinet in February 2012 and now on our website.

2.6 In respect of other planning documents such as Supplementary Planning Documents and Urban Design Frameworks, it is noted that there will be at least one period of public consultation prior to approval by Cabinet.

2.7 The procedures for planning applications follow relevant legislation and the series of advice notes available on our website.

2.8 A consultation summary will be prepared for publication with the final SCI.

### **3. ISSUES RAISED IN COMMENTS**

3.1 Appendix A summarises observations and objections received and the officer response in respect of them. In addition to those in the appendix, several respondents noted general support for the draft SCI.

3.2 In respect of policy issues, comments show an interest in the way that Council will engage on strategic issues and the methods of consultation. The support that Council can give for neighbourhood planning is also noted.

3.3 Comments on the process for considering planning applications mostly relate to how applications can be viewed online and how objectors can be heard. The Council has comprehensive systems in place which are continually being reviewed and improved where appropriate.

3.4 Overall it is considered that the draft SCI is fit for purpose and no amendments are required as a result of the consultation. Subject to comments from the Development Management Panel, Overview and Scrutiny and Cabinet, the procedures and processes can be finalised to guide consultation on planning issues.

### **4. RECOMMENDATION**

4.1 It is recommended that Cabinet authorises the Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning and Housing, in conjunction with the Chairman of the Development Management Panel and the Head of Planning Services, to finalise and approve the Statement of Community Involvement.

#### **Appendix A: Consultation Summary**

##### **Background Information**

The consultation document and full comments are available on the Council's consultation portal: <http://consult.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/portal>

The Local Development Scheme is on the Council's website:

<http://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/Planning/Planning%20Policy/Pages/Local%20Development%20Scheme.aspx>

**CONTACT OFFICER** - enquiries about this report to Paul Bland, Planning Services Manager (Policy) on 01480 388 430

**APPENDIX A  
CONSULTATION SUMMARY**

<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>District Council Response</b>
<b><u>Policy Issues</u></b>	
<p>Strategic scale proposals should be subject to public consultation before being included in a draft Local Plan. Council should publish a diary of meetings with developers and presentations on strategic scale issues.</p>	<p>Strategic scale proposals such as that at Alconbury Airfield will be outlined at the key principles and evidence stage prior to inclusion in the draft Local Plan. A diary of all meetings would not be practical.</p>
<p>Cooperation with neighbouring councils, including the County Council, is supported. The impact of neighbouring developments such as the proposed Great Haddon will need to be taken into account in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Draft paragraph 4.2 recognises the need for cooperation. The duty to cooperate is a legal requirement under the Localism Act and the impact of neighbouring proposals will be considered in producing the Local Plan.</p>
<p>An Appendix should be included listing all the groups included on the policy consultation database. The process for being added to the list should be noted.</p>	<p>There is an example of another Council listing groups on their website (Mid Sussex) but most other Councils have not. The list would quickly become out of date so the website would need to be updated regularly. The list would have to be limited to key contacts rather than all individuals, but there could be issues of Data Protection. The SCI indicates how people can put themselves on the consultation database. It is not considered necessary to also have a public list of who is on it.</p>
<p>Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum should be added to the list of those consulted with for all policies that have implications for access, recreation and rights of way.</p>	<p>A relevant email address has been added by the consultee to the consultation database and therefore the Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum will receive automatic notifications of policy consultations.</p>
<p>Engagement other than through the online portal is to be encouraged. The Federation of Small Businesses would be happy to support the authority in business engagement, for example by facilitating business focus groups where local plan activities have a significant impact on the business environment i.e. town centre or major employment sites.</p>	<p>The SCI supports additional means of engagement. The support of the Federation of Small Businesses is welcomed.</p>
<p>Neighbourhood Plans may be difficult to produce. Guidance and support may be needed.</p>	<p>Draft paragraph 5.3 recognises that Council will need to provide guidance and support.</p>

Summary of Comments	District Council Response
<b><u>Planning Application Issues</u></b>	
<p>Consultation with neighbours should be required prior to applications.</p> <p>Pre-application consultation for small applications as well as large can save time and money. Are applicants already being encouraged to consult with neighbours and the local town or parish councils as early as possible?</p> <p>Written materials exchanged under preliminary enquiries relevant to a later application should be publicly available.</p>	<p>The Localism Act only requires consultation on very large scale developments at the pre-application stage. The Council cannot require consultation with neighbours for all applications, although it is encouraged. The Council's Pre-Application Advice Notes specifically encourage prospective applicants to consult with any neighbours and the local Town/Parish Council. Routinely making enquiries public would discourage some early pre-application discussions. Many people, for many reasons, would rather their enquiry is not revealed in advance of the submission of an application and particularly during the early stages of a prospective proposal. Many enquiries are indeed not followed by applications.</p>
<p>Applications should be available to view online within 2 days of validation.</p>	<p>Since the recent introduction of the Electronic Document Management (EDM), applications are available to view within 2 days of the consultation/notification letters being sent out.</p>
<p>Viewing planning application files has recently been made slower by replacement of the 'interface'. This should be improved.</p>	<p>It is understood that the replacement of concern on the Public Access system was made last year when the system was upgraded. Although this makes some viewing slower, other aspects have been improved. The Public Access software is bought as a package.</p>
<p>Discharge of condition applications should be given a different type of reference number to distinguish them on the planning portal.</p>	<p>Recent improvements to ensure that all documents displayed on the website are clearly described will ensure that it is easy to distinguish each conditions discharge submission from other documents.</p>
<p>It would be useful to have all 'consultee' responses to planning applications showing as is being done in Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.</p>	<p>All comments received have been displayed on Public Access on the Council's website since the beginning of this year. A specific system for statutory consultees may be possible at some time in the future as the Council is continually working to improve the experience for those viewing and responding to applications.</p>
<p>Stakeholders should be notified whenever there are significant changes to application plans that have already been consulted on.</p>	<p>Reconsultation/renotification is carried out if significant changes to a proposal are to be considered.</p>
<p>Consultation should be thoroughly carried out. More</p>	<p>The views of local residents are given very careful consideration and are</p>

<p>attention should be given to the views of local residents. Comments should not be readily overruled. Objectors should be made aware of their right to be heard at Development Management Panel. Guidance on rights to be heard could be included in District Wide or sent out with the annual Council tax bill.</p>	<p>summarised and considered in the officer report published on the website for all applications. When an application is referred to the Development Management Panel, objectors are sent a letter advising them of their right to address the Panel. The 'Your Right to Speak at Development Management Panel on planning applications' leaflet is available on the Planning Applications page on the Council's website. The Council no longer produces a District Wide magazine and it is not considered appropriate to include advice on this detailed matter with the annual Council tax bill.</p>
<p><b>Summary of Comments</b></p>	<p><b>District Council Response</b></p>
<p><b><u>Monitoring and Review Issues</u></b></p>	
<p>Paragraph 7.2 should describe what is considered a suitable manner for private consultations to be carried out, as it states that Council's approach may be amended where private consultation has been carried out in a suitable manner and the results made publicly available. .</p>	<p>It may be that the Council will not need to carry out consultation on an issue which has already been consulted on. The suitability of private consultation will need to be considered in relation to the complexity of the issue. The public availability of the results is important and the level of public response will help inform whether there is a need for additional consultation.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

COMT  
CABINET  
COUNCIL

10 APRIL 2012  
19 APRIL 2012  
25 APRIL 2012

## HUNTINGDONSHIRE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY CHARGING SCHEDULE 2012

(Report by Head of Planning Services)

### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to recommend that the Cabinet endorses and Council formally approves the Huntingdonshire Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule, the related Instalment Policy, and the Regulation 123 Infrastructure List.

### 2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a mechanism, introduced by Government in 2010, to allow local planning authorities to seek to raise funds from development in order to pay for the infrastructure that is, or will be, needed as a result of new development. The proposed Huntingdonshire CIL Charging Schedule sets out the charges that will apply to most new development across the District.
- 2.2 The draft Huntingdonshire CIL Charging Schedule was subject to a formal Public Examination on the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> March 2012. The Examination was carried out by Mr Nigel Payne, an independent Examiner appointed by the Planning Inspectorate, with his final report being submitted in mid April 2012. The Examiner recommends that as the submitted CIL Charging Schedule is viable, it should be approved, subject to a number of requested minor wording modifications.
- 2.3 The proposed Huntingdonshire CIL Charging Schedule 2012, which incorporates the minor modifications identified by the Examiner, is attached as Appendix A. In summary, the proposed Huntingdonshire CIL Charging Schedule 2012 recommended for approval by the Examiner is as follows:

Charge for development types	CIL rate (per square metre)
All development types unless stated otherwise in this table	£85 (standard rate)
All A Class Uses 500 sq m or less	£40
All A Class Uses > 500 sq m	£100
All Class C1 Uses	£60
All Class C2 Uses	£45
Health (D1)	£65
Business (B1), General Industrial, Storage & Distribution (B2 and B8), Community Uses <sup>(1)</sup> (within D1 - except Health Uses - and D2), and Agricultural <i>(1. Community uses are ones provided by the public, not-for-profit or charitable sectors)</i>	£0

- 2.4 The CIL is based on the need to finance identified community infrastructure needs, and it would be payable per net additional square metre of floorspace. The identified community infrastructure needs are contained within Draft Charging Schedule Infrastructure Project List, November 2011, which was submitted as evidence with the Draft CIL Charging Schedule and can also be viewed on the CIL Examination page of the HDC website.
- 2.5 The CIL charge is payable on commencement of development and the CIL Regulations include strict rules on payments. The CIL charge is noted as a Land Charge, and continued non-payment constitutes a criminal offence. The Council will be permitting payment by instalments, as is allowable under Regulation 69B of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended). The Instalment Policy will be applicable to all developments liable to pay CIL and allows 120 days before the first instalment has to be paid. The CIL charges for some larger scale developments may be paid in phases, if this approach is agreed at planning permission stage. In such cases, each phase is treated as a separate CIL charge and the instalment policy reflected against each phase. The Instalment Policy for Huntingdonshire is attached as Appendix B and, once approved, will be published on the Council's website.
- 2.6 The proposed CIL Charging Schedule is complementary to the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which was approved by Cabinet in December 2011 and is on the HDC website. The SPD and the CIL will operate in conjunction with each other when the CIL is approved.
- 2.7 Affordable housing development, certain development by charities and a limited range of minor ancillary development is exempt from CIL. All new dwellings, irrespective of size, are liable to pay CIL. Domestic household extensions under 100 square metres of net additional floorspace are not liable for CIL. All other development is liable for CIL if 100 square metres or above and is charged on a scale of rates based on viability testing that has been carried out. The outcome of the viability testing means that some types of new development, such as new business space, are subject to a nil charge, whilst other types of new development, including all new dwellings (houses and flats), are subject to a viability tested charge.

