

A meeting of the **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (ECONOMIC WELL-BEING)** will be held in **CIVIC SUITE 0.1A, PATHFINDER HOUSE, ST MARY'S STREET, HUNTINGDON, PE29 3TN** on **THURSDAY, 6 JUNE 2013** at **7:00 PM** and you are requested to attend for the transaction of the following business:-

**Contact
(01480)**

APOLOGIES

1. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 8)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meetings held on 4th April and 15th May 2013.

**Mrs C Bulman
388234**

2. MEMBERS' INTERESTS

To receive from Members declarations as to disclosable pecuniary, non disclosable pecuniary or non pecuniary interests in relation to any Agenda Item.

3. NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS (Pages 9 - 14)

A copy of the current Notice of Executive Decisions is attached. Members are invited to comment as appropriate on any items contained therein.

**Mrs H Taylor
388008**

4. HUNTINGDONSHIRE REGULATION 123 AND INFRASTRUCTURE BUSINESS PLAN 2013/14 LIST (Pages 15 - 30)

To consider a report by the Assistant Director of Environment, Growth and Planning, prior to consideration by the Cabinet.

**S Ingram
388400**

(Members of the Overview & Scrutiny Panel (Environmental Well-Being) have been invited to attend and partake in the discussion on this item).

5. COMMUNICATIONS

Following a request at a previous meeting, to receive a presentation by the Corporate Team Manager.

**Mrs H Donnellan
388263**

6. TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2012/13 (Pages 31 - 42)

To consider and comment on the Treasury Management Annual Report, prior to its consideration by Cabinet and Council.

**S Couper
388103**

7. WORK PROGRAMME (Pages 43 - 54)

To consider a report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services enabling the Panel to review their current programme of studies and plan their work for the forthcoming year.

**A Roberts
388015**

8. WORKPLAN STUDIES (Pages 55 - 64)

To consider with the aid of a report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services, the programme of studies.

**Mrs C Bulman
388234**

9. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY (ECONOMIC WELLBEING) - PROGRESS (Pages 65 - 70)

To consider a report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services.

**Mrs C Bulman
388234**

10. SCRUTINY (Pages 71 - 76)

To scrutinise decisions taken since the last meeting as set out in the Decision Digest and to raise any other matters for scrutiny that fall within the remit of the Panel.

Dated this 29 day of May 2013



Head of Paid Service

Notes

A. Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

(1) *Members are required to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests and unless you have obtained dispensation, cannot discuss or vote on the matter at the meeting and must also leave the room whilst the matter is being debated or voted on.*

(2) *A Member has a disclosable pecuniary interest if it*

(a) relates to you, or

(b) is an interest of -

(i) your spouse or civil partner; or

(ii) a person with whom you are living as husband and wife; or

(iii) a person with whom you are living as if you were civil partners

and you are aware that the other person has the interest.

(3) *Disclosable pecuniary interests includes -*

(a) any employment or profession carried out for profit or gain;

(b) any financial benefit received by the Member in respect of expenses incurred carrying out his or her duties as a Member (except from the Council);

(c) any current contracts with the Council;

- (d) any beneficial interest in land/property within the Council's area;
- (e) any licence for a month or longer to occupy land in the Council's area;
- (f) any tenancy where the Council is landlord and the Member (or person in (2)(b) above) has a beneficial interest; or
- (g) a beneficial interest (above the specified level) in the shares of any body which has a place of business or land in the Council's area.

B. Other Interests

(4) If a Member has a non-disclosable pecuniary interest or a non-pecuniary interest then you are required to declare that interest, but may remain to discuss and vote.

(5) A Member has a non-disclosable pecuniary interest or a non-pecuniary interest where -

(a) a decision in relation to the business being considered might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial standing of you or a member of your family or a person with whom you have a close association to a greater extent than it would affect the majority of the council tax payers, rate payers or inhabitants of the ward or electoral area for which you have been elected or otherwise of the authority's administrative area, or

(b) it relates to or is likely to affect any of the descriptions referred to above, but in respect of a member of your family (other than specified in (2)(b) above) or a person with whom you have a close association

and that interest is not a disclosable pecuniary interest.

Please contact Mrs Claire Bulman, Democratic Services Officer, Tel: 01480 388234 / email: Claire.Bulman@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 Panel.

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 (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 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (ECONOMIC WELL-BEING) held in CIVIC SUITE 0.1A, PATHFINDER HOUSE, ST MARY'S STREET, HUNTINGDON PE29 3TN on Thursday, 4 April 2013.

PRESENT: Councillor T V Rogers – Chairman.

Councillors G J Bull, S Greenall, R Harrison, R B Howe, P G Mitchell, M F Shellens and A H Williams.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence from the meeting were submitted on behalf of Councillors E R Butler and Mrs L A Duffy and Mr Eacott and Mr Hall.

110. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 7th March 2013, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

111. MEMBERS' INTERESTS

No declarations were received.

112. CABINET FEEDBACK - DOCUMENT CENTRE REVIEW

(Councillor J A Gray, Executive Councillor for Resources, was in attendance for this item).

The Panel received a report from the Cabinet (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) outlining its response to the findings of the Panel's review of the District Council's Document Centre. Having questioned the extent to which the Cabinet would act on the recommendations, the Panel was informed by Councillor J A Gray that whilst the Cabinet did not agree with all the conclusions, the report would act as a catalyst for change. The Managing Director, in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Resources and the Panel's Document Centre Champion, would give detailed consideration to the recommendations and, as a starting point, the matter would be discussed shortly at a meeting of the Chief Officer's Management Team.

Having thanked the Cabinet for its response, Members commented generally on the need for more detailed feedback from the Cabinet on its responses to their recommendations. It was reported that a number of suggestions had been made as part of the review of the effectiveness of overview and scrutiny to address this issue. In terms of the process for undertaking further reviews, the Executive Councillor and the Chief Officers Management Team would be

advised of the scope of reviews at the outset and be given an opportunity to comment on the draft final report.

In concluding the discussion, the Panel reiterated the need for the Document Centre to be looked at as a whole function and requested that a report on progress made, specifically with respect to those proposals outlined within section 3.1 of the report, be presented in six months time. Whereupon, it was

RESOLVED

that the contents of the report be noted.

113. NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

(During the discussion on this item (7.30pm) Councillor M F Shellens took his seat at the meeting).

The Panel considered and noted the current Notice of Executive Decisions (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book). With reference to the forthcoming Supplementary Capital Estimate for the Loves Farm Community Centre, Members requested a formal opportunity to comment on the proposals prior to their consideration by the Cabinet.

114. BORROWING

(Councillor J A Gray, Executive Councillor for Resources was in attendance for this item).

With the assistance of a report by the Borrowing Working Group (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) the Panel considered the findings of a study, which had been undertaken to identify the terms of a debate on the Council's policy on borrowing and to develop an understanding of the District Council's approach to borrowing. A report by the Assistant Director (Finance and Resources) was also submitted which provided further comments on the subject.

By way of introduction, it was explained that the study had been undertaken in response to Members' concerns regarding the projected growth in Council borrowing in the period to 2026/27 and to highlight to Members what the future debt levels would be. The Panel's attention was drawn to Annex A which outlined the capital expenditure currently included within the approved Budget and Medium Term Plan. The Working Group was of the view that borrowing should be used to fund a narrower definition of capital expenditure and the remainder should be funded from revenue. The Working Group then commended the recommendations set out in Section 4 of the report to the Panel.

The Assistant Director (Finance & Resources) explained that the Council could fund capital expenditure either from revenue or spread the cost over the lifetime of the asset through borrowing. The Council would consider the impact of each over the life of the Medium Term Plan and beyond when deciding which approach to take. With this in

mind, Members' attention was then drawn to the examples within the report by the Assistant Director which showed the effects of funding £1M per year for vehicle replacements in different ways and of funding all capital expenditure (with the exception of long term assets) from revenue. The latter would have a significant impact on the Council's reserves and in the current financial situation this could not realistically be achieved. An explanation of the process through which capital proposals were reviewed each year, prior to their inclusion within the draft budget, was also provided.

The Executive Councillor for Resources thanked the Working Group for its contribution in an area that needed examination. In his view there might be some merit in transferring some of the items of capital expenditure outlined in annex A to revenue, albeit not all of them. However, in light of the difficult financial situation in which the Council currently found itself, this was not currently deliverable without significant reductions in revenue spending. With respect to the recommendation that there should be a limit on the amount the Council could borrow, Councillor Gray indicated that he had no difficulty with the concept of introducing a limit based upon 15% of net revenue spend, which could be exceeded by a motion passed at full Council.

In considering the contents of the Working Group's report, the Panel discussed the Council's need for further borrowing after 2016. Members were advised that over the next five years it was expected there would be a relatively small increase in borrowing, which suggested that equilibrium with the Minimum Revenue Provision was being achieved. It was likely that the 15% limit would not be exceeded in this period, though it might do so subsequently. Members were reminded that in addition to the figures with the report, the Treasury Management Strategy permitted borrowing in advance to take account of low interest rates and offered the potential to provide loan finance to local organisations.

In response to a number of questions asked by Members, it was reported that the Council had borrowed £10M on a long term basis at a rate of 3.5%. The other borrowing on short term rates was susceptible to changes in interest rates. Having been advised of the accounting definition of items which could be classified as capital expenditure, the Panel was reminded that the Council was legally required to classify as capital expenditure those items which met the criteria but it could choose whether to fund it from existing resources or borrowing.

With regard to the Working Group's recommendations, the Panel took into account the principle that funding capital expenditure through borrowing meant that the future beneficiaries contributed towards the cost of the benefits the Council provided. It was suggested that the Government encouraged public sector agencies to capitalise their costs whenever possible. Overall, the Panel was of the opinion that, given the Council's current financial position, recommendation (a) could not be supported in its current form and that, instead, the Cabinet should be invited to consider which items currently funded through borrowing might be funded from revenue when this was affordable. On the basis of the Panel's deliberations the Members of

the Working Group indicated that they were content to withdraw recommendation (a). Whereupon, it was

RESOLVED

that the Cabinet be recommended to:

- (a) consider whether there are any capital items that are currently funded through borrowing, which should be funded from revenue when this is affordable; and
- (b) agree a limit on the cost of borrowing of 15% of net revenue spend. The limit could then only be exceeded with the approval of the full Council.

115. BUDGET

(Councillor J A Gray, Executive Councillor for Resources, was in attendance for this item).

With the assistance of a report by the Head of Legal & Democratic Services (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) the Panel considered the suggestions for savings, which had previously been put forward during formal and informal discussions on the Council's Budget. The ideas presented by the Liberal Democrats and the UK Independence Party for potential short and long term cost savings proposals were also considered.

In considering the list of suggestions for possible budgetary savings, the Chairman invited individual Panel Members to identify those items which should be given greater priority. At the conclusion of this exercise, it was agreed that the following priority areas should be put forward for consideration by the Cabinet:-

- ❖ shared services, outsourcing or service reorganisation;
- ❖ the Council's electoral arrangements;
- ❖ improved procurement;
- ❖ selling advertising on the Council's car parks, vehicles, website etc;
- ❖ greater enforcement on the Council's car parks;
- ❖ the use of consultants and agency staff;
- ❖ prioritised training;
- ❖ alternative funding of the Shopmobility Portakabin; and
- ❖ civil parking enforcement.

In terms of the principles that should be adopted towards identifying spending adjustments, the Panel endorsed the view that there should be a 'top down' approach. In response Councillor J A Gray stated that Executive Councillors had already considered this. The Cabinet also had been looking at the Council's financial position in the longer term. The Assistant Director (Finance & Resources) informed the Panel of the approach of the Senior Managers Group.

Members were of the view that the Council should look at ways of achieving adjustments in the short and longer terms and focus on

areas of highest cost. Given the order of savings that were required, they recognised the likelihood that the Council would need to consider ceasing some activities. Comment was also made regarding the need to introduce a simplified form of financial reporting, to include the presentation of financial trends which was necessary for effective cost management.

RESOLVED

that the Panel's suggestions for contributing to the Council's saving target be submitted to the Cabinet for consideration at its next meeting.

With reference to Council funding more generally, Councillor A H Williams drew Members' attention to a recent letter in the local press. The Panel discussed ways in which some of the points made might be clarified.

116. WORKPLAN STUDIES

The Panel received and noted a report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) containing details of studies that were being undertaken by the Overview and Scrutiny Panels for Social and Environmental Well-Being.

117. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL (ECONOMIC WELL-BEING) - PROGRESS

The Panel received and noted a report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) reviewing progress on matters that had previously been discussed. With reference to the Community Infrastructure Levy, the Chairman reported that the Regulation 123 List and associated Infrastructure Business Plan 2013/14 were currently subject to public consultation.

118. SCRUTINY

The Panel considered and noted the latest edition of the Council's Decision Digest (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book).

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of the OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (ECONOMIC WELL-BEING) held in CIVIC SUITE, PATHFINDER HOUSE, ST MARY'S STREET, HUNTINGDON PE29 3TN on Wednesday, 15 May 2013.

PRESENT: Councillors S Akthar, P L E Bucknell, G J Bull, E R Butler, S Cawley, S Greenall, R Harrison, P G Mitchell, P D Reeve, T V Rogers and A H Williams.

APOLOGY: An Apology for absence from the meeting was submitted on behalf of Councillors M F Shellens.

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED

that Councillor T V Rogers be elected Chairman of the Panel for the ensuing Municipal Year.

Councillor T V Rogers in the Chair.

2. MEMBERS' INTERESTS

No declarations were received.

3. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED

that Councillor R Harrison be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Panel for the ensuing Municipal Year.

4. CORPORATE PLAN WORKING GROUP

RESOLVED

that Councillors T V Rogers and R Harrison be appointed to serve on the Corporate Plan Working Group for the ensuing Municipal Year.

Chairman

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS INCLUDING THOSE TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE

Prepared by Councillor J D Ablewhite Miss Effe Chrisostomou
Date of Publication: 24 May 2013
For Period: 3 June 2013 to 30 September 2013

Membership of the Cabinet is as follows:-

Councillor J D Ablewhite	- Executive Leader of the Council, with responsibility for Strategic and Delivery Partnerships	3 Pettis Road St. Ives Huntingdon PE27 6SR Tel: 01480 466941 E-mail: Jason.Ablewhite@huntingdonshire.gov.uk
Councillor N J Guyatt	- Deputy Executive Leader of the Council with responsibility for Strategic Planning and Housing	6 Church Lane Stibbington Cambs PE8 6LP Tel: 01780 782827 E-mail: Nick.Guyatt@huntingdonshire.gov.uk
Councillor B S Chapman	- Executive Councillor for Customer Services	6 Kipling Place St. Neots Huntingdon PE19 7RG Tel: 01480 212540 E-mail: Barry.Chapman@huntingdonshire.gov.uk
Councillor J A Gray	- Executive Councillor for Resources	Shufflewick Cottage Station Row Tilbrook PE28 OJY Tel: 01480 861941 E-mail: Jonathan.Gray@huntingdonshire.gov.uk
Councillor R Howe	- Executive Councillor for Healthy and Active Communities	The Old Barn High Street Upwood PE26 2QE Tel: 01487 814393 E-mail: Robin.Howe@huntingdonshire.gov.uk

Councillor T D Sanderson - Executive Councillor for Economic Development and Legal	29 Burmoor Close Stukeley Meadows Huntingdon PE29 6GE Tel: 01480 412135 E-mail: Tom. Sanderson@huntingdonshire.gov.uk
Councillor D M Tysoe - Executive Councillor for Environment	Grove Cottage Maltings Lane Ellington Huntingdon PE28 OAA Tel: 01480 388310 E-mail: Darren.Tysoe@huntingdonshire.gov.uk

Notice is hereby given of:

- Key decisions that will be taken by the Cabinet (or other decision maker)
- Confidential or exempt executive decisions that will be taken in a meeting from which the public will be excluded (for whole or part).

A notice/agenda together with reports and supporting documents for each meeting will be published at least five working days before the date of the meeting. In order to enquire about the availability of documents and subject to any restrictions on their disclosure, copies may be requested by contacting Mrs Helen Taylor, Senior Democratic Services Officer on 01480 388008 or E-mail Helen.Taylor@huntingdonshire.gov.uk.

Agendas may be accessed electronically at www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk.

1 Formal notice is hereby given under The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 that, where indicated part of the meetings listed in this notice will be held in private because the agenda and reports for the meeting will contain confidential or exempt information under Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 (as amended) and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it. See the relevant paragraphs below.

Any person who wishes to make representations to the decision maker about a decision which is to be made or wishes to object to an item being considered in private may do so by emailing Legal&DemServDemocratic@huntingdonshire.gov.uk or by writing to the Senior Democratic Services Officer. If representations are received at least eight working days before the date of the meeting, they will be published with the agenda together with a statement of the District Council's response. Any representations received after this time will be verbally reported and considered at the meeting.

Paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 (as amended) (Reason for the report to be considered in private)

1. Information relating to any individual
2. Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual
3. Information relating to the Financial and Business Affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information)
4. Information relating to any consultations or negotiations or contemplated consultations or negotiations in connection with any labour relations that are arising between the Authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of or office holders under the Authority
5. Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings
6. Information which reveals that the Authority proposes:-
 - (a) To give under any announcement a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or
 - (b) To make an Order or Direction under any enactment
7. Information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime.

Colin Meadowcroft
Head of Legal and Democratic Services

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

- Notes:- (i) Additions changes from the previous Forward Plan are annotated ***
(ii) Part II confidential items which will be considered in private are annotated ## and shown in italic.

Subject/Matter for Decision	Decision/ recommendation to be made by	Date decision to be taken	Documents Available	How relevant Officer can be contacted	Consultation	Relevant Executive Councillor	Relevant Overview & Scrutiny Panel
Reg 123/CIL Business Plan → →	Cabinet	20 Jun 2013	Reg 123 consultation responses/CIL Business Plan	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		N J Guyatt	Economic Well-Being
Home Improvement Agency, Shared Service - Annual Operating Review	Cabinet	20 Jun 2013	Minutes O & SP (Social Well-Being) 6/9/11 - http://applications.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/g13056/Printed%20minutes,%20Tuesday,%2006-Sep-2011%2019.00,%20Overview%20and%20Scrutiny%20Panel%20Social%20Well-Being	Trish Reed, Housing Strategy Manager Tel No. 01480 388203 or e-mail Trish.Reed@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		B S Chapman	Social Well-Being
Community Chest Allocation 2013/2014	Grants	27 Jun 2013		Dr S Lammin, Head of Environmental and Community Health Services Tel No. 01480 388280 or email Sue.Lammin@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		T D Sanderson	Social Well-Being

Subject/Matter for Decision	Decision/ recommendation to be made by	Date decision to be taken	Documents Available	How relevant Officer can be contacted	Consultation	Relevant Executive Councillor	Relevant Overview & Scrutiny Panel
Huntingdonshire Economic Growth Plan 2013 - 2023	Cabinet	18 Jul 2013		Sue Bedlow, Economic Development Manager Tel No. 01480 3887096 or email Sue.Bedlow@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		J D Ablewhite	Economic Well-Being
Loves Farm - Request for Supplementary Estimate	Cabinet	18 Jul 2013		Chris Allen, Project and Assets Manager Tel No. 01480 388380 or e-mail Chris.Allen@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		J A Gray	Economic Well-Being
Draft Revised Supplementary Planning Document - Land Sensitivity to Wind Turbine Development	Cabinet	18 Jul 2013	Draft revised SPD	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Consultation and Engagement Strategy***	Cabinet	19 Sep 2013		Louise Sboui, Senior Policy Officer Tel No. 01480 388032 or email Louise.Sboui@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		R Howe	Social Well-Being
Financial Strategy***	Cabinet	19 Sep 2013		Steve Couper, Assistant Director of Finance and Resources Tel No. 01480 388103 or email Steve.Couper@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		J A Gray	Economic Well-Being