### **3. CONSULTATION**

- 3.1 The Huntingdonshire CIL Charging Schedule and its supporting evidence base were subject to extensive consultation, and the outcomes of the consultation process have been reported to Cabinet. The consultations were advertised in the local press, and the consultation material was available to view at specified public places across the District and on the HDC website. The key consultation opportunities were as follows:
- Preliminary Draft CIL Charging Schedule: 29<sup>th</sup> July 2011 to 9<sup>th</sup> September 2011
  - Draft CIL Charging Schedule: 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2011 to 3<sup>rd</sup> January 2012
  - Draft CIL Charging Schedule Statement of Modifications: 20<sup>th</sup> January 2012 to 20<sup>th</sup> February 2012



- 3.2 To complement the formal consultations, the Council held two Developers and Agents Forum meetings, on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2011 and 16<sup>th</sup> December 2011, and a series of meetings with individual developers and interested parties.

#### **4. NEXT STEPS**

- 4.1 Subject to Cabinet and Council approval of the recommendations of this report, the approved Charging Schedule will be published on the Council's website. This will enable the Huntingdonshire Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule to be implemented from 1<sup>st</sup> May 2012. From that date all eligible planning permissions will be subject to the relevant charge, and the appropriate systems are being put in place in order for the Council to collect the Levy from that date.

- 4.2 The Charging Schedule requires a correctable error, in accordance with Regulation 26 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended), as a point of legal clarification regarding charging. This would not affect the amount chargeable on any given chargeable development as it is a point of law. A correction notice would be issued if approved and the process undertaken to notify this matter as required. It is proposed that at the end of paragraph 1.4 of the Charging Schedule the following sentence is added

“In certain circumstances CIL may also be charged where planning permission is granted to change the use of existing floorspace.”

- 4.3 The detailed governance aspects of distributing and implementing the CIL receipts are being developed. The CIL receipts in the first year of operation are likely to be relatively minimal and therefore it is recommended that approval is given to initially 'bank' receipts in order for the funds to build-up to enable distribution to priority community infrastructure projects in subsequent years. The Regulation 123 List is attached as Appendix C. This can be reviewed at least annually. Once approved, the list will also be published on the Council's website as required.
- 4.4 It is likely that the CIL Charging Schedule will be reviewed after it has been in place for 3 years, following the introduction of the new Local Plan. The Examiner acknowledged this timescale and considered it to be appropriate.

#### **5. CONCLUSIONS**

- 5.1 The Huntingdonshire CIL Charging Schedule has been developed in conjunction with a sound evidence base and has been subject to extensive consultation and independent Examination. The independent Examiner has concluded that the Charging Schedule satisfies the necessary legal and regulatory criteria and has recommended that, with minor modifications, it should be approved. Once approved by the Council, the CIL will be used in conjunction with the Developer Contributions SPD in order to determine the scale of developer contributions towards site related infrastructure and wider community infrastructure across the District.

## **6. RECOMMENDATION**

6.1 It is recommended that:

- (i) the Cabinet endorses, and Council approves the Huntingdonshire Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule 2012 (attached at Appendix A), the CIL Instalment Policy (attached at Appendix B), and the CIL Regulation 123 Infrastructure List (attached at Appendix C);
- (ii) the Cabinet endorses, and Council approves the correctable error for the Charging Schedule as a point of legal clarification as noted in paragraph 4.2 of this report
- (ii) the Executive Councillor for Planning and Housing in conjunction with the Head of Planning Services are authorised to undertake the necessary procedures required to make the correctable error identified and to commence implementation of the approved Huntingdonshire Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule from 1<sup>st</sup> May 2012.

## **APPENDICES**

- Appendix A Huntingdonshire Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule  
[effective 1<sup>st</sup> May 2012]
- Appendix B Huntingdonshire Instalment Policy  
[effective 1<sup>st</sup> May 2012]
- Appendix C Huntingdonshire Regulation 123 Infrastructure List  
[effective 1<sup>st</sup> May 2012]

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

All background papers can be viewed on the CIL Examination page of the HDC website <http://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/Planning/Community%20Infrastructure%20Levy/Pages/CommunityInfrastructureLevyExamination.aspx>

## **CONTACT OFFICER**

Enquiries about this report to Steve Ingram, Head of Planning Services, on 01480 388400

# Huntingdonshire Community Infrastructure Levy - Charging Schedule 2012

Huntingdonshire Community Infrastructure Levy - Charging Schedule 2012



## 1 Charging Schedule

1.1 This is the Charging Schedule for Huntingdonshire and has been prepared in accordance with:

- Part 11, Planning Act 2008
- Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010
- Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2011
- Community Infrastructure Levy Guidance: Charge setting and charging schedule procedures
- Planning Policy Statement 12: Creating strong safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning

1.2 Huntingdonshire District Council, as the local Planning Authority, is the Charging Authority and will also be the Collecting Authority. This Charging Schedule comes into force on 1st May 2012.

### Liability to Pay CIL

1.3 A chargeable development is one for which planning permission is granted <sup>(1)</sup> and which is liable to pay CIL in accordance with the Regulations.

### The CIL Rate

1.4 The charge detailed below will be levied on most new building developments that people would normally use. It is chargeable in pounds per square metre on the net additional floorspace **if** that floorspace is more than 100m<sup>2</sup>. However, if the development involves the creation of a new dwelling, even if it is less than 100m<sup>2</sup>, it is still liable to pay CIL.

1.5 Based on the viability work undertaken and the aim to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability for CIL funding of infrastructure and the effects of CIL on the economic viability of the district as a whole, the standard CIL rate across Huntingdonshire, once the charging schedule has been adopted, will be £85 per square metre for all development types unless specifically stated otherwise.

Proposed Charge for development types	CIL rate (per square metre)
All development types unless stated otherwise in this table	£85 (standard rate)
All A Class Uses 500 sq m or less	£40
All A Class Uses >500 sq m	£100
All Class C1 Uses	£60
All Class C2	£45
Health (D1)	£65
Business (B1), General Industrial, Storage & Distribution (B2 and B8), Community Uses <sup>(1)</sup> (within D1 - except Health Uses - and D2) and Agricultural	£0

1. Community uses are ones provided by the public, not-for-profit or charitable sectors

1.6 The rate shown shall be updated annually for inflation in accordance with the Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors "All In Tender Price Index".

<sup>1</sup> Regulation 9 CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended)

# 1 Charging Schedule

## Huntingdonshire Community Infrastructure Levy - Charging Schedule 2012

- 1.7** Site specific contributions may also be required through a Section 106 agreement or as part of the conditions attributed to a planning consent. Details on this can be found in the Developer Contributions SPD, which, following a statutory consultation process at the same time as the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule, was adopted in December 2011.

### **CIL Geographical Zone**

- 1.8** The proposed levy rates will apply uniformly to all land uses across the whole geographic extent of the district of Huntingdonshire.

### **Calculating the Chargeable Amount**

- 1.9** The chargeable amount to be paid by a development will be calculated in accordance with the formula set out in Regulation 40 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 as amended from time to time.

## Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Instalment Policy

In accordance with Regulation 69B of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), Huntingdonshire District Council will automatically allow the payment of CIL by instalments. The instalments permitted will be linked to the amount payable (the chargeable amount) as recorded on the Demand Notice.

As permitted under Regulation 9 (4) of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended), where outline planning permission which permits development to be implemented in phases has been granted, each phase of the development as agreed by Huntingdonshire District Council is a separate chargeable development and the instalment policy will, therefore, apply to each separate chargeable development and associated separate liable amount chargeable.

This policy will **not apply** if any one or more of the following applies:

- a) A commencement notice has not been submitted prior to commencement of the chargeable development, as required by Regulation 67 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended);
- b) On the intended date of commencement
  - i. Nobody has assumed liability to pay CIL in respect of the chargeable development;
  - ii. A commencement notice has been received by Huntingdonshire District Council in respect of the chargeable development; and
  - iii. Huntingdonshire District Council has not determined a deemed commencement date for the chargeable development and, therefore, payment is required in full, as required by Regulation 71 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended);
- c) A person has failed to notify Huntingdonshire District Council of a disqualifying event before the end of 14 days beginning with the day on which the disqualifying event occurs, as per the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended)
- d) An instalment payment has not been made in full after the end of the period of 30 days beginning with the day on which the instalment payment was due, as per the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended)

Where the instalment policy is not applicable, the amount must be paid in full at the end of the period of 60 days beginning with the notified or deemed commencement date of the chargeable development or the date of the disqualifying event, which ever is the earliest, unless specified otherwise within the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).

<b>Huntingdonshire CIL Instalment Policy</b>		
<b>Total CIL liability</b>	<b>Number of instalments and amount payable</b>	<b>Payment period</b>
Amount less than £16,000	Payable as one instalment	100% payable within 120 days of the commencement date
Amount between £16,000 and £50,000	Payable in three instalments	1 <sup>st</sup> instalment of 25% payable within 120 days of commencement date 2 <sup>nd</sup> instalment of 50% payable within 210 days of commencement date 3 <sup>rd</sup> instalment of 25% payable within 270 days of commencement date
Amount above £50,000 but less than £100,000	Payable in three instalments	1 <sup>st</sup> instalment of 25% payable within 120 days of commencement date 2 <sup>nd</sup> instalment of 50% payable within 240 days of commencement date 3 <sup>rd</sup> instalment of 25% payable within 365 days of commencement date
Amount between £100,000 and £500,000	Payable in three instalments	1 <sup>st</sup> instalment of 25% payable within 150 days of commencement date 2 <sup>nd</sup> instalment of 50% payable within 300 days of commencement date 3 <sup>rd</sup> instalment of 25% payable within 450 days of commencement date
Amount over £500,000	Payable in three instalments	1 <sup>st</sup> instalment of 25% payable within 180 days of commencement date 2 <sup>nd</sup> instalment of 50% payable within 450 days of commencement date 3 <sup>rd</sup> instalment of 25% payable within 720 days of commencement date
NB: If 25% or more of the chargeable development is occupied at any time before the chargeable amount has been paid in full then the outstanding amount will be due in full within the instalment time given or 60 days whichever is the lesser unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Council BEFORE commencement of development.		

This policy will come into effect on 1 May 2012, the date of the approval of the Huntingdonshire Community Infrastructure Levy: Charging Schedule 2012.



## Huntingdonshire Community Infrastructure Levy: Regulation 123 List for 2012/13

CIL Regulation 123 restricts the use of planning obligations for infrastructure that will be funded in whole or in part by the Community Infrastructure Levy, to ensure no duplication between the two types of developer contributions. Further detail regarding Section 106 requirements can be found in the Developer Contributions SPD (adopted December 2011).

A CIL charging authority is expected to publish a list of infrastructure that it intends will benefit from CIL on its website. Huntingdonshire District Council (as CIL Charging Authority) can review this list at least once a year as part of its monitoring of CIL collection and expenditure.

The inclusion of a project or type of infrastructure in this list does not signify a commitment from the Council to fund (either in whole or in part) the listed project or type of infrastructure through CIL. Nor does the order of the table imply any order of preference for CIL funding.

As the Huntingdonshire CIL Charging Schedule will not become effective before 1st May 2012, and as CIL is also not payable until after development commences, it is recognised that there will be limited CIL receipts in the first year of operation (2012/13). In view of this, it has been agreed by Full Council on 25 April 2012 that all CIL receipts in 2012/13 will be banked for expenditure at a later date.

The CIL Infrastructure Project List that was subject to Examination in March 2012 contains a broad range of projects and project types across the District that could be eligible for CIL funding in the period to 2026. The current indicative range of infrastructure projects, derived from the Infrastructure Project List, that may be funded in whole or part through CIL in the five year period between 2012 – 2017, are set out in the table below.

Project Name	Timescale Start	Timescale End	Assumed Cost (£)
Huntingdon West Link Road	2012 - 2013	2013	9,971,000
St Ives to Huntingdon Bus Priority Measures (Cambridgeshire Guided Busway)	2009 - 2016	2016	5,000,000
St Neots Station Improvements	2013 - 2015	2015	3,600,000
Reinforcement of Grid at Eaton Socon	2012 - 2017	2017	10,000,000
Ramsey Enterprise Centre	2011 – 2016	2016	3,000,000
Combined Heat & Power System for Ramsey	2011 - 2016	2016	2,000,000
Eynesbury / St Neots Green Space (Riverside Park and Barford Road Pocket Park)	2011 - 2016	2016	3,500,000

St Ives West Green Space	2011 - 2016	2016	500,000
Land East of St Neots Access to Open Countryside	2011 – 2016	2016	1,000,000
Great Fen Project land acquisition phase 1	2011 - 2016	2016	13,000,000
Grafham Water to Abbots Ripton Corridor	2011 - 2016	2016	2,250,000
Ouse Valley Biodiversity Project (from Barford Rd to Earith)	2011 - 2016	2016	3,000,000
Hinchingbrooke Hospital – Critical Care Centre	2011 - 2016	2016	7,500,000
HRC New Vocational Centre / Studio School	2012 – 2013	2013	2,800,000
HRC Sports Changing Rooms and 3G Pitch	2012 – 2013	2013	700,000
HRC Garden Centre Social Enterprise	2013 – 2014	2014	1,000,000
HRC New Technology & Sustainable Energy Centre	2013 – 2014	2014	4,000,000
HRC Critical Infrastructure and Internal Reconfiguration Work	2011 - 2016	2016	2,206,000
HRC Sports Science and Health Industries complex	2016 – 2017	2017	1,900,000
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>76,927,000</b>

CABINET

19 April 2012

## FINANCIAL MONITORING - CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2011/12 (Report by the Head of Financial Services)

### 1. PURPOSE

1.1 This report highlights the forecast variations from the 2011/12 Capital Programme approved in February 2011. It includes any member or officer decisions already taken in accordance with the Code of Financial Management. Whilst the financial year has now ended there are still final adjustments to be made to debtors and creditors before the final outturn is established. An outturn report will be submitted to Cabinet in July.

### 2. MONITORING OF THE 2011/12 CAPITAL PROGRAMME

2.1 The Budget approved in February 2011 was £11.9m after allowing for a provision for schemes brought forward from 2010/11 and carried forward to 2012/13. Subsequent adjustments are summarised below:-

Capital Programme	2011/12 Capital Expenditure		
	Gross Budget	External Contributions	Net Budget
	£000	£000	£000
<b>Approved Total Budget (February 2011)</b>	<b>15,366</b>	<b>3,433</b>	<b>11,933</b>
Actual brought forward from 2010/11	6,284	5,189	1,095
Less provision	-1,200	0	-1,200
	<b>20,450</b>	<b>8,622</b>	<b>11,828</b>
<b>Supplementary Estimate</b>			
Disabled Facilities Grant	401	-148	549
<b>Forecast Cost Variations (Annex A)</b>	236	456	-220
<b>Forecast Timing Changes (Annex B)</b>	-12,736	-5,001	-7,735
<b>Revenue to Capital Variations (Annex A)</b>	255	0	255
<b>Current Forecast</b>	<b>8,606</b>	<b>3,929</b>	<b>4,677</b>

2.2 The revenue impact on the MTP of the 2010/11 outturn and subsequent variations is shown below.

### 3. SIGNIFICANT ITEMS

#### 3.1 PV Panels – Eastfield House

The PV (Solar) Panels were installed on Eastfield House in February and are now in operation.

### 3.2 Vehicle Replacement Programme

A number of new vehicle replacements originally planned for this year have been able to be delayed due to their continued smooth running. Any permanent savings will emerge in the autumn review of the MTP.

### 3.3 Huntingdon Multi-Storey Car Park

The start of the construction of the car park has been delayed due to extended negotiations on the related town centre development agreements.

### 3.4 IMD Schemes

A number of IMD Business Systems schemes have been deferred. This includes email archive which will follow completion of server virtualisation, and eforms where the project has made good progress but has not yet been completed.

3.5 **Revenue to Capital Transfers** Where appropriate, such transfers will be undertaken as they provide a beneficial revenue impact.

## 4. REVENUE IMPACT

4.1 The revenue impact on the MTP of the 2010/11 outturn and subsequent variations is shown below.

<b>Revenue Impact</b>	<b>2011/ 2012</b>	<b>2012/ 2013</b>	<b>2013/ 2014</b>	<b>2014/ 2015</b>	<b>2015/ 2016</b>
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Timing Changes 2010/11 to 2011/12	4	0	0	0	0
Cost Variations	2	32	35	39	41
Timing Changes 2011/12 to 2012/13	-39	-170	0	0	0
Revenue/Capital Transfers	-254	29	33	36	38
Revenue variations re timing changes	-54	116	-89	-184	-224
<b>TOTAL FORECAST VARIATION</b>	<b>-341</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>-21</b>	<b>-109</b>	<b>-145</b>

*N.B. This table is based on a simplified basis for identifying the revenue impact of capital expenditure. Allowance has also been made for any revenue elements of the changes as identified in the relevant MTP bid proposals. Many of these variations are fully or partly allowed for in the new Budget/MTP approved in February.*

## 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 It is **RECOMMENDED** that Cabinet note the contents of this report.

### BACKGROUND PAPERS

Capital programme and monitoring working papers.

Previous Cabinet reports on capital expenditure.

Contact Officer – Steve Couper ☎ 01480 388103

## ANNEX A

<b>Forecast Cost Variations</b>	<b>Gross Budget</b>	<b>External Contributions</b>	<b>Net Budget</b>
	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>
<b>Savings</b>			
Building Efficiency Improvements	-17	0	-17
Wheeled Bin Replacements	-99	0	-99
Alconbury Flood Scheme	-31	-31	0
Town Centre Developments	-5	0	-5
Mortgage Redemption	0	549	-549
HQ Project	-2	0	-2
Public Conveniences	-150	-150	0
Community Facilities Grants	-20	0	-20
	<b>-324</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>-692</b>
<b>Extra Cost</b>			
Sustainable Homes Retrofit	85	15	70
Vehicle Replacement Programme	11	0	11
	<b>96</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Invest To Save Schemes</b>			
South Street Toilets	5	0	5
Mobile Home Park	0	73	-73
Call Centre CRM	20	0	20
PV Panels – Eastfield House	374	0	374
	<b>399</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>326</b>
<b>Technical</b>			
Rule Change to Capital Overheads	117	0	117
Brought Forward Adjustment	-52	0	-52
	<b>65</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>TOTAL COST VARIATIONS</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>-220</b>
<b>Revenue to Capital</b>			
<b>E-forms</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>85</b>
One Leisure Huntingdon Pure Spa Conversion	13	0	13
One Leisure St Ives - Outdoor Centre Car Park	42	0	42
GIS	15	0	15
Corporate EDM	2	0	2
Operations Business Systems	5	0	5
CRIMP	5	0	5
Uniform	12	0	12
Encryption & Control Software	8	0	8
Government Connect	8	0	8
ICT Replacement & Server Virtualisation	18	0	18
ICT Replacement	12	0	12
My Council System	22	0	22
Automated Phone Payments	3	0	3
Interface Software	19	0	19
Share Point	12	0	12
PV Panels – Eastfield House	2	0	2
Transportation Capital Grants	22	0	22
Removal of contingency	-50		-50
	<b>255</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>255</b>

New item this time

No change from previous report

Adjusted value this time

**ANNEX B**

Timing Changes to 2012/13 and beyond	2011/12 Capital Expenditure		
	Gross Budget	External Contributions	Net Budget
	£000	£000	£000
Heart of Oxmoor	0	-1,366	1,366
Huntingdon West Development	-7,153	-2,430	-4,723
One Leisure St Ives Redevelopment	-2,950	0	-2,950
<b>One Leisure Future Maintenance</b>	<b>-210</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-210</b>
Replacement Fitness Equipment	-77	0	-77
One Leisure Ramsey Development	-560	0	-560
CCTV Camera Replacements	-139	0	-139
Decent Homes	-79	-143	64
<b>Social Housing Grant</b>	<b>-239</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-239</b>
Sustainable Homes Retrofit	0	-415	415
HQ Project	0	-150	150
<b>ICT Replacement &amp; Server Virtualisation</b>	<b>-91</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-91</b>
Working Smarter	-23	0	-23
Replacement Equipment Document Centre	-76	0	-76
<b>One Leisure St Ives Football Improvements</b>	<b>-497</b>	<b>-497</b>	<b>0</b>
Ramsey Rural Developments	-62	0	-62
Multi-Functional Devices	-48	0	-48
Industrial Estates Repairs	-8	0	-8
Cambridge Street Car Park	-89	0	-89
<b>Railway Station Improvements</b>	<b>-38</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-38</b>
VAT Partial Exemption	-128	0	-128
Huntingdon Multi-Storey Car Park	-700	0	-700
Leisure Centres CCTV	-12	0	-12
One Leisure Huntingdon – Impression Equipment	-37	0	-37
Sawtry Reception Automation	-25	0	-25
Ramsey Reception Automation	-25	0	-25
Disabled Facilities Grants	-40	0	-40
Private Sector Grants	-30	0	-30
Wheeled Bins	5	0	5
Vehicle Replacement Programme	-462	0	-462
Email Archive	-34	0	-34
Eforms	-25	0	-25
Business Systems	-40	0	-40
<b>Reduction in Provision for further slippage</b>	<b>1,156</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,156</b>
	<b>-12,736</b>	<b>-5,001</b>	<b>-7,735</b>