Subject/Matter for Decision	Decision/ recommendation to be made by	Date decision to be taken	Documents Available	How relevant Officer can be contacted	Consultation	Relevant Executive Councillor	Relevant Overview & Scrutiny Panel
Town and Parish Council Charter	Cabinet	19 Sep 2013		Dan Smith, Community Health Manager Tel No. 01480 388377 or e-mail Dan.Smith@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		N J Guyatt	Social Well-Being
Customer Services Strategy	Cabinet	19 Sep 2013		Kathryn Sexton, Customer Services Manager Tel No. 01480 387040 or e-mail Kathryn.Sexton@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		B S Chapman	Economic Well-Being
Dairy Crest - Fenstanton: Planning and Urban Design Framework	Cabinet	19 Sep 2013		Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Affordable Housing Policy - Update	Cabinet	19 Sep 2013		Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Whole Waste System Approach***	Cabinet	17 Oct 2013		Eric Kendall, Head of Operations Tel No. 01480 388635 or email Eric.Kendall@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		D M Tysoe	Social Well-Being
A14	Cabinet	17 Oct 2013	Preferred option for consultation	Steve Ingram, Assistant Director, Environment, Growth and Planning 01480 388400 or email Steve.Ingram@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being

Subject/Matter for Decision	Decision/ recommendation to be made by	Date decision to be taken	Documents Available	How relevant Officer can be contacted	Consultation	Relevant Executive Councillor	Relevant Overview & Scrutiny Panel
Huntingdon West Masterplan	Cabinet	21 Nov 2013	Following consultation. Preferred option.	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Local Plan to 2036 - Proposed Submission***	Cabinet	12 Dec 2013		Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Draft Budget & MTP***	Cabinet	12 Dec 2013		Steve Couper, Assistant Director of Finance and Resources Tel No. 01480 388103 or email Steve.Couper@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		J A Gray	Economic Well-Being

COMT
OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY (ECONOMIC)
CABINET

20 MAY 2013
6 JUNE 2013
20 JUNE 2013

HUNTINGDONSHIRE REGULATION 123 AND INFRASTRUCTURE BUSINESS PLAN 2013/14 LIST

(Report by Assistant Director Environment, Growth & Planning)

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to recommend that the Cabinet approves the Huntingdonshire Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulation 123 List.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The CIL is a mechanism, introduced by Government in 2010, to allow local planning authorities to raise funds from development to pay for the infrastructure that is, or will be, needed as a result of new development. Cabinet has been kept informed of the development of the CIL Charging Schedule and its adoption by HDC Council in April 2012 with an implementation date of 1st May 2012.
- 2.2 The CIL Regulation 123 list restricts the use of planning obligations for infrastructure that will be funded in whole or in part by the CIL, to ensure no duplication between the two types of developer contributions (CIL and S106 agreements).
- 2.3 At its meeting on 21 March 2013, Cabinet approved a revised Draft Huntingdonshire CIL Regulation 123 List for public consultation.
- 2.4 The Government published a new Community Infrastructure Levy Guidance document in December 2012 which included changes to previous practice and stated that state that when charging authorities wish to revise their regulation 123 list in this way, they should ensure that these changes are clearly explained and subject to appropriate local consultation. The Draft Huntingdonshire CIL Regulation 123 list incorporating the IBP 2013/14 was consulted on for a period of 8 weeks from 2 April to 24 May 2013 inclusive.
- 2.5 The local consultation was publicised widely through a number of means, including:
- Email notification to all local planning authorities adjoining the district, the county council, parish/town councils, partner consultees, infrastructure providers and other organisations and individuals subscribed to the Limehouse consultation system
 - Email notification to partners through the Local Strategic Partnership
 - Letters to all Town and Parish Councils
 - Email notification to business networks
 - Notification to voluntary / community networks
 - Notification at the Neighbourhood Forum meetings
- 2.5 The document will also be available for anyone to access at:

- public libraries across the district
- Customer Service Centres across the district

2.6 Details regarding the consultation were also available on the Council website.

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

3.1 Representations from 12 respondents were received within the consultation time. One response was received out of time. The key themes raised within the representations were regarding further projects for consideration and the impact speculative development could have on an area. Only 2 respondents stated that they did not support the approach taken in this work. The Council believes that it has adopted an appropriate approach and is in line with the regulatory requirements.

3.2 The detailed representations and related officer comments are shown at Appendix A.

3.3 Having considered the representations made, it is not considered that any changes or modifications to the document consulted on are required.

4. REGULATION 123 LIST

4.1 A CIL charging authority is expected to publish on its website its approved Regulation 123 list of infrastructure that could be funded by CIL. Huntingdonshire District Council (as CIL Charging Authority) had its current Regulation 123 list published for 1st May 2012 implementation date and agreed this could be reviewed annually where necessary as part of its CIL governance process.

4.2 It is not considered that the revised Regulation 123 list that has been consulted on would have a significant impact on the viability evidence that supported examination of the charging schedule.

5. RECOMMENDATION(S)

5.1 It is recommended that Cabinet:

- a) Approve the revised Regulation 123 List incorporating the Huntingdonshire Infrastructure Business Plan 2013/14.

Background Papers:

- Core Strategy 2009
- CIL Examination documents, which can be found on the HDC website at <http://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/Planning/Community%20Infrastructure%20Levy/Pages/CommunityInfrastructureLevyExamination.aspx>
- Huntingdonshire Infrastructure Business Plan 2013/14
- Draft Regulation 123 List

Contact Officer: Steve Ingram,
Assistant Director Environment, Growth & Planning
☎ 01480 388400

Representations on the Draft Huntingdonshire CIL Regulation 123 List

Name, Company/ Organisation	Comment	Officer View
Mr John Atkinson	Agreed the Council has adopted the right approach in developing the Draft Regulation 123 List as required by the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).	Support noted.
Roy Reeves Warboys Parish Council	I noticed that there was nothing included for Warboys. Is that because there is little development scheduled for Warboys in the new Local Plan? However with the expected free for all with effect from yesterday with the NPPF changes, where does that place Warboys if we get some large speculative proposals for development?	The infrastructure detailed in the Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) is based on infrastructure requirements supplied by infrastructure partners based on growth in the Core Strategy to 2026. It has not taken into account potential 'in fill' development nor can it foresee future speculative development. If a large scale speculative development came forward for Warboys then the needs for that development would be considered as usual in line with policy requirements.
Angela Atkinson Marine Management Organisation	Thank you for inviting the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) to comment on the above consultation. As this does not have consequences for the work of the MMO we have no comments to submit in relation to these consultations.	Noted.
Rick Carroll Head teacher at Longsands Academy.	I have spent time looking at all documentation and raise concern that with reference to Secondary Schools in St Neots it is recorded as no Project Detail. I worked with fellow Head teachers of the Secondary provision in St Neots to produce a detailed business plan for the necessary expansion at both Longsands and Ernulf. Please can you explain why this has not been acknowledged? I wish to support the use of CIL monies as much as possible to ensure the best possible educational facilities for out young people.	The Infrastructure Business Plan does not record the secondary schools expansion project in St Neots as "No project detail" but records it as a "Project". Respondent has been contacted to discuss and has stated that following the reassurance that the Secondary requirements for education are incorporated in the business plan, he is "happy with draft documentation."
Ann Enticknap St Ives Town Council	Members considered that clarification should be sought on where the St Ives West money would be allocated to as although the development was in Houghton Parish, it was considered part of the St Ives Planning Area. No specific schemes had been identified for Houghton The HDC Business Plan which included CIL schemes do not include improved access to the town from the Marsh Harrier and adjacent area and no improvements were planned on either the A1123 or A1096 which, it was considered, ought to be included. Mention was made of a Library on Cromwell Road. As this road did not exist comment should	Unlike Section 106 developer obligations, CIL receipts are not tied to the development area to which they relate. The Infrastructure Business Plan 2013/14 has recommended CIL project spend for the current financial year and this has been approved by Cabinet. CIL funding is limited and prioritisation will need to

Name, Company/ Organisation	Comment	Officer View
	<p>be made. It was noted that the existence of a Neighbourhood Plan would enable 25% of CIL money to go to the Town Council, but not having one would lead to a cap of £100 per property in the Town.</p>	<p>be agreed of the projects that can be funded. Other complementary funding sources will be required to deliver many elements of infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council has recently started work to develop the 2014/15 Infrastructure Business Plan. Town and Parish Councils have already been written to on this and asked to submit their top infrastructure priorities. The Town Council are asked to ensure the projects highlighted in their response are noted within their reply to that letter to feed into the next stage of the IBP process.</p>
Chris Swain Environment Agency	<p>The Environment Agency welcomes the opportunity to feed into the proposed Regulation 123 List amendment.</p> <p>We support the CIL charging schedule, and the recognition in the associated Infrastructure Business Plan that waste water treatment and water supply are critical elements of infrastructure for sustainable growth. We also support the use of prioritisation categories (on page 4) so that all involved can be clear about priorities over time. We recognise that whilst CIL receipts are lower than expected, that there is value in building up a substantive pot to achieve meaningful outcomes later on.</p> <p>The viability assessment work will need to factor in the costs of infrastructure funded by other means, such as waste water, as this has the potential to have a significant impact on the availability of funding for less critical infrastructure. Water companies are continuing to plan infrastructure as part of their business planning round for 2014 and we advise keeping track of this for areas such as Alconbury where options with significant cost elements are still being appraised.</p> <p>As surface water management planning develops around the county, we advise staying abreast of projects where CIL might unlock further flood defence or Water Framework Directive grant in aid funding. These may have the potential to provide significant benefit relative to the contribution.</p> <p>We look forward to continuing our joint working around the District and updating one another on opportunities and risks for delivering sustainable growth and infrastructure as the context evolves.</p>	<p>Support noted of document and prioritisation process.</p> <p>The Council fully supports the recognition of the importance of other funding streams, such as the utility company asset management plans. Work has recently started on the 2014/15 Infrastructure Business Plan, which will include sites from the Local Plan Stage 3 consultation that are not part of the existing Core Strategy, such as Alconbury.</p> <p>The involvement of the Environment Agency in the Huntingdonshire Strategic Partnership Growth & Infrastructure Group is welcomed and will ensure that all water matters are fully considered in the IBP preparation.</p>
Paul Ryan The Stukeleys Parish Council	<p>Huntingdonshire is expected to have a lot of development over coming years so it is important that sufficient funding is available to implement necessary public works across the district to maintain quality of life. If sufficient new funding, for example from developers, is not provided</p>	<p>Support of developer contributions noted. The contributions from CIL and S106 are linked to a number of factors including development mitigation, viability and the need for sustainable growth.</p>

Name, Company/ Organisation	Comment	Officer View																																											
	<p>then the shortfall would have to be made up from local taxation which penalises the population and is a drag on the economy. We support the principle that major developments should directly pay for necessary public works (for example by S106) closely associated with the development and, via CIL, for development and investment requirements more widely. We believe that development payments by S106 and via their CIL contribution should be sufficient to pay for all necessary development throughout the district. The forecast shortfall of CIL indicates this is not the case and is a major concern.</p> <p>There remains the risk of reduced developer contributions (via CIL or S106) as a result of “affordability” analysis; this should be resisted. If a development cannot afford to fund necessary public works then it shouldn’t go ahead.</p> <p>The consultation refers directly to: “Draft Huntingdonshire Community Infrastructure Levy: Regulation 123 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) List”</p> <p>We generally support the principles in this. However it makes reference to the “Infrastructure business plan” and we have a number of comments on this document, listed below. It is a classic example of the “Devil is in the Details”.</p> <p>1 Utilities</p> <p>We note that utility development costs are included in the lists with a note showing “CIL” as a potential contribution e.g. P77:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="421 1114 1234 1315"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Project Type Summary</th> <th rowspan="2">Locality</th> <th rowspan="2">Project Type Detail</th> <th rowspan="2">Project Name</th> <th rowspan="2">Project Status</th> <th colspan="3">Potential Contributions</th> </tr> <tr> <th>CIL</th> <th>S106</th> <th>Other</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Utilities</td> <td>Huntingdon</td> <td>Water & Sewage</td> <td>New Strategic Sewer</td> <td>Project No Detail</td> <td>CIL</td> <td></td> <td>AMP</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Huntingdon</td> <td>Water and Sewerage</td> <td>Improvements required at Brampton WWTW</td> <td>Project No Detail</td> <td>CIL</td> <td></td> <td>AMP</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Huntingdon</td> <td>Electricity</td> <td>Godmanchester general works</td> <td>Project No Detail</td> <td>CIL</td> <td></td> <td>AMP</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Huntingdon</td> <td>Gas</td> <td>Mains Reinforcement</td> <td>Project No Detail</td> <td>CIL</td> <td></td> <td>AMP</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The discussion on P111 says “The funding for utilities at a strategic level is usually paid for by the respective utilities company through their asset management plans”.</p> <p>We ask that it is made clear that ALL investment required for utilities infrastructure development is paid for by the (for-profit) utilities companies and none is taken from CIL or (for works not closely associated with new land developments) from other developer contributions. The latter consideration is relevant because demands on develop S106 contributions for utilities (which</p>	Project Type Summary	Locality	Project Type Detail	Project Name	Project Status	Potential Contributions			CIL	S106	Other	Utilities	Huntingdon	Water & Sewage	New Strategic Sewer	Project No Detail	CIL		AMP		Huntingdon	Water and Sewerage	Improvements required at Brampton WWTW	Project No Detail	CIL		AMP		Huntingdon	Electricity	Godmanchester general works	Project No Detail	CIL		AMP		Huntingdon	Gas	Mains Reinforcement	Project No Detail	CIL		AMP	<p>Whilst there is a shortfall in CIL receipts to meet infrastructure delivery, this is not new and has always been the case. Other funding mechanisms must also be considered.</p> <p>CIL rates have been set through a formal process and are mandatory. S106 has always been through a negotiation process. If viability is raised this is considered as set out within the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>Support of the principles within the Regulation 123 list is welcomed.</p> <p>The funding for utilities is noted as ones that could <u>potentially</u> receive CIL funding. All infrastructure items have clearly been identified if they could legally receive CIL funding. It is not to state that the item would receive. The Council recognises the government funding process already in place for utility companies and one of the objectives of the IBP is to prioritise projects that would receive money. This financial year that has only been agreed for the Huntingdon West Link Road.</p> <p>The IBP 13/14 has not stated many items for the smaller settlements as there is likely to only be infill growth in those areas. No reference is specifically given to requirements due to the growth from the Alconbury Weald proposal as this is not development within the approved Core Strategy. However, the Council has recently started work to develop the 2014/15 Infrastructure Business Plan, which will include sites from the Local Plan Stage 3 consultation including those that are not part of the existing Core Strategy, such as Alconbury Weald. Town and Parish Councils have already been written to on this and asked to submit their top infrastructure priorities.</p> <p>It will be for each Town and Parish Council to determine locally their priorities for spending any ‘meaningful proportion’ that they receive,</p>
Project Type Summary	Locality						Project Type Detail	Project Name	Project Status	Potential Contributions																																			
		CIL	S106	Other																																									
Utilities	Huntingdon	Water & Sewage	New Strategic Sewer	Project No Detail	CIL		AMP																																						
	Huntingdon	Water and Sewerage	Improvements required at Brampton WWTW	Project No Detail	CIL		AMP																																						
	Huntingdon	Electricity	Godmanchester general works	Project No Detail	CIL		AMP																																						
	Huntingdon	Gas	Mains Reinforcement	Project No Detail	CIL		AMP																																						

Name, Company/ Organisation	Comment	Officer View
	<p>are likely to be “critical”) would tend reduce their CIL contribution via the “affordability” consideration.</p> <p>2 Smaller settlements</p> <p>We see in Appendix A many projects for the SPAs and KSCs and very few for smaller settlements. Obviously, larger projects may be better sited within the larger settlements but this should not be to the exclusion of improvements to smaller ones. As an example, we see CIL funding scheduled for community buildings and play space in the SPAs. Here, in The Stukeleys, we have had to rely on grant funding and local taxation to pay for improvements to our (GS) village hall and play spaces. In the discussion below we outline specific local projects we would like to see implemented. In consideration of projects listed for the SPAs and KSCs, our local projects should not be funded from the 15% “meaningful proportion” that may come to SPC from Alconbury Weald (noting, of course, that “Northbridge” was removed from our Parish, so HTC will benefit from that development’s 15%).</p> <p>3 Transport</p> <p>This is the main concern of the population in regard to new developments, in particular roads congestion. The degree of development forecast for the District, and Huntingdon area in particular, will have a major impact. Obviously the “A14” issue causes uncertainty, but it is very likely that parts of the local road network will suffer congestion whatever happens to the A14.</p> <p>We have commented previously on transport assessments offered by major developers, saying that the are often optimistic about congestion and do not properly address the effects of combinations of development. A significant deficiency of recent transport assessments of major projects has been that junctions have been modelled in isolation rather than in combination. Hence “backing up” from one junction to a previous has not been included. In particular we are very concerned about the Huntingdon northern bypass (A141) and the “iron bridge” junction (Stukeleys Road & St. Peters Road) in relation to forecast developments of “Northbridge”, Alconbury Weald and Wyton Airfield. Congestion at this junction will be made worse by additional traffic flow attracted by the new Huntingdon West bypass route. It appears to us that the roads works proposed by developers are insufficient to deal with traffic impact more widely in the District. If this turns out to be the case then there will be a call on local authority funds to address the consequences. Whole-district modelling should be undertaken, trying whatever solutions can be conceived. Costs of these solutions should be apportioned to new developments.</p> <p>However, we do not support general development of the roads network simply to allow for increase in one-person-per-car travel because this would significantly degrade amenity and the environment. It is disappointing that the priorities assigned to transport projects listed in Appendix A suggests emphasis on car travel rather than more sustainable modes. This is, of course, contrary to the agreed Cambridgeshire transport objectives. To maintain (and hopefully improve) quality of life in the District, we need to achieve modal shift away from private car</p>	<p>recognising that this is not new money but part of the available funding to meet infrastructure needs. The Council wishes to work with local communities on this matter.</p> <p>Transport is a key infrastructure consideration. Details for individual sites are approved in partnership with Cambridgeshire County Council and the Highways Agency, utilising agreed transport assessments and traffic modelling. This is part of the development management process and undertaken in line with appropriate legislative requirements.</p> <p>The Council supports alternative modes of transport but it cannot ignore that Huntingdonshire is a rural area with particular reliance on car travel to achieve economic growth. The Council continues to work with CCC on its transport agenda that looks to achieve modal shift where appropriate and work is now commencing on the development of a Cambridgeshire Long Term Transport Strategy (to 2050) and it is expected that this will consider many of your issues raised. This Council is clear that it wishes this work to provide a much clearer plan of what Huntingdonshire will look like in transport terms through to 2050.</p> <p>The reference to additional transport projects is noted. The Parish Council is asked to ensure the projects highlighted in their response are noted within their reply to that letter referred to earlier in order to feed into the next stage of the IBP 14/15 process.</p> <p>The school education projects within the IBP 13/14 have been submitted by the LEA, with its partners, and have been determined from the growth trajectory.</p>

Name, Company/ Organisation	Comment	Officer View
	<p>travel. In particular we ask for much more significant support for bus priority, walking and cycling. In the projects list it appears the last two are regarded as leisure pursuits rather than realistic and attractive daily travel options. It should not be so.</p> <p>Around our Parish, particular projects we ask for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic calming on Ermine St. • Creation of strategic green space around Grange Farm, and its protection from development in perpetuity. • Hard-surface off-road cyclepath connecting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stukeley Meadows, “Northbridge”, Gt. and Lt. Stukeley to Alconbury village and further North. E.g. as Sustran’s proposed re-routing of national cycle route 12 ○ St. Peters Hill, Great Stukeley, Alconbury Weald, Abbots Ripton and further North towards the Great Fen project <p>Around Huntingdon town, priority projects should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A141 Northern bypass. Though “more roads” should not be the preferred solution to increase transport demand, it is clear that this route will need modification. • “Iron Bridge” junction. It is constrained by the railway/bridge and existing buildings so there are few opportunities to improve flow and increase capacity. However, doing nothing will not be acceptable since it will be the main access to the town from the NW, including the new developments of Northbridge and Alconbury Weald. • River crossing. We should expect large changes in traffic flows as a result of whatever changes are made to the A14. However, we should not simply expect big reductions. Modelling will be needed to inform us of possible consequences. Whatever is the outcome, river crossing will be critical and the old town bridge could suffer in fabric, amenity and congestion. These must be avoided. • Town centre cyclepaths. To encourage modal shift for daily travel, we need to improve cycle connectivity around and through the town centre. It is unacceptable that there is no N-S or E-W routes through the centre. Likewise, connections to immediate residential areas need to be good and this is not the case from the large area NE of the centre; Though there is a cyclist route through the area, it stops before the ring road leaving users with a daunting barrier and expected to travel around the ring road to continue their journey. • Hinchingsbrooke park connections. Presently, both the residential and (separated) employment area are isolated from the town centre and from NW Huntingdon. Most residents/employees see the only option to be private car, hence the congestion at the junction to Brampton Road. Alternative sustainable and attractive modes of transport need to be provided. <p>4 Education</p> <p>It is correct to fund Education infrastructure via S106 and CIL contributions. However, the</p>	

Name, Company/ Organisation	Comment	Officer View
	<p>details need careful attention, particularly in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location, convenience and sustainable travel • Value for money <p>We note from recent discussions in connection with Alconbury Weald that strategy for provision of College education around the north of the District is unresolved, but there are likely to be implications for Huntingdon Regional College and Sawtry College. This needs to be resolved; development of Alconbury Weald will rightly have a significant impact on provision and appropriate location. Large investments are involved and it is critically important to ensure these are wisely made. In particular, the listed projects for HRC California Road should only be made if there is a commitment that the site will remain the main location of the College and it will not move or split to other sites such as Hinchingsbrooke or Alconbury Weald. Relevant timescales for restrictions should reflect the scale of investment. For investments of the scale indicated in the projects list we would expect the commitment to extend over, say, 20 years. Considering the uncertainty over college provision in the area, it would be wise to resolve the strategy before spending the money.</p> <p>Local to The Stukeleys we have the issue of primary school provision for children in our Parish. At present our children are not allocated to the nearest primary school at Stukeley Meadows with the consequence of less sustainable and convenient travel into Huntingdon town. It appears there is a risk that this will be repeated in connection with "Northbridge" where the primary school (planned as 1.5 FE) so our children will end up being bussed past two schools. Much better would be to make the small additional provision at Northbridge so that many of our children could walk or cycle to school.</p>	
<p>Dan Clarke Capital and Funding Manager Cambridgeshire County Council</p>	<p>Thank you for inviting comments on your Draft Regulation 123 List. We have previously worked with Huntingdonshire officers inputting into the business plan infrastructure requirements needed to support development within Huntingdonshire.</p> <p>We do however have concerns over the significant funding shortfalls for infrastructure, and as such it will be important that the most critical and essential infrastructure receives funding to support sustainable growth in a timely manner. In this regard we want to work with Huntingdonshire on prioritisation of infrastructure and agreement on what will be funded and when.</p> <p>We recommend the development of a protocol to provide greater clarity on priorities and how funding will be shared and allocated to delivery bodies such as ourselves towards priority infrastructure. There is a real risk that without this certainty that essential infrastructure could be delayed unless CIL funding is made available for infrastructure projects in a timely manner.</p> <p>Given the significant funding gap, it will be important that we work in partnership to ensure as far as possible that future CIL related neighbourhood funding should be directed towards</p>	<p>The Council has and continues to welcome the County Councils (CCC) input into the infrastructure planning process.</p> <p>The infrastructure funding shortfall has been acknowledge and recognised from all past infrastructure planning and CIL nor S106 should never be seen as the only funders of infrastructure. The Council welcomes CCC membership of the Local Strategic Partnership Growth & Infrastructure Group which leads on the development of the business plan in partnership.</p> <p>The IBP is the process through which agreement is reached, with Cabinet approval, of the priorities for funding from CIL. The IBP also provides a mechanism for considering all other potential funding opportunities to maximise infrastructure delivery.</p>

Name, Company/ Organisation	Comment	Officer View
	<p>essential infrastructure requirements in the first instance before being considered towards additional aspirational requirements.</p> <p>Other matters raised by officers include the need for the Business Plan to properly prioritise infrastructure such as the Secondary School expansions at Ernulf Academy and Longsands Academy at a potential cost of £17m. These two schools will accommodate pupils from the Wintringham park development and are critical to the deliver of the development. There is a similar issue in St Ives where additional primary school places equivalent to 1FE (30 places) at Eastfields/Westfields/Wheatfields. are required to support development. Clarity is sought as to how these will be funded.</p> <p>Pressure on CIL contributions will be particularly acute within Huntingdonshire in the immediate and medium term. This is given the scale of infrastructure requirements, plus commitments to repaying loans for West of Town Centre Link Rd from CIL. It is currently anticipated that approx £5.4m is required. This is anticipated to leave less than £1.4m towards essential infrastructure to 2016 when the cost of this alone has been estimated to be £37.87m. Further prioritisation is needed to ensure there is real clarity early over what CIL funding will be available over the next 3 years to help deliver critical and essential infrastructure.</p> <p>In answer to the consultation question;</p> <p>'Do you consider the Council has adopted the right approach in developing the Draft Regulation 123 List as required by the CIL Regulations 2010 as amended?'</p> <p>We consider the approach being taken by Huntingdonshire to be appropriate as long as the business plan is reviewed on an iterative basis, ensuring that it accurately reflects the infrastructure needed to allow development.</p>	<p>The 'meaningful proportion' allocated to Town and Parish Councils from CIL receipts can be spent on the priorities determined by the local community. The Council, with its partners, will work with the Town and Parish Councils to support them in this process to consider their local needs in full. It is not the purpose of the IBP to provide the answers and funding for all infrastructure delivery. The Council and all its partners need to consider all funding options, as has already been highlighted, the CIL contribution will only be able to support the minority, not the majority, of infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>The CIL contribution levels and timeframe for the Huntingdon West Link Road have yet to be agreed. The Council and CCC are already working with partners to develop the IBP 2014/15 to consider further prioritisation. Support of the approach being taken is welcomed. It has already been agreed with partners that the IBP will be reviewed annually, as necessary.</p>
Simon Sutton	<p>Does not consider the Council has adopted the right approach in developing the Draft Regulation 123 List as required by the CIL Regulations 2010 as amended.</p> <p>The planning outlines for the Sawtry section of this "Draft" have only just come to light for the residents of Sawtry. The whole thing seems to have been worked out behind the backs of residents and parish councilors alike. I am confused at the wording used, "consultation" ..? At what point have we been consulted over these potential planning applications?</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council believes that it has adopted an appropriate approach and is in line with the regulatory requirements. All Parish Councils have been kept informed of work on the community infrastructure levy and associated infrastructure planning. The document is regarding strategic planning requirements. Planning applications are consulted on individually.</p>
Mrs Sarah Wilson Godmanchester	<p>Does not consider the Council has adopted the right approach in developing the Draft Regulation 123 List as required by the CIL Regulations 2010 as amended. Godmanchester TC consider this consultation document to be incomprehensible and not fit for</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council believes that it has adopted an appropriate approach and is in line with the regulatory requirements.</p>

Name, Company/ Organisation	Comment	Officer View
Town Council	<p>purpose. It is impossible for us to comment fully and effectively, following your guidelines, without seeking legal, technical and financial advice.</p> <p>Godmanchester TC continue to have a fundamental objection to any large scale development in Godmanchester.</p> <p>We note Executive summary 1.1 and implementation and Monitoring 7.2 which state "... living document and will be consistently reviewed in order to respond to emerging proposals.....does not represent an exhaustive list expected to be refined.. or amended. This indicates to us this document is very fluid and is allowing HDC to regularly change its mind, and also that this consultation is part of a tick box exercise. We are consulting on shifting sand. It is interesting HDC holds this document as fluid, when other planning documents like the adopted local plan are considered sacrosanct. We expect certainty about the process going forward including clear timetable and process for future consultation</p> <p>We note the discussion about Alconbury Weald Enterprise zone is not formally included within this document except as a discussion item, as Alconbury Weald is not in current local plan, or Core Strategy. This development is huge, 5000 houses, representing a proposal that will nearly double housing units to be built in Huntingdonshire if everything proceeds. It would have been helpful if HDC produced figures with and without Alconbury Weald.</p> <p>HDC has previously pledged £8M towards the funding of the upgrading of the A14. Within this CIL document £1.98M is pledged. Where is the extra £6M to come from?</p> <p>The following comments relate to Huntingdon SPA specific sites, Bearscroft Area, which is highly relevant to Godmanchester TC. This site does not yet have planning permission, and any comments we make here should not prejudice due planning process. As stated before, Godmanchester TC continue to have a fundamental objection to this development.</p> <p>Cash flow and spending plan 6.6 . We note the emphasis on providing the enabling infrastructure to the sites within Huntingdon SPA speedily to secure these future CIL receipts. We trust the planning application for Bearscroft is considered on its own merits, not on its ability to bring in future CIL.</p> <p>Appendix A . infrastructure project list. Huntingdon SPA specific site Bearscroft farm.</p> <p>We are surprised to see a list of projects to potentially be funded by s106. We assume these are general lists subject to amendment at a later stage. It is impossible to know what has been included or excluded, and we request further information about what is provided under each of the headings. The list of planning obligations proposed by GMC TC is still under discussion, so the list in appendix A is incomplete.</p> <p>We are highly surprised to see costing for the above projects to the exact pound. For example - Children and young people's play space- £457,589. Please can tell us how these precise figures were arrived at?</p> <p>Appendix C- project categorisation Huntingdon SPA Bearscroft</p> <p>We are disappointed and object to the prioritisation categories allocated to the projects at Bearscroft. If this development proceeds it represents a huge 25% increase in the population of GMC. All the given categories, allotments, play space, community, recreation and primary education, are considered essential to reduce potential detrimental effect on the current population of GMC, and to provide a sustainable environment for current and future residents.</p>	<p>It is acknowledge that the document is a complex one. The chapters have been written to provide information as clearly as is possible and the appendices provide the detailed breakdown of infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>The Regulation 123 and associated IBP 13/14 is not part of the planning suite of documents and does not provide any policy for what development will or will not happen. It needs to be seen as a 'living' document as new sites come forward or delivery timescales change that would impact on infrastructure delivery. That is not to change whether it could or could not be funded via CIL, the purpose of the Regulation 123 list.</p> <p>It would not have been appropriate to include full details on Alconbury Weald at this stage. The IBP 14/15 will include this site.</p> <p>The A14 is highlighted in its original plan. A revised scheme has yet to be formally agreed. The £1.98 billion was the HA estimated cost of the scheme. The £8 million you refer to is with regards the on-going development work for the revised scheme.</p> <p>As noted above, the Regulation 123 and associated IBP 13/14 is not part of the planning suite of documents and does not provide any policy for consideration in the assessment of planning applications.</p> <p>The details shown from S106 projects listing for strategic sites is to identify infrastructure items that will fall within the S106 requirements, and so cannot be funded by CIL. The document states that it aims to reflect the latest understanding of requirements and must not be taken to represent an exhaustive list of requirements through to 2026.</p> <p>The projects and costs are indicative in many cases. Where more precise figures are shown, these are calculated using the policy and calculations within the Developer Contributions SPD. However, they are also noted as "need project". Once firmer detail is known the cost would be updated accordingly in the next review. It is fully recognised that infrastructure items are</p>

Name, Company/ Organisation	Comment	Officer View
		important to communities. Given the limited funding, prioritisation is the only option. The criteria used is explained in table 4.1 and highlights the difference between those that are critical to enabling development and mitigating impact arising from the development and those that are important to deliver good place making principles, but would be appropriate to deliver at a later date.
Ramune Mimiene, Assistant Clerk Brampton Parish Council	<p>Outlined below Brampton Parish Council's interpretation, and a few observations, on the Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) 2013-14 – Consultation Draft.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process logic outlined well, with separate Sections reflecting different elements of the analysis. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 2 – full review of policy content. ○ Section 3 – List of currently identified projects. ○ Section 4 – Prioritization process for infrastructure. ○ Section 5 – Outcomes of initial prioritization undertaken as part of this IBP. ○ Section 6 – Cashflow modeling required for CIL, S106 or other means. • One of the early recommendations in the report is that funding for the Huntingdon West Link road, identified as a Critical Short Term project, be approved forthwith to allow pre-conditions project work to proceed. • The IBP seeks to foster shared ambitions between delivery partners and ensure that development in Huntingdonshire is supported by required infrastructure. • It will be updated annually and be continually revised to keep pace with delivery requirements across the district. • CIL provides developers with certainty over costs applicable to development; as well as planning authorities with the flexibility to direct funds to infrastructure as appropriate. • It is intended to simplify the process of developer contributions, by providing the infrastructure to support the development of an area, rather than having to make individual planning applications in that area (the purpose of S106 agreements). • An important distinction (at para 2.21) is that neighbourhoods which accept development through a Neighbourhood Plan will get 25% from CIL; whereas those without such a plan will be restricted to 15%. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The definition of 'local' needs definition. ○ Councils therefore need to work with the HDC and the Local Strategic Partnership (which is??) for planning to take place in partnership – <i>a bit of a non sequiter!</i> • The Huntingdonshire Core Strategy already sets out the strategic spatial planning framework out to 2026. • At para 2.27 there is CIL rate per square metre by building class. • Section 3, Table 3.1 lists the multi-area projects necessary to deliver the core strategy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Split between education; green corridors; major green sites; bus; and roads. ○ Under Roads is listed the West Link Road; A141/Sawtry Way junction improvement; A14 	<p>Support of process logic welcomed. It is noted that the definition of local will vary. In terms of the 'meaningful proportion', local communities are defined as Town and Parish Councils.</p> <p>The infrastructure types notes in the IBP are, as stated in response, comprehensive. No further sub-headings were submitted. However, the Council has recently started work to develop the 2014/15 Infrastructure Business Plan, which will include sites from the Local Plan Stage 3 consultation including those that are not part of the existing Core Strategy, such as Alconbury Weald. Town and Parish Councils have already been written to on this and asked to submit their top infrastructure priorities.</p> <p>Affordable housing is as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The HDC CIL Instalment Policy has been approved and is now in place. The policy supports scheme viability and does not alter the end level of receipts that will be received.</p>

Name, Company/ Organisation	Comment	Officer View
	<p>Ellington to Milton; and A1 Buckden roundabout improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial Planning Area Projects are covered at para 3.10; and under the Huntingdon SPA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ RAF Brampton is listed for approx 49ha of land for mixed use development to include approx 400 homes, 3.2ha of employment land, 300m2 of retail floor space and community facilities. ○ Although not mentioned specifically in the Core Strategy, Alconbury Weald's designation as an Enterprise Zone in 2011 means it has implications for future planning considerations. It will be included in the emerging Local Plan to 2036. • Table 3.2 identifies the Huntingdon SPA projects necessary to deliver the Core Strategy; and identifies where the funding line will fall, ie CIL, S106 or other. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Projects are listed under Allotments, Play Space, Cemetery, Community, Police, Library, Leisure and Recreation, Education, Healthcare, Major Green Sites, Bus, Road, Walking and Cycling, Water and Sewage, Electricity, Gas, and Econ & Regeneration. ○ So fairly comprehensive..... but are there further additions we need to make under each of these sub-headings? • The CIL Infrastructure Prioritization – at <u>Section 4</u> – makes the point that a target of at least 14,000 homes need to be built from 2001 to 2026 to achieve the Core Strategy. So detailed development trajectories are required and need to be continuously reviewed, as changes and agreements occur. • Fig 4.1 provides a conceptual line diagram of the Project Interdependencies necessary from 2012 onwards. • CIL Implementation covers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Short Term Projects – one year period – 2013/14 ○ Medium Term Projects - two year period – 2014/15 & 2015/16 ○ Long Term Projects - remaining period – 2016-2026 • <u>Section 5</u>, Table 5.1 covers these project periods against time-line and Table 5.2 covers Huntingdon SPA in particular; with projects listed as above. • <u>Section 6</u> outlines the Cash Flow and Spending Plan. The estimated CIL receipt income is based on the following assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A revised Dec 12 housing trajectory is to be used as the planning baseline. ○ An average unit size of 82sqm is to be applied. ○ An affordable housing rate of 40% is applied to all developments – but what is the definition of affordable? ○ Calculations are based on a CIL rate of £85 per sqm ○ HDC CIL payment installment policy allows payments to be spread over more than one year on large developments – an adverse affect for receipts from RAF Brampton site? • Analysis suggests that across the district some £33m could be collected 2012 to 2026. • However during the short and medium term only £1.6m and £6.3m could be collected. • Other funding options are described at paras 6.7 to 6.9; with the implication that shortfalls will exist. • Indeed a funding gap does exist and is outlined at 6.13 onwards: it is substantial. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As 6.14 makes clear the long term imbalance/shortfall of some £1.6billion can be reduced to 	

Name, Company/ Organisation	Comment	Officer View
	<p>£100m by the removal of three large scale transport projects (A14 Ellington to Milton; and A1 Buckden roundabout improvement ;and the A428 Caxton Common to A1) – if they are then funded by the Highways Agency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outside projects prioritized as critical, short term essential and policy high priority are recorded in the two largest SPA – Huntigdon and St Neots. ○ Importantly, the report acknowledges that these two areas are also the two greatest contributors to the CIL pot; so this interdependency must be taken into account when prioritizing the spending of CIL income. <p>Note: I have made no attempt here to go into the specific line entries of costs vs individual projects – an assumption is made that these are accurately derived.</p> <p>Appendix A lists the Full Infrastructure Project list, and whether each project has a funding contribution; and whether it has started or is complete; is to start by a date; and what the completion target date is.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Huntingdon SPA S106 projects are separately listed, as are other SPAs. <p>Appendix B shows the CIL Applicable Housing Trajectory; which indicates in the first table that some 7025 new units will have been completed by 2025/26 across the district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specifically within the Huntingdon SPA the total is 2579: with 200 at Huntingdon West; 400 at RAF Brampton; 750 at Bearscroft Farm; and 190 at other sites. • The 400 units on the RAF Brampton site will accumulate at 80 units per year between 2015 and 2020. <p>Appendix C provides a Project Categorization in an overall sense, but there is no attempt made here to categorize them across the district in a priority order: as this will be entirely dependent on the individual SPA CIL and S106 et al allocations and their own preferences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not an easy process to see a way ahead on currently. <p>Appendix D is a Funding Source Review – and outlines the areas of involvement by the 3 main organizations with access to funding, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HDC, • CCC, and • the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership (The LEP); <p>with explanations provided as the role and authorities vested in these organizations. Sources of funding are identified and do make for quite interesting reading; indeed the various tolling options for the A14 are covered but with no decision as to the level of toll or the collection process.</p>	
Tom Gilbert- Wooldridge English Heritage	<p>Thank you for the email dated 2 April consulting English Heritage on the above list. We do not wish to make specific comments, but would like to offer the following general observations:</p> <p>English Heritage recognises the importance of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as a source of funding to deliver the infrastructure required to underpin the sustainable development within Huntingdonshire. English Heritage advises that CIL charging authorities identify the ways</p>	<p>Note no specific comments to make.</p> <p>The Council supports the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. The observations stated are noted.</p>

Name, Company/ Organisation	Comment	Officer View
	<p>in which CIL, planning obligations and other funding streams can be used to implement the strategy and policies within the Local Plan aimed at achieving the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting, in accordance with paragraphs 6, 126 and 157 of the NPPF.</p> <p>In terms of using the CIL to fund infrastructure, although the historic environment is not mentioned explicitly by Section 216 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended), it can form part of different infrastructure types. Roads and other transport facilities may include historic structures (such as bridges); school facilities can include historic buildings; and open/recreational spaces can contain archaeology and/or form part of the character and setting of designated heritage assets such as listed buildings and conservation areas. Heritage assets can also be described as community infrastructure in their own right (such as specific tourist attractions). The Localism Act also allows CIL to be used for maintenance and ongoing costs, which may be relevant for a range of heritage assets. At the same time, it is important that any CIL projects minimise any harm that might be caused to heritage assets.</p> <p>Development specific planning obligations (e.g. S106 agreements) continue to offer further opportunities for funding improvements to and the mitigation of adverse impacts on the historic environment, such as archaeological investigations, access and interpretation, and the repair and reuse of buildings or other heritage assets.</p> <p>The CIL Regulations emphasise the need to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy with the potential effects which CIL might have upon the economic viability of development across its area. This is an important consideration for any development proposals involving or affecting heritage assets, where development costs may be increased due to the special considerations necessary. We note that the Council can offer discretionary relief for exceptional circumstances, and suggest that such relief could be applied to schemes affecting specific heritage assets. For example, CIL relief could enable the restoration of heritage assets identified on English Heritage's Heritage at Risk Register.</p> <p>We hope that the above comments are of use.</p>	

Consultation response received after the closing date

Name, Company/ Organisation	Comment	Officer View
Mrs Gail Stoehr Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	<p>This submission constitutes formal advice from the Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum. Huntingdonshire District Council is required, in accordance with section 94(5) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, to have regard to relevant advice from this forum in carrying out its functions.</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum has considered the consultation being carried by Huntingdonshire District Council on its Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) list of projects provided in the document "<i>Huntingdonshire Infrastructure Business Plan 2013/14</i>".</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum is pleased to note that the CIL list of projects includes a number of projects related to green infrastructure and walking and cycling infrastructure. The Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum draws to the attention of Huntingdonshire District Council of the benefits that such infrastructure will bring to growing communities in the District, including those relating to the economy, the environment and health and well-being.</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum notes that in relation to the Ramsey Spatial Planning Area (SPA) (page 24) there is a lack of green infrastructure projects proposed for funding and that there is a lack of cycling and walking infrastructure proposed for funding that would provide new or improved routes for non-motorised users to the „Great Fen Project“. The Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum advises that serious consideration should be given by Huntingdonshire District Council to remedying these omissions before the CIL list of projects is approved.</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum notes that in relation to the Key Service Centre and Small Settlement Projects (page 25) there is a lack of green infrastructure projects proposed for funding and that there is a lack of cycling and walking infrastructure proposed for funding. The Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum advises that serious consideration should be given by Huntingdonshire District Council to remedying these omissions before the CIL list of projects is approved. For proposals and ideas relating to projects relevant to the villages in the District the Council should carry out a specific consultation exercise with the relevant parish councils.</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum notes that in relation to the CIL Implementation Plan (Section 5) that the green infrastructure projects identified in earlier sections are split within the implementation tables (Tables 5.1 – 5.3) between the categories "Policy High" and "Desirable".</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum advises that the creation of this split is not convincingly demonstrated by the process described in Section 4 CIL Infrastructure Prioritisation and is not convincingly demonstrated by the evidence base in the consultation document. The Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum advises that consideration should be given by Huntingdonshire District Council to providing better evidence for the „downgrading" of certain infrastructure projects from "Policy High" and "Desirable".</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum was set up by Cambridgeshire County Council as required by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, and its remit is to advise relevant bodies as</p>	<p>Support of the green infrastructure and walking and cycling projects noted.</p> <p>Ramsey Spatial Planning Area (SPA) is not anticipated to have significant growth during the period of the Core Strategy to 2026 necessitating additional infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>The Council supports the comments on the Great Fen. A number of infrastructure items, including access, are covered in the IBP under the multi-area projects.</p> <p>The Key Service Centres and the small settlement projects are not anticipated to have significant growth during the period of the Core Strategy to 2026 necessitating additional infrastructure requirements. However, the Council has recently started work to develop the 2014/15 Infrastructure Business Plan. Town and Parish Councils have already been written to on this and asked to submit their top infrastructure priorities.</p> <p>The project categorisation should not be seen as a down grading of projects but a prioritisation process necessary to consider use of limited funding.</p> <p>Projects may, over time, change in that categorisation process. The detail on this will be reviewed during the next stage of the IBP 14/15.</p>

Name, Company/ Organisation	Comment	Officer View
	defined in Section 94(4) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 on matters relating to access to the countryside. Section 94(4) bodies are required by the legislation to take the views of the Local Access Forum into account, and the latest Guidance issued by The Secretary of State at the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs lists Huntingdonshire District Council as a Section 94(4) body.	

TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2012/13 (Report by the Accountancy Manager)

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Council approves the Treasury Management Strategy for the coming year when it approves the budget and MTP each February. It also receives a mid-year report and an annual report after the end of the financial year. The Strategy is scrutinised by the Economic Well-being Panel.
- 1.2 The key points in the 2012/13 Strategy were:
- To invest any available funds in a manner that balanced low risk of default by the borrower with a fair rate of interest.
 - To ensure there was sufficient cash to meet day-to-day obligations.
 - To borrow when necessary to fund capital expenditure and to borrow in advance if rates were considered to be low. It envisaged the need for further borrowing in the range of £4.4m to £14.0m.

2. ECONOMIC REVIEW

- 2.1 An economic review of the year provided by our Treasury Management advisors is attached as Annex A.

3. PERFORMANCE OF FUNDS

- 3.1 The following table summarises the treasury management transactions undertaken during the 2012/13 financial year and the details of the investments and loans held as at 31 March 2013 are shown in Annex B.

	Principal Amount £m	Interest Rate %
Investments		
at 31 st March 2012	10.4	4.29
less matured in year	-132.9	
plus arranged in year	+128.9	
at 31 st March 2013	6.4	3.93
Average Investments	14.7	2.96
Borrowing		
at 31 st March 2012	14.5	2.82
less repaid in year	-34.4	
plus arranged in year	+35.9	
at 31 st March 2013	16.0	2.56
Average Borrowing	11.9	3.32

- 3.2 The average rate of interest on all investments of 2.96% was 2.63% above the 7-day benchmark rate of 0.33%. This very good performance was due to £5m of the investments being locked into higher rates before the year started together with the use of liquidity accounts with major banks and building societies which gave the added safety of instant access together with interest rates in excess of the benchmark
- 3.3 If only short-term cash flow investment activity is considered, the rate of interest on investments was 0.87% and still more than double the 7-day benchmark rate of 0.33%.
- 3.4 The Council's exposure to interest rate risk at the end of the year was the £10m long term PWLB borrowing from 4 years ago which is still well below current long term rates and £1.9m short term borrowing for less than 2 months at a mixture of 0.31% and 0.4%. This gave an average borrowing rate of 3.32%.
- 3.5 The actual net investment interest (after deduction of interest payable on loans) was a credit of £39,186, which is more than three times the estimated credit budget of £11,000 for the year. This has occurred due to higher than estimated interest rates and levels of reserves.

4. STRATEGY – BORROWING

- 4.1 **Long-term borrowing.** The strategy allowed for 'must borrow' to finance that part of the capital programme that could not be met from internal funds. There was also a provision for 'may borrow' which allowed borrowing in anticipation of need, based on whether longer term rates seemed low compared with future likely levels. No long-term borrowing was carried out as the rates were not deemed to be low enough, short-term borrowing rates were very low, and for most of the year much of the funding need was covered by internal funding.
- 4.2 **Short-term borrowing.** The Authority needed to borrow short-term during the year to manage its cash flow; it averaged £1.9m.

5. STRATEGY - INVESTMENTS

- 5.1 The Council's strategy for 2012/13 was based on all investments being managed in-house. The investments were of three types:
- time deposits,
 - liquidity (call) accounts (with banks with a high credit rating and the top 25 building societies by asset value), and
 - money market funds

The strategy included limits on the size of investments with each

organisation and country limits. The limits are shown in Annex C.

- 5.2 The strategy was reviewed during the course of the year and the mid-year report was reported to Council on the 19th December 2012.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 6.1 The Council's primary objectives for the management of its investments are to give priority to the security and liquidity of its funds before seeking the best rate of return.
- 6.2 **Security** is managed by investing short-term with highly-rated banks, building societies and local authorities in the UK. The Authority received regular updates from its advisors, Arlingclose, sometimes daily, on changes to the credit rating of counterparties. This allowed the Council to amend its counterparty list and not invest where there is concern about the credit rating.
- 6.3 **Liquidity.** In December 2008, the Council invested £10m in time deposits, however £5m was repaid in December 2012 and the remaining £5m will be repaid in December 2013. The majority of the Council's funds were in liquidity accounts which have a rate or interest above base rate and provide instant access to funds.
- 6.4 Overall, liquidity was managed by producing cash flow forecasts that help set the limit on the duration of the investments in time deposits. The projections turned out to be cautious which sometimes resulted in funds being available before they were needed with any surplus being invested on a temporary basis.
- 6.5 On the 4th July 2012 the Council approved an amendment to the 2012/13 Treasury Management Strategy that reduced the minimum credit ratings for Liquidity Accounts to F2. The reason for this amendment was because general reductions in credit ratings had started to reduce the accounts that the Council could use.
- 6.6 **Return on investments.** Security and liquidity took precedence over the return on investments, which resulted in investments during 2012/13 generally being of short duration due to the benefit of good rates on liquidity and growing concerns over the credit rating of counterparties.
- 6.7 When the Authority borrowed £10M in advance in December 2008 it invested the funds at marginally higher interest rates thus protecting the Council from any short term loss of interest.

7. COMPLIANCE WITH REGULATIONS AND CODES

- 7.1 All the treasury management activity undertaken during the financial year complied with the approved strategy, the CIPFA Code of Practice, and relevant legislation.
- 7.2 The Code requires the Council to approve both Treasury Management and Prudential Indicators. Those for 2012/13 were approved at the Council meeting on 22nd February 2012. At the mid-year report, a revised Treasury Management Indicator in respect of Interest Rate Exposure was approved; Annex D shows the relevant indicators and the actual results.

8 CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The performance of the funds in a year when rates stayed very low was pleasing, significantly exceeding the benchmark and the budgeted investment interest.
- 8.2 In a year of uncertainty in the financial markets all of the Council's investments were repaid in full and on time.
- 8.3 The Authority has carried out its treasury management activities with due regard to minimising risk, and in accordance with legislation. During the year it reviewed its strategy in the light of external events in the markets.

9 RECOMMENDATION

- 9.1 It is recommended that Cabinet note this report.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2012/13 cash management files and working papers
Reports to the Cabinet and Treasury Management Advisory Group
CIPFA Code on Treasury Management

CONTACT OFFICER

Mr Clive Mason Accountancy Manager Tel. 01480 388157

ECONOMIC REVIEW OF 2012/13

- 1.1 The global outlook stabilised mainly due to central banks maintaining low interest rates and expansionary monetary policy for an extended period. Equity market assets recovered sharply with the FTSE 100 registering a 9.1% increase over the year. This was despite economic growth in G-7 nations being either muted or disappointing.
- 1.2 In the UK the economy shrank in the first, second and fourth quarters of calendar 2012. It was the impressive 0.9% growth in the third quarter, aided by the summer Olympic Games, which allowed growth to register 0.2% over the calendar year 2012. The expected boost to net trade from the fall in the value of sterling did not materialise, but raised the price of imports, especially low margin goods such as food and energy. Avoiding a 'triple-dip' recession became contingent on upbeat services sector surveys translating into sufficient economic activity to overhaul contractions in the struggling manufacturing and construction sectors.
- 1.3 Household financial conditions and purchasing power were constrained as wage growth remained subdued at 1.2% and was outstripped by inflation. Annual CPI dipped below 3%, falling to 2.4% in June before ticking up to 2.8% in February 2013. Higher food and energy prices and higher transport costs were some of the principal contributors to inflation remaining above the Bank of England's 2% CPI target.
- 1.4 The lack of growth and the fall in inflation were persuasive enough for the Bank of England to maintain the Bank Rate at 0.5% and also sanction additional £50 billion asset purchases (QE) in July, taking total QE to £375 billion. The possibility of a rate cut was discussed at some of Bank's Monetary Policy Committee meetings, but was not implemented as the potential drawbacks outweighed the benefits of a reduction in the Bank Rate. In the March Budget the Bank's policy was revised to include the 2% CPI inflation remit alongside the flexibility to commit to intermediate targets.
- 1.5 The resilience of the labour market, with the ILO unemployment rate falling to 7.8%, was the main surprise given the challenging economic backdrop. Many of the gains in employment were through an increase in self-employment and part time working.
- 1.6 The Chancellor largely stuck to his fiscal plans with the austerity drive extending into 2018. In March the Office for Budgetary Responsibility (OBR) halved its forecast growth in 2013 to 0.6% which then resulted in the lowering of the forecast for tax revenues and an increase in the budget deficit. The government is now expected to borrow an additional £146bn and sees gross debt rising above 100% of GDP by 2015-16. The fall in debt as a percentage of GDP, which the coalition had targeted for 2015-16, was pushed two years beyond this horizon. With the national debt metrics out of kilter with a triple-A rating, it was not surprising that the UK's sovereign rating was downgraded by Moody's to Aa1. The AAA status was

maintained by Fitch and S&P, albeit with a Rating Watch Negative and with a Negative Outlook respectively.

- 1.7 The government's Funding for Lending (FLS) initiative commenced in August which gave banks access to cheaper funding on the basis that it would then result in them passing this advantage to the wider economy. There was an improvement in the flow of credit to mortgagees, but was still below expectation for SMEs.
- 1.8 The big four banks in the UK – Barclays, RBS, Lloyds and HSBC – and several other global institutions including JP Morgan, Citibank, Rabobank, UBS, Credit Suisse and Deutsche came under investigation in the Libor rigging scandal which led to fines by and settlements with UK and US regulators. Banks' share prices recovered after the initial setback when the news first hit the headlines.
- 1.9 **Europe:** The Euro region suffered a further period of stress when Italian and Spanish government borrowing costs rose sharply and Spain was also forced to officially seek a bailout for its domestic banks. Markets were becalmed after the ECB's declaration that it would do whatever it takes to stabilise the Eurozone and the central bank's announcement in September of its Outright Monetary Transactions (OMT) facility, buying time for the necessary fiscal adjustments required. Neither the Italian elections which resulted in political gridlock nor the poorly-managed bailout of Cyprus which necessitated 'bailing-in' non-guaranteed depositors proved sufficient for a market downturn. Growth was hindered by the rebalancing processes under way in Euroland economies, most of which contracted in Q4 2012.
- 1.10 **US:** The US Federal Reserve extended quantitative easing through 'Operation Twist', in which it buys longer-dated bonds with the proceeds of shorter-dated US Treasuries. The Federal Reserve shifted policy to focus on the jobless rate with a pledge to keep rates low until unemployment falls below 6.5%. The country's extended fiscal and debt ceiling negotiations remained unresolved.
- 1.11 **Gilt Yields and Money Market Rates:** Gilt yields ended the year lower than the start in April. By September the 2-year gilt yield had fallen to 0.06%, raising the prospect that short-dated yields could turn negative. 10-year yields fell by nearly 0.5% ending the year at 1.72%. The reduction was less pronounced at the longer end; 30-year yields ended the year at 3.11%, around 25bp lower than in April. Despite the likelihood the DMO would revise up its gilt issuance for 2012/13, there were several gilt-supportive factors: the Bank of England's continued purchases of gilts under an extended QE programme; purchases by banks, insurance companies and pension funds driven by capital requirements and the preference for safe harbour government bonds.
- 1.12 One direct consequence of the Funding for Lending Scheme was the sharp drop in rates at which banks borrowed from local government. 3-month, 6-month and 12-month Libid rates which were 1%, 1.33% and 1.84% at the beginning of the financial year fell to 0.44%, 0.51% and

0.75% respectively.

BORROWING AND INVESTMENTS AT 31 MARCH 2013

	Short Term Rating		Date Invested/ Borrowed	Amount		Interest Rate	Repayment Date	Year of Maturity
	Fitch	Moody		£m	£m			
BORROWING								
Short-term								
Worcestershire County Council		Not rated		5.0		0.31	29-Apr-13	2013/14
London Borough of Merton		Not rated		1.0		0.40	30-Apr-13	2013/14
				<u>6.0</u>				
Long Term								
PWLB				5.0		3.91	19-Dec-57	2057/58
PWLB				<u>5.0</u>		3.90	19-Dec-58	2058/59
				<u>10.0</u>				
TOTAL BORROWING				<u>16.0</u>				
INVESTMENTS IN-HOUSE								
Short-term								
NatWest Liquidity	F1	P2		1.3		0.60		2012/13
Cambridgeshire BS Call Account		Not rated		0.1		0.50		2012/13
Skipton BS	F3			<u>5.0</u>		4.85	19-Dec-13	2013/14
				<u>6.4</u>				
TOTAL INVESTMENTS				<u>6.4</u>				
NET BORROWING				<u>9.6</u>				

**IN-HOUSE FUND MANAGEMENT 2012/13
(IF NO FURTHER BORROWING IN ANTICIPATION)**

Duration of investments	No investment shall be longer than 5 years. Maximum duration for a Building Society with no rating is 1 month.	