<b>New item this time</b>
<b>No change from previous report</b>
<b>Adjusted value this time</b>

## FINANCIAL MONITORING – REVENUE BUDGET 2011/12 (Report by the Head of Financial Services)

### 1. Revenue Monitoring

- 1.1 In total, service managers now expect to achieve savings of £1.6M against the original budget for this year after allowing for the deferral of a further £0.2M of projects to 2012/13. Significant contributions have come from OneLeisure (£0.3M), holding jobs vacant (£0.3M) insurance retendering, net interest payments and an accumulation of minor items across the whole Council.
- 1.2 Much of this saving was anticipated when the Medium Term Plan was approved in February but the Council will now have a further £0.4M in reserves (£0.6M highlighted in the table below less £0.2M for deferred projects).
- 1.3 An outturn of £20.8M is now forecast but £1.8M of revenue reserves will still be needed to meet the resulting deficit.
- 1.4 Whilst the financial year is now ended there are still likely to be variations when debtors and creditors are identified and the final review of reserves for potentially uncollectable debts is completed. A report on the final outturn will be presented to Cabinet in July.
- 1.5 The variations are summarised in Annex A and comments are provided below for items over £50k:
  - **Spending delayed until 2012/13 (-£171K)**

The Code of Financial Management permits the carry forward of budgets to future years where they have been earmarked to a specific project and this has been delayed for reasons outside the Council's control. The amount is still slightly less than the sum brought forward from last year but there may still be further valid requests to come.
  - **Benefits Caseload changes (-£56K)**

The Council benefits financially when benefit overpayments are recovered promptly. This saving reflects the net benefit from the latest mix of benefit payments at their various recovery rates.
  - **Development Management Fees (£80k)**

The economic situation continues to result in reductions in the value of planning application fees.
  - **Planning Employee Costs (-£65K)**

A further increase in the saving in staff costs has been achieved this year.

- **Pension Lump Sum (-£61k)**  
This adjusts the budget to the agreed sum that the Council will contribute to the Pension Fund to cover, over a period of years, the fund deficit.
- **Transfer from Revenue to Capital Spending (£53K)**  
Wherever possible items are transferred to capital as it is in the Council's financial interests to do so. This adjustment reflects some further spending that meets our definitions of capital expenditure.

**Strategic HR Support (£76K)**

Consultant costs charged to the Special Reserve.

- **Other variations - individually less than £10k (-£334K)**  
Managers are encouraged to identify variations in their budgets however small; it is normal for the value to increase as the end of year but the equivalent report last year indicated only £272K. Thus the £599K in total this year reflects the greater concern by Managers that wherever possible small savings should be made even if they can only be achieved in a single year.

**2. Amounts collected and debts written off**

2.1 The position as at 31 March 2012 is shown in Annex B.

**3 Recommendation**

It is recommended that Cabinet note:

- The significant success of service managers in achieving further savings which result in a net improvement in revenue reserves of £0.4M.
- the sums collected and written off in Annex B.

**ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT 1985**

**Source Documents:**

1. Cabinet and Council Reports
2. Budgetary control files.

**Contact Officers:** Eleanor Smith, Accountancy Manager (01480 388157)  
Steve Couper, Head of Financial Services (01480 388103)



REVENUE BUDGETARY CONTROL 2011/12	Original Budget	Reported to Cabinet January 2012	Changes	Forecast outturn
	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Approved budget</b>	<b>22,615</b>	<b>22,615</b>		<b>22,615</b>
<b>Spending Delayed from 2010/11</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>559</b>		<b>559</b>
<b>Spending Delayed to 2012/13</b>	<b>-370</b>	<b>-370</b>	<b>-171</b>	<b>-541</b>
<b>Variations - Service</b>				
Recovery of legal costs		22		22
Recovery of election costs		-42		-42
Reduction in number of Cabinet members		-31		-31
Electoral Administration Act		-16	8	-8
Central and Democratic Services supplies		-18		-18
Software Licences extra provision #		20		20
IMD Helpdesk		-21		-21
IMD external work		-17		-17
IMD network saving		-37		-37
Bulky Waste income #		40		40
Recycling credits		0	50	50
Recycling gate fees		-228		-228
Agency staff - refuse, recycling and street cleansing		30		30
Agency worker regulations		30	-30	0
Diesel		23		23
Delay in increase in car park fees		124		124
Car park income		74	-5	69
Guided Bus - Less impact on parking income		-40		-40
NNDR revaluations		-20		-20
Market income		48		48
Operations division staffing		-37		-37
Operations business processing		20		20
Emergency planning		-20		-20
Chewing gum removal		-18		-18
Hinchingbrooke Country Park café		15	4	19
Developers' contributions		-16	-2	-18
Customer Services changes #		79	-50	29
NNDR administration grant		17		17
Benefits caseload changes		-25	-56	-81
Reduced hours at the Call Centre		-21		-21
Home improvement agency fee income		-17		-17
Building control fee income		100		100
Building Control staff		-15		-15
Deficit on building control fee earning account to be met from reserve		37	-20	17

Building efficiency improvements grant		17		17
Environmental projects		-30	2	-28
Environmental improvements repair and renewals fund		-43		-43
Pathfinder House running costs		-35	-25	-60
Pathfinder House NNDR		-45		-45
Estates property rental income		109		109
Payment from closing the East of England Agency		-20		-20
Cover for staff representatives on ELAG		25		25
One Leisure income		-30		-30
One Leisure St Neots fitness suite		-152		-152
General savings on One Leisure		-87	-29	-116
One Leisure staff savings		-45		-45
One Leisure St Ivo football improvements		16		16
One Leisure Ramsey development		20		20
Savings in audit salaries		-40		-40
Audit Fees		0	45	45
Insurance retendering and accrual to 2012/13		-175		-175
Interest		-105		-105
Development management fees		140	80	220
Planning employee costs		-172	-65	-237
Community infrastructure levy preparation		115	17	132
RAF Alconbury development net of income		-40		-40
Wooley Hill Wind Farm appeal		60		60
St Neot's town development net of income		5		5
Neighbourhood forum partnership contribution		-18	-9	-27
Other variations, each less than £15k		-265	-334	-599
<b>Variations - Technical/Corporate</b>				
Pay and Allowances Review #		111		111
Pension fund contributions		-31		-31
Pension lump sum		0	-61	-61
Vacancies in excess of turnover allowance		-328		-328
Savings on staff mileage		-21	-26	-47
Provision for debt repayment (MRP)		-64		-64
Transfer from revenue to capital spending		-195	-53	-248
Strategic HR support			76	76
Rental deposit bad debt provision		-86	42	-44
Loss of interest from housing association loan redemption		32		32
Commutated sums		-16		-16
VAT partial exemption		-16		-16
<b>Total variations</b>		<b>-1369</b>	<b>-612</b>	<b>-1810</b>
<b>Total Net Spending</b>	<b>22,615</b>	<b>21,435</b>	<b>-612</b>	<b>20,823</b>

	Original	Reported to Cabinet January 2012	Changes	Forecast outturn
	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Financed from</b>				
Government support	-11,538	-11,538		-11538
Collection fund adjustment	-105	-105		-105
Council tax	-7,383	-7,383		-7383
<b>General Reserves</b>				0
Use of delayed projects reserve	-370	-559		-559
Contribution to delayed projects reserve	370	370	171	541
Building control reserve		-37	20	-17
Special reserve			-76	-76
General reserves	-3,589	-2,183	497	-1686
<b>Total use of reserves</b>	<b>-3,589</b>	<b>-2,409</b>	<b>612</b>	<b>-1,797</b>
<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>-22,615</b>	<b>-21,435</b>	<b>612</b>	<b>-20,823</b>

# Potential variations or slower achievement of savings items

## AMOUNTS COLLECTED AND DEBTS WRITTEN OFF

### Collected

The total amount of payments received, less customer refunds and transfers to other debts:

	April to Dec 2011	Jan to March 2012	Total
	£000	£000	£000
<b>Type of Debt</b>			
Council Tax	71,426		
NNDR	49,826		
Sundry Debtors	6,300		
Excess Charges	119		

### Amounts written off

Whilst the amounts have been written-off in this financial year, much of the original debt would have been raised in previous financial years.

	Up to £5k			Over £5k			TOTAL
	April to Dec 2011	Jan to March 2012	Total	April to Dec 2011	Jan to March 2012	Total	Total
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Type of Debt</b>							
Council Tax	131.5			0.0			
NNDR	36.8			62.9			
Sundry Debtors	100.6			51.8			
Excess Charges	14.2			0.0			

### Authority to write off debts

The Head of Customer Services is authorised to write-off debts of up to £5,000, or more after consultation with the Executive Councillor for Finance, if she is satisfied that the debts are irrecoverable or cannot be recovered without incurring disproportionate costs. The Head of Financial Services deputises in her absence.

## NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUMS WORKING GROUP (Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being))

### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Members will be aware of the ongoing review of the Neighbourhood Forums in Huntingdonshire which is being undertaken by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being). The review had been prompted by the Cabinet at their meeting on 19th May 2011. At its meeting held on 1st November 2011, the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) decided to establish a Working Group comprising Councillors S J Criswell, J J Dutton, S M Van De Kerkhove and R J West, together with Mr R Coxhead, to undertake the review. Councillor S J Criswell was appointed as the Working Group's *rapporteur*. To date, the Working Group has met on five occasions.
- 1.2 The last meeting of the Neighbourhood Forums Working Group took place on 27th February 2012 when Councillors S J Criswell and R J West and Mr R Coxhead were present. Apologies for absence from the meeting were submitted on behalf of Councillors J J Dutton and S M Van De Kerkhove.
- 1.3 The Working Group has been reviewing the boundaries, elected Member representation for each area and the constitutional terms for new Neighbourhood Forum arrangements. This work has taken a significant amount of time to complete, but takes into account the consultation responses received from Town and Parish Councils which were presented to the Panel in November 2011, the preliminary views of the existing Neighbourhood Forums and the outcome of initial discussions with the Police and Cambridgeshire County Council. The Working Group has now completed this work and has sought the Panel's views on its recommendations to date. These were discussed and endorsed by the Panel at their meeting on 6th March 2012. Additionally, the views of the Corporate Governance Panel were obtained at their meeting on 28th March 2012. A few minor suggestions were made to the proposed terms of the Constitution which have been included within the draft.
- 1.4 During the course of their investigations, the Working Group spent a considerable amount of time taking into account a number of factors and variables relating to any governance model that might be introduced within the District. It has been a challenge for the Working Group to address all these points and, having deliberated at some length on a number of these issues, the Working Group formed the view that a balance had to be struck to ensure that any new model introduced within the District would meet and address the issues raised. These are discussed further in the preceding sections of this report.
- 1.5 It is proposed that any new model is to be introduced in the next Municipal Year and reviewed after it has been in operation for a period of 12 months. Members of the Cabinet are invited to comment on the proposals prior to the Panel undertaking a consultation exercise with the Town and Parish Councils and Partners on the proposals thus far.

## 2. PROPOSED BOUNDARY AREAS AND ELECTED MEMBER REPRESENTATION

- 2.1 A map defining the proposed boundary areas for the Local Joint Committees (LJC) is attached as **Appendix A**. An attempt has been made to identify areas that are smaller and more localised than the existing Neighbourhood Forums. Members of the Working Group have been mindful of localism and the opportunities that the LJCs would present in this respect and are therefore proposing nine new areas within the District. Under the present arrangements, there are five Neighbourhood Forums. As has been said, the areas reflect the views of Town and Parish Councils on whom they considered to be part of their local communities.
- 2.2 At their meeting in December 2011, the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) endorsed a recommendation that the Cabinet should adopt the Shape Your Place initiative within Huntingdonshire. The initiative seeks to promote community engagement by enabling local public bodies to establish dialogue with a sector of local residents that might not utilise the existing Neighbourhood Forums. This was subsequently endorsed by the Cabinet at its January 2012 meeting. The initiative will be launched on 1st July 2012 and a drop in session for Members will be held prior to the April meeting of the Council on the 25th April 2012 to introduce it. It is intended that the boundaries for Shape Your Place will, as far as possible, be co-terminus with those proposed for the LJCs. This has been achieved, though some Shape Your Place areas will cover more than one LJC. There is a need to finalise the boundaries for the LJCs to enable Cambridgeshire County Council to commence designing the Huntingdonshire Shape Your Place website.
- 2.3 The boundary areas could not be considered in isolation from the elected Member representation for each proposed area. **Appendix B** provides a breakdown highlighting the Towns and Parishes which fall in each area together with the District Wards and relevant County Council Divisions. It has been difficult for the Working Group to ensure a consistent split in Member representation, however, the view has been taken that localism and the geographical identities of settlements should be the overriding factor in determining the boundaries for the proposed Local Joint Committees.

## 3. LOCAL JOINT COMMITTEES – CONSTITUTIONAL TERMS

- 3.1 Members of the Working Group have considered at some length the constitutional terms for the LJCs which are attached as **Appendix C**. These have been subject to review by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and the Managing Director (Communities, Partnerships and Projects) has had prior sight of them.
- 3.2 The Constitution has been designed in such a way that it will be flexible enough to allow the LJCs to operate as they see fit. The Committees do not have to undertake all of the functions proposed, and they can adapt their own arrangements in accordance with local need.
- 3.3 The likely business to be discussed at LJC meetings might include the following:-
- community liaison between the three tiers of local government, NHS, Police, Fire and other Partners;
  - matters for decision;
  - budget monitoring;
  - open public form – for members of the public to raise issues of local concern;
  - potential duties that might be devolved down from Area Joint Committees;

- management of funds that might be devolved down through the Community Infrastructure Levy, New Homes Bonus and Community Energy Fund;
  - neighbourhood planning; and
  - local authority and partner consultations.
- 3.4 Members will be aware that Cambridgeshire County Council are currently in the process of reviewing Area Joint Committees (AJC) given their view that they are no longer fit for purpose. Whilst AJC meetings have been diarised for the ensuing Municipal Year, County Council have advised that these meetings will end as soon as possible, once alternative arrangements have been made. Options that are currently being explored include looking at how some decisions can be delegated to Service Directors, following consultation with the relevant County Portfolio Holder and the local Ward Member(s). The County Council have indicated that other potential decisions could be devolved down to the proposed LJCs as and when appropriate.
- 3.5 Given the possibility that the LJCs might have decision making responsibilities delegated to them, consideration has been given to a range of options relating to representation, voting and decision making. Section 7 of the Constitution covers voting arrangements. The options considered by the Working Group include:-
- Various models of appointment to the LJCs;
  - Differential voting rights through weighting or veto;
  - Differential voting rights by restricting the items on which Members may vote;
  - Conditioning the way matters are delegated to the Local Joint Committee;
  - Insisting on unanimous decisions; and
  - Insisting on a minimum percentage on decisions – for e.g. 75%.
- 3.6 Each of the options has been considered and it has been concluded that Town and Parish Councils should be entitled to one seat each. The relevant District and County Members will make up the rest of the LJC membership.
- 3.7 The Working Group proposes that Town and Parish Council nominations should be Councillors who are not also the relevant District or County Member for that area. Additionally, it is suggested that the Town and Parish Councils should be requested to nominate a substitute as it is felt that they should be represented at all times, particularly if any budgetary or financial decisions are to be made.
- 3.8 In terms of voting, the Working Group has concluded that all of those with a seat on the LJC should be entitled to one vote each. “Twin-hatters” (i.e. Members who are both the relevant District Councillor and County Councillor) should receive two votes each.
- 3.9 Voting will be determined by way of a simple majority of votes either for or against a proposal, with the Chairman having a casting vote if necessary. The Working Group has considered whether votes should be weighted for each local authority tier, but has concluded that this option might prove to be too complex in practice given that views could be divided within a local authority tier. In addition, it is felt that the chosen option demonstrates commitment to localism.
- 3.10 The Working Group suggests that, when necessary, voting could be conditioned when a matter is delegated to LJCs. For example, if a decision is delegated it might be that it is taken by an Executive Councillor after consultation with an LJC. There

need to be clear rules on what decisions can be made by the Committees. Work in this respect will follow at a later stage in the Working Group's investigations.

#### 4. CURRENT AND PROJECTED FUTURE COSTS

- 4.1 It is proposed that the LJsCs should meet at least two times a year, with other meetings being called as necessary (Section 5 of the Constitution). The Working Group has discussed the servicing of the meetings (Section 10 of the Constitution) and has suggested that, in the spirit of localism, secretarial functions should be shared with the Town and Parish Councils within the area, perhaps on a rota basis. Officer support from both the District and County Councils are further being proposed, the duties of which are outlined within Section 11 of the Constitution.
- 4.2 A Neighbourhood Forum Co-ordinator was employed in January 2009, appointed jointly by the County and District Councils and managed by the District. Following resignation of the post holder partway through that year, support for the Neighbourhood Forums has been provided by the District Council (Democratic Services), partly by absorbing the work and partly by extending the hours of an existing Officer who currently is employed on a part-time basis. The funding is utilised to meet the latter costs as well as meeting the costs of venue hire.
- 4.3 The table below provides a comparison of the existing number of meetings compared to those which are proposed for the future:-

<b>Existing Arrangements</b>		
5 Forum Areas	4 Meetings Per Year	<b>20 Meetings Per Annum</b>

<b>Planned Arrangements</b>		
9 Forum Areas	2 Meetings Per Year	<b>18 Meetings Per Annum</b>

This reflects a 10% reduction in the number of meetings proposed.

- 4.4 The secretarial functions include preparing for the venue, time spent at meetings and the production of Minutes. They currently take an average of 9 hours per meeting to complete.
- 4.5 It will be necessary for some support functions to continue to be provided by the District Council. They currently require an average of 12.5 hours per meeting in Officer time and is the equivalent of 13% of one FTE. The functions are outlined within Section 11 of the Constitution.
- 4.6 The total existing cost for the Neighbourhood Forums is £26,000 per annum, inclusive of room hire, catering, printing and Officer support. A reduction in the hours spent servicing the meetings will produce a saving of £10,920 per annum, reflecting the 42% reduction in resources required. This will bring the total cost of the planned arrangements to £15,080 a year.
- 4.7 The table below details the contributions received from Partners:-

	<b>CCC</b>	<b>Police</b>	<b>Fire</b>	<b>NHS</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>2009/10</b>	£5,000	£5,000	£1,200	£5,000	£16,200
<b>2010/11</b>	£5,000	£5,000	£1,200	£5,000	£16,200



Given that the District Council initiated its review early on in the 2011/12 financial year and the uncertainty surrounding the future of the existing Neighbourhood Forums, invoices for 2011/12 were issued to Partners at the end of March 2012.

## 5. CORPORATE GOVERNANCE PANEL COMMENTS

- 5.1 Members of the Corporate Governance Panel have welcomed the work undertaken by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being). Minor suggestions were proposed to the draft Constitution (at 2.1, 2.2 and 12.3) to provide clarification on the proposed terms. These have now been included within the draft.
- 5.2 The Corporate Governance Panel questioned a number of matters including the proposals for “twin hatters” to have two votes each, Town and Parish Council representation at meetings and the level of public attendance hoped to be generated at meetings. The Panel also expressed some reservations over the likely take up of Town and Parish Councils assisting with the servicing of LJC meetings and made comment that the setting of policing priorities should remain at these meetings.

## 6. TIMESCALES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 6.1 The table below is an indication of the likely timescales for the implementation of any new model introduced within the District.



Corporate Governance Panel	28th March 2012
Cabinet	19th April 2012
Consultation period with Town and Parish Councils and Partners	30th April to 8th June 2012 (6 weeks)
Working Group to meet to analyse responses received	Meeting to take place between 11th and 22nd June 2012
Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being)	3rd July 2012
Cabinet	19th July 2012
Launch of LJC Meetings	September 2012

## 7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 The Working Group has spent a significant amount of time reviewing the boundaries for the proposed LJCs whilst being mindful of elected Member representation for each area and their constitutional terms. There is a need to consult the Town and Parish Councils on the LJCs to gain their views on the proposals and, if they are to be introduced, all the local authorities who are to be represented on them will have to complete various formalities. The Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) has had an opportunity to consider and comment on the proposals thus far and

endorsed the Working Group's recommendations at their meeting on the 6th March 2012. Similarly, the Corporate Governance Panel has endorsed these proposals.

- 7.2 The Cabinet is therefore requested to consider and comment on the proposed boundaries, composition, voting and Constitution for Local Joint Committees prior to the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) undertaking a consultation exercise with the Town and Parish Councils and Partners on the proposals thus far.

**Contact Officer:** Miss H Ali, Democratic Services Officer  
 01480 388006  
 [Habbiba.Ali@huntingdonshire.gov.uk](mailto:Habbiba.Ali@huntingdonshire.gov.uk)

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Minutes and Reports of Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) held on 6th September, 1st November and 6th December 2011 and 3rd January, 7th February and 6th March 2012.



Neighbourhood Forums Working File held by Democratic Services Section.

# Proposed Local Joint Committee

March 2012



**Key**

-  County Ward
-  District Ward



This page is intentionally left blank

**DIVISION, WARD AND PARISH BREAKDOWN FOR PROPOSED LOCAL JOINT COMMITTEES**

AREA	PARISHES	DISTRICT WARDS	COUNTY WARD(S)
<b>1</b>  <b>20 Seats</b>	Sibson-cum Stibbington Water Newton Alwalton Chesterton Eilton Haddon Morborne Folksworth and Washingley Stilton Denton and Caldecote Holme Yaxley Farcet	Eilton and Folksworth (1) Yaxley and Farcet (3) Stilton (1)	Norman Cross (2)
	<b>13 PARISHES</b>	<b>5 DISTRICT MEMBERS</b>  <b>Guyatt</b> Banerjee, Butler and Watt Mitchell	<b>2 COUNTY MEMBERS</b>  <b>Guyatt</b> McGuire, M
	<b>2</b>	Sawtry (2)	Sawtry and Ellington (1)
	<b>11 Seats</b>	Sawtry Glatton Conington Little Gidding Great Gidding Winwick Hamerton and Steeple Gidding Upton and Coppingford	<b>2 DISTRICT MEMBERS</b>
<b>2</b>  <b>11 Seats</b>	<b>8 PARISHES</b>	<b>2 DISTRICT MEMBERS</b>	<b>1 COUNTY MEMBER</b>
<b>% Split</b> Parish - 65% District - 25% County - 10%			
<b>% Split</b> Parish - 73% District - 18% County - 9%			

**DIVISION, WARD AND PARISH BREAKDOWN FOR PROPOSED LOCAL JOINT COMMITTEES**

		<p>Tuplin and Tysoe</p>	<p>McGuire, V</p>
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p>Bythorn and Keyston                      Brington and Molesworth                      Old Weston                      Leighton                      Catworth                      Buckworth                      Barham and Woolley                      Spaldwick                      Stow Longa                      Easton                      Ellington                      Grafham                      Perry                      Covington                      Kimbolton and Stonely                      Great Staughton                      Tilbrook</p>	<p>Ellington (1)                      Brampton (2)                      Kimbolton and Staughton (1)</p>	<p>Brampton and Kimbolton (1)                      Sawtry and Ellington (1)</p>
<p><b>23 Seats</b></p>			
<p><b>% Split</b>                      Parish - 74%                      District - 17%                      County - 9%</p>	<p><b>17 PARISHES</b></p>	<p><b>4 DISTRICT MEMBERS</b>                      Baker, M                      Downes and Jordan                      Gray</p>	<p><b>2 COUNTY MEMBERS</b>                      Downes                      McGuire, V</p>

**DIVISION, WARD AND PARISH BREAKDOWN FOR PROPOSED LOCAL JOINT COMMITTEES**

<p>4</p>	<p>Godmanchester Brampton Huntingdon Alconbury Alconbury Weston The Stukeleys</p> <p><b>6 PARISHES</b></p>	<p>Godmanchester (2) Brampton (2) Huntingdon East (3) Huntingdon North (2) Huntingdon West (2) Alconbury and The Stukeleys (1)</p> <p><b>12 DISTRICT MEMBERS</b></p> <p>Hyams and Godley <b>Downes</b> and Jordan Akthar, Greenall and Shellens <b>Dutton</b> and Mackender-Lawrence Cawley and Sanderson Baker, K</p>	<p>Huntingdon (2) Godmanchester and Huntingdon East (2) Brampton and Kimbolton (1)</p> <p><b>5 COUNTY MEMBERS</b></p> <p>Brown and Kadic <b>Dutton</b> and Wilson <b>Downes</b></p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Little Paxton St Neots Hail Weston</p> <p><b>3 PARISHES</b></p>	<p>Little Paxton (1) Kimbolton and Staughton (1) St Neots Eaton Ford (2) St Neots Eaton Socon (2) St Neots Priory Park (2) St Neots Eynesbury (3)</p> <p><b>11 DISTRICT MEMBERS</b></p> <p><b>Churchill</b> Gray <b>Farrer</b> and <b>Harty</b> Harrison and Jennings Chapman and Longford Hansard, Ursell and Van De Kerkhove</p>	<p>Little Paxton and St Neots North (2) Brampton and Kimbolton (1) St Neots Eaton Socon and Eynesbury (2)</p> <p><b>5 COUNTY MEMBERS</b></p> <p><b>Harty</b> and <b>Churchill</b> Downes Hutton and <b>Farrer</b></p>
<p><b>19 Seats</b></p>	<p><b>% Split</b> Parish - 16% District - 58% County - 26%</p>		

**DIVISION, WARD AND PARISH BREAKDOWN FOR PROPOSED LOCAL JOINT COMMITTEES**

<p>6</p>	<p>Buckden Diddington Southoe and Midloe Offord Cluny Offord Darcy Great Paxton Toseland Yelling Abbotsley Great Gransden Waresley-cum-Tetworth</p> <p><b>11 PARISHES</b></p>	<p>Gransden and The Offords (2) Buckden (1)</p> <p><b>3 DISTRICT MEMBERS</b></p> <p>Boddington and <b>West</b> Clough</p>	<p>Buckden, Gransden and The Offords (1)</p> <p><b>1 COUNTY MEMBER</b></p> <p><b>West</b></p>	
<p><b>15 Seats</b></p> <p><i>% Split</i> Parish - 73% District - 20% County - 7%</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>Ramsey Warboys Bury Wistow Upwood and The Raveleys Abbots Ripton Kings Ripton Woodwalton</p> <p><b>8 PARISHES</b></p>	<p>Ramsey (3) Warboys and Bury (2) Upwood and The Raveleys (1)</p> <p><b>6 DISTRICT MEMBERS</b></p> <p>Curtis, <b>Reeve</b> and Swales Bucknell and Ward Howe</p>	<p>Warboys and Upwood (1) Ramsey (1)</p> <p><b>2 COUNTY MEMBERS</b></p> <p>Lucas <b>Reeve</b></p>
<p><b>16 Seats</b></p> <p><i>% Split</i> Parish - 50% District - 37% County - 13%</p>				



**DIVISION, WARD AND PARISH BREAKDOWN FOR PROPOSED LOCAL JOINT COMMITTEES**

<p>8</p>	<p>Fenstanton Hilton Hemingford Abbots Hemingford Grey Houghton and Wyton St Ives Holywell-cum-Needingworth Wyton-on-the-Hill</p> <p><b>8 PARISHES</b></p>	<p>The Hemingfords (2) St Ives West (1) St Ives South (2) St Ives East (2) Fenstanton (1) Upwood and The Raveleys (1) Earith (2)</p> <p><b>11 DISTRICT MEMBERS</b></p> <p><b>Bates</b> and Williams Dew, J Davies and Dew, D Ablewhite and Reynolds, D Harlock Howe Godfrey and Rogers</p>	<p>The Hemingfords and Fenstanton (1) St Ives (2) Warboys and Upwood (1)</p> <p><b>4 COUNTY MEMBERS</b></p> <p><b>Bates</b> Pegram and Reynolds, K Lucas</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>Old Hurst Woodhurst Pidley-cum-Fenton Somersham Colne Earith Bluntisham Broughton</p> <p><b>8 PARISHES</b></p>	<p>Somersham (2) Earith (2)</p> <p><b>4 DISTRICT MEMBERS</b></p> <p><b>Criswell</b> and Bull Godfrey and Rogers</p>	<p>Somersham and Earith (1)</p> <p><b>1 COUNTY MEMBER</b></p> <p><b>Criswell</b></p>
<p><b>23 Seats</b></p>			
<p><b>% Split</b> <b>Parish - 35%</b> <b>District - 48%</b> <b>County - 17%</b></p>			
<p><b>13 Seats</b></p>			
<p><b>% Split</b> <b>Parish - 61%</b> <b>District - 31%</b> <b>County - 8%</b></p>			

**DIVISION, WARD AND PARISH BREAKDOWN FOR PROPOSED LOCAL JOINT COMMITTEES**

**NB - Those in red denote "twin-hatters"**

District Wards Covering Duplicate Areas:	Upwood and The Raveleys x 2 Brampton x 2 Kimbolton and Staughton x 2 Earith x 2
--	--

County Wards Covering Duplicate Areas:	Sawtry and Ellington x 2 Warboys and Upwood x 2 Brampton and Kimbolton x 3
--	--

## HUNTINGDONSHIRE LOCAL JOINT COMMITTEES

### CONSTITUTION

#### 1. Composition

- 1.1 The Local Joint Committees (LJCs) will be constituted in accordance with Sections 101 and 102 of the Local Government Act 1972 and will be Joint Committees for decision making.
- 1.2 Committees will be established across the District on the boundaries delineated in Appendix 1. The boundaries will be kept under regular review.

#### 2. Membership

- 2.1 Membership will comprise Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) Members for the LJC area. Town and Parish Councils within the LJC area will appoint one representative each. Membership will cease if, for whatever reason, Membership of the nominating authority ceases.
- 2.2 Town and Parish Councils will appoint a representative on an annual basis prior to the LJCs first meeting in each Municipal Year. A Town and Parish Council shall not appoint, as a voting Member or substitute, a person who is not a Member of that authority.
- 2.3 Each representative will have equal voting rights.
- 2.4 Town and Parish Council substitutes at meetings will be allowed provided the Secretary is informed at least 3 working days prior to a meeting.
- 2.5 Substitutes should be nominated at the same time as the Town and Parish Council representatives and will have the same voting rights as the Member that they replace and will count towards the establishment of a quorum.

#### 3. Functions

- 3.1 The purpose of the LJCs is to enable transparent strategic decision making at a localised level but not to detract from public engagement with Town and Parish Councils who should be the normal point of engagement. In doing so, it will also:
  - (a) engage the public at a more strategic level than Town or Parish Councils;
  - (b) promote and enhance local democracy;
  - (c) facilitate closer working between the three tiers of local government and other public and community services within the LJC area;
  - (d) enable Town and Parish Councils, the County Council, the District Council and the Police and public sector and voluntary sector Partners (including interested Community Groups), where appropriate, to discuss and address issues of current or future concern to the LJC area;

## APPENDIX C

- (e) make plans and related decisions for the LJC area (or constituent parts of the LJC area) based on need/evidence, including community views represented and captured through existing or additional work and virtual social mediums such as 'Shape Your Place';
- (f) undertake or enable consultations (outside of the LJC meeting) to ensure the community is consulted as widely as possible, including organising special public meetings where these are indicated/agreed as being needed in the LJC area (or constituent parts of the LJC area);
- (g) determine expenditure of any delegated budget. This must be spent within policy to improve service standards. It could also be used to support the delivery of service improvements identified in Parish plans or to provide grants to local voluntary organisations;
- (h) provide a reporting mechanism to the Town and Parish Councils in paragraph 2.1 above by requesting them to attend local meetings and scrutinise service delivery within the LJC area - i.e. the LJC's will have a strong role in the performance management of services in local communities;
- (i) act as a decision maker with regard to the local delivery of a range of services and to prioritise resource allocation in their area within existing standards and policy;
- (j) where they cannot be resolved by the LJC, refer matters of concern regarding service to the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee/Panel or of policy to Cabinet and for the Chairman to have the right to speak at those bodies of CCC and HDC in order to represent the views of the LJC;
- (k) act as a formal consultation mechanism for CCC, HDC and other public and community services over and above that undertaken with individual Town and Parish Councils;
- (l) facilitate partnership working between the County, District, Town and Parish Councils within an LJC area;
- (m) assist with neighbourhood planning/preparation of community plans/liaison on Parish plans;
- (n) liaise with the Police, Fire, NHS, other public bodies and community groups;
- (o) provide a mechanism to enable Councils to pursue the localism agenda – in the wider sense of organising communities into action as well as acting as a conduit for the upward transmission of views;
- (p) consult on and prioritise any funds that might be devolved relating to the Community Infrastructure Levy and the New Homes Bonus; and
- (q) carry out any functions delegated by CCC and HDC.

In addition to this framework, each LJC will have the freedom to customise or develop their activities according to local need.

**4. Budgets**

- 4.1 Where the LJC has a delegated budget, its administration will be subject to local authority audit procedures.

**5. Meetings and Chairing of Meetings**

- 5.1 Each LJC will meet at least two times each year with other meetings being called as necessary with the prior agreement of the Chairman or if more than half the Members of the Committee are in favour.
- 5.2 The Chairman and Vice-Chairman of an LJC will be appointed annually. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman will be from amongst the membership of the LJC – preferably from a Town and Parish Council.
- 5.3 Ordinary meetings will take place in the local area.
- 5.4 An invitation to attend together with the Agenda for each meeting and the Minutes of the previous meeting will be sent to each Member no less than five working days before each meeting.
- 5.5 At least ten working days notice will also be given to the public of the time and place of each meeting by posting details at HDC's offices and on its website. Copies of such notice will also be sent to CCC and each Town and Parish Council in the area and will be widely publicised.
- 5.6 All meetings of the LJC will normally be open to the press and public.
- 5.7 Members of the public are encouraged to attend LJC meetings, to contribute to discussions and raise issues of local concern. There will be a separate item on the Agenda for each meeting for this purpose. Members of the public who are speaking will be encouraged to be concise and avoid repetition, thereby ensuring sufficient opportunity for others to contribute.
- 5.8 The Chairman of the LJC may invite any person to attend a meeting for the purpose of making a presentation or participating in discussion on any item relevant to that body's functions.
- 5.9 Town and Parish Councils are encouraged to receive reports on the work of the LJC.

**6. Public Participation**

- 6.1 So as to encourage public participation and engagement in the business of the LJC, Members and Officers shall ensure local people are informed, involved and consulted about any issues relevant to the LJC (excluding regulatory matters).
- 6.2 Each LJC meeting will decide how best to achieve this objective.

**7. Voting**

- 7.1 Any matter will be decided by a simple majority of all voting members of the LJC present at the time the question is put. Any elected Members are entitled to vote at LJC meetings.
- 7.2 In the event of an equality of votes for and against, the Chairman will have a casting vote, but there will be no restriction on how he/she chooses to exercise this right.
- 7.3 Members who are both the relevant District Councillor and County Councillor will have two votes each.
- 7.4 Some decisions will be delegated to an Executive Member of CCC or HDC. In these instances the delegation will remain but the decision maker will take into account the views expressed by the LJC.

**8. Quorum**

- 8.1 The quorum for all meetings will be at least one third of voting Members to include representatives from more than one tier of local government.

**9. Minutes**

- 9.1 The Minutes of all meetings will take the form of a decision list. This will be presented to the Chairman to sign at the next scheduled meeting.
- 9.2 The Chairman will move that the Minutes of the previous meeting be signed as a correct record and no discussion shall take place on their content except with regard to their accuracy.

**10. Secretary**

- 10.1 Secretarial functions will be shared between the Members of the LJC.
- 10.2 The responsibilities of the Secretary in respect of the business of the LJCs will be to ensure meetings are serviced and also specifically:
  - (a) to provide advice and support to Members in relation to the conduct of meetings;
  - (b) to liaise with the Chairman, other Members and District and County support Officers to identify the matters to be included on the Agenda for each meeting; and
  - (c) to produce a decision list following the deliberations of each meeting and circulate this to all participants within ten working days of the meeting.

**11. Officer Support**

11.1 CCC and HDC will both provide Officer support for each LJC.

11.2 The duties of the Officers in respect of the business of LJCs will be:

- (a) to assist the Chairman to set the Agenda for each meeting;
- (b) to collate and dispatch all relevant papers and publicise the date, time and venue for each meeting;
- (c) to ensure that, where appropriate, reports are produced and that all Members, Officers and Partners who are invited to meetings are aware of the purpose of their attendance;
- (d) to provide general advice and support to Members;
- (e) to support the Chairman and Members in engaging and consulting local residents;
- (f) to ensure that all necessary actions are taken promptly to implement decisions;
- (g) to monitor the implementation of decisions and report back to the community and, where appropriate, refer any decision to CCC, HDC, Partner or Town and Parish Council bodies for further consideration;
- (h) to circulate details of actions taken in advance of the next meeting; and
- (i) to produce a schedule of dates and venues for meetings.

**12. Conduct at Meetings**

12.1 High standards of conduct are expected from the representatives of public sector and voluntary sector organisations at LJC meetings. Elected Members must abide by the Members Code of Conduct of their respective authority when engaged in the business of the LJCs. They should apply the rules concerning the declaration of interests at LJC meetings.

12.2 Where it is clear that a decision in which a Town or Parish representative has such an interest in a matter likely to arise at a particular meeting, the substitute Member (with no interest to declare) may attend that LJC meeting or a part of the meeting in his/her place.

12.3 Where a Town or Parish Council Member of the LJC, or a substitute Member, has failed to attend 2 consecutive LJC meetings, the seat will be declared vacant. In the event of the vacancy occurring in respect of a Town or Parish Council, another representative will be appointed to sit on the LJC by the relevant authority.

12.4 Members of the public speaking at LJC meetings should not engage in personal criticism or slanderous comment or use the LJC as a means of pursuing personal objectives.

**13. Expenses**

- 13.1 Voting Members and substitutes shall be entitled to recover from the nominating authority by which they are appointed any expenses they incur in connection with the discharge of the LJC's functions (for example travel expenses) according to their authority's own policy.

**14. Review**

- 14.1 This Constitution will be reviewed after 12 months at a meeting to which all Members of all LJC's in Huntingdonshire will be invited.

**15. Interpretation**

- 15.1 The decision of the Chairman on the interpretation of this Constitution shall be final.



# Agenda Item 9

## SAFETY ADVISORY GROUP

WEDNESDAY, 7 MARCH 2012

GROUND FLOOR MEETING ROOM 1A/B

### ACTION SHEET

**MEMBERS  
PRESENT:**

**Management Side:**

Councillor A Hansard - Chairman  
Councillor J W Davies  
Councillor Mrs P A Jordan  
Councillor T V Rogers

**Employee Side:**

Mrs S Mckerral  
Mrs G Smith  
G Vince

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

T Bowmer  
Mrs A Jerrom  
S Howell

**APOLOGIES:**

Councillor Mrs B E Boddington  
P Corley  
K Lawson  
C Sneesby

ITEM NO.	SUBJECT	ACTION BY
1	<p><b>Report of Previous Meeting</b></p> <p>The report of the meeting of the Advisory Group held on 7th December 2011 was received and noted.</p>	
2	<p><b>Members' Interests</b></p> <p>No declarations were received.</p>	
3	<p><b>Feedback on the Potential Risks Associated with the Atrium Floor</b></p> <p>With the aid of a report by the Corporate Safety Advisor, Mr T Bowmer, the Group was updated on the situation regarding the ongoing work to address the slippery atrium floor in the customer services reception area</p>	

ITEM NO.	SUBJECT	ACTION BY
	<p>of Pathfinder House. At its meeting in December 2011 the Group had received a report from the Unison appointed Health and Safety representative, Mr K Lawson outlining his professional concerns over safety issues with the surface. A report detailing the actions deemed necessary had been formally submitted to the Chief Officer's Management Team (COMT) in January 2012 at the request of SAG, and interim measures had been agreed.</p> <p>Tenders had gone out for super absorbent matting to replace the permanent entrance matting, and in the interim additional temporary matting had been rolled out in the three entrance areas which appeared to be working well.</p> <p>Having attended a meeting with all interested parties earlier in the day Mr Bowmer advised of the current situation. Mr Bowmer drew the Group's attention to Appendix 1 of his report which detailed the remedial actions that were required by COMT in order to adequately control the risk. Mr Bowmer explained that although a permanent solution involving replacement of the current surface had been identified, Facilities Management had decided to take an incremental approach and were trying the aforementioned measures involving matting, in the hope that these might obviate the need for fully carpeting the area. A trip hazard had been introduced with the use of matting and COMT had requested that to minimise this risk the matting should be rolled up and removed during dry weather. This had been agreed by Facilities Management and Mr Bowmer had offered manual handling training in this respect if required. Having questioned whether cleaning staff had been trained in suitable cleaning techniques for the floor, the Group was advised that training had taken place but that no formal record had been kept. Members therefore requested that a report detailing the training be submitted to a future meeting.</p> <p>The Group was advised that further measures including risk assessments had been recommended by COMT and that these were in the process of being carried out by Customer Service Centre staff in association with Environmental Management.</p> <p>In discussing the amount of outdated slips and trip information contained within the Council's intranet system, the Group agreed to a suggestion by Mr Bowmer that he should be given access to the Health and Safety Pages on the Intranet in order that he can maintain and edit the information, a task previously undertaken by HR. Mr Bowmer advised that staff could then be signposted to these pages.</p> <p>Having concurred with Mr Bowmer's view that the investigations into the slip risk had identified a number of areas where corporate improvements in safety management could be made and having had their attention drawn to Appendix 2 of the report which highlighted a general failure of management controls, the Group</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the Safety Advisor create an 'arrangements section' to the Health and Safety Policy for the</li> </ul>	<p>Facilities Management</p> <p>Head of IMD</p> <p>Safety Advisor</p>

ITEM NO.	SUBJECT	ACTION BY
	<p>Group's consideration. The arrangements section would include among other topics, HDC's policy on, controlling slip and trip hazards and risk assessment. In addition the Safety Advisor is directed to put forward health and safety record templates for SAG's consideration, to include risk assessment templates;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the Safety Advisor be given appropriate permissions and access to the Health and Safety pages on the Council's intranet in order that he may update, edit and maintain appropriate information; and</li> <li>• that a corporate reporting system/existing reporting systems should be created/utilised to encourage employees to report unsafe acts and safety improvements.</li> </ul>	<p>COMT/Head of IMD</p> <p>COMT/Safety Advisor</p>
4	<p><b>Violent Incident Register</b></p> <p>By way of a report by the Head of Customer Services, the Group noted the progress that has been achieved by the Violent Incident Panel over the previous 12 months.</p> <p>The Advisory Group was reminded that the Violent Incident Register had been introduced in 2007 in order to alert employees and elected members to significant risks to their personal safety by providing up to date, timely information about known incidents of violence and aggression. The Register was managed by a Panel of officers comprising the Head of Customer Services (Chairman), Street Scene Manager, Corporate Systems and Information Manager, Solicitor, the General Manager, Leisure and the Corporate Health and Safety Advisor, following a stringent management regime.</p> <p>The Advisory Group was advised that there had been 13 incidents of violence directed towards Council employees in the 12 months to December 2011. Of these 7 have been added to the Register, which was available to all staff via the GIS system on the Council's intranet site, allowing an informed decision to be made and appropriate action to be taken by employees or elected Members prior to a visit to a known aggressor.</p> <p>In answer to a question the Group was informed that action taken toward aggressors was dependent on the severity of the incident, with reports made to the Police where appropriate.</p>	
5	<p><b>First Contact Service Update</b></p> <p>With the aid of a report by the Head of Customer Services, the Group</p>	

ITEM NO.	SUBJECT	ACTION BY
	<p>was updated on the work of the First Contact Service.</p> <p>Mrs Barber reminded the Group that the First Contact Service had been introduced in 2001 as part of the Council's overall stress management arrangements when it had been agreed that there should be an additional alternative means of support to employees which would provide a confidential listening service. Mrs Barber explained that there are currently 11 First Contacts all of whom are Council officers that have volunteered their time and undertaken appropriate training. The service is able to refer employees to the Council's external counselling service, currently Cambridgeshire Consultancy Service and Richmond Fellowship, where appropriate.</p> <p>The Advisory Group was advised that there had been 150 formal and 91 informal approaches from employees to the Service to date and 34 referrals to the professional counselling service. During the period January to December 2011 24 formal, 8 informal approaches and 5 referrals to counselling had been made. There had been no referrals to the Richmond Fellowship in that period. The service continues to be well used by employees and an increase in approaches made in the previous quarter has been attributable to staff concerns over budget cuts and job security. The value placed on the service by staff was highlighted in a recent peer review for the Equality Framework for Local Government.</p> <p>In answer to a question from the Health, Safety and Emergency Planning Officer, Operations, Mrs Barber advised that reports covering stress absences are regularly made to the Employment Panel.</p> <p>Having acknowledged the value of the service and the commitment of the First Contact officers, Councillor Hansard undertook to send a letter of thanks to the First Contact Service on behalf of the Advisory Group.</p>	AH/AJ
6	<p><b>Accident Reporting Procedure</b></p> <p>The Advisory Group considered a report by the Corporate Safety Advisor seeking their comments on the proposed new accident reporting procedure prior to its adoption by Employment Panel.</p> <p>Mr Bowmer explained that the Council has a statutory obligation to record, investigate and where appropriate report certain types of accidents under the terms of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, and in particular the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 1995 (RIDDOR). Significant amendments to RIDDOR would come into force on 6th April 2012 in order to bring it in line with the self certification period of 7 days, and it was therefore considered timely to introduce a Corporate Accident Reporting Procedure which would reflect the new arrangements. The Group was advised that the although the Council currently had a number of informal service based procedures for ensuring that accidents were reported there was no corporate accident reporting procedure clearly detailing the Council's duties and responsibilities.</p>	

ITEM NO.	SUBJECT	ACTION BY
	<p>The Group was advised that Chief Officers, Heads of Service and Leisure and Operations Safety Co-ordinators had been consulted on the new procedure, and a training programme had been planned in order to introduce the final procedure to Heads of Service and Activity Managers.</p> <p>Having been advised that the procedure, as a supplement to the Health and Safety Policy, fell within the remit of the Employment Panel, it was</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the contents of the procedure be endorsed for adoption by the Employment Panel; and</li> <li>• that the planned training course/workshops to introduce the new procedure to Heads of Service and Activity Managers, be supported by the Group.</li> </ul>	Safety Advisor
7	<b>Quarterly Accident/Incident Reports</b>	
<p>(a) Operations Division</p> <p>The Group was acquainted by way of a report by the Operations Division Health and Safety Co-ordinator with details of the 12 accidents that been reported by the divisions' employees since the last meeting. Two accidents had been reported under the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations (RIDDOR). One non-employee related accident had been reported at Paxton Pits but the individual had declined to give any details. Having commented on the high number of twisted ankles that been reported by refuse recycling loaders, Members were assured that the situation was being monitored and addressed.</p>		
<p>(b) District Council Employees</p> <p>The Group received and noted a report by the Corporate Health and Safety Advisor giving details of the accidents and incidents that had occurred in the Council's office based premises and those reported by the Sports and Active Lifestyles Team during the previous quarter.</p> <p>Members were advised that an ambulance had been called for one employee although it had transpired that the injury had been caused during the employee's walk to work. One member of staff had tripped on the new 'Waterhog' matting in the Customer Services Section although no injury had been sustained. The number of children that had suffered minor injuries during lifestyle activities had risen to 3 since the report was compiled.</p>		

ITEM NO.	SUBJECT	ACTION BY
	<p>(c) One Leisure</p> <p>The Group also received a report by the One Leisure Quality, Facilities and Safety Manager detailing accidents which had been reported since the last meeting. No accidents had been reported under the requirements of RIDDOR Regulations. Five employee related accidents and 122 non-employee accidents, 7 of which were not caused as a direct result of taking part in an activity, had been reported, and remedial action had been taken.</p>	
8	<p><b>Fire Evacuations</b></p> <p>The Corporate Health and Safety Advisor drew the Group's attention to two recent fire evacuations that had taken place at Pathfinder House on the 26th January and 23th February 2012. Having reported that no-one in the building had been prepared to take on responsibility for the preparation of a report on the events for the Safety Advisory Group, a job which previously would have been undertaken by the former Health and Safety Co-ordinator, Mr Bowmer tabled a report that he had prepared.</p> <p>The Group was advised that Mr Bowmer had been approached by Unison Appointed Safety Representative and Fire Officer Mrs S McKerral who had raised several concerns with him over the failings of the evacuations. Mrs McKerral had listed her concerns in a report which had been incorporated within the report submitted by Mr Bowmer. Their main concerns were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council appeared to have no Responsible Person for Fire following the departure of the Director of Central Services</li> <li>• Several of the previously appointed Competent Persons for Fire had now left the Council's employ, and on the day of the second evacuation there had been no Competent Person on duty, therefore there had been no-one to report to following the evacuation. Mrs McKerral had reported to her Head of Service and that report had then been forwarded to Mr Bowmer</li> <li>• No fire policy or procedure existed</li> <li>• Wall name boards were difficult to remove from the wall and the design meant names could easily slip</li> <li>• Queuing had been a major problem on the fire escape stairway</li> <li>• Noise on the stairway had resulted in instructions not being heard</li> <li>• Confusion as to the whereabouts of Evac Chairs for the disabled</li> <li>• Assembly points are positioned at the minimum distance allowed (18m) which results in employees standing too close to the building</li> <li>• Fire Officer tabards were being worn by members of staff that had not been appointed as Fire Officers</li> <li>• Lancaster staff did not evacuate – although they are expected to come under the responsibility of the Council it is not known who is their Fire Officer</li> </ul>	

ITEM NO.	SUBJECT	ACTION BY
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only a small number of line managers are aware of personal evacuation emergency plans (PEEP)</li> </ul> <p>Two reports from the Facilities and Administration Manager covering both evacuations are contained within Mr Bowmer's report along with recommendations for measures that need to be put in place in order to reduce the Council's overall corporate risk rating which has significantly increased.</p> <p>Having been made aware of the seriousness of the current situation, the Group</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that Cabinet should be advised of the failures of the current system;</li> <li>• that a Responsible Person for Fire should be appointed; and</li> <li>• that a comprehensive Fire Evacuation Plan and Policy be produced.</li> </ul>	COMT/Cabinet
9	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p> <p>The next meeting of the Group was scheduled for 27th June 2012.</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

**Document is Restricted**

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

**Document is Restricted**

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

**Document is Restricted**

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

**Document is Restricted**

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

**Document is Restricted**

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank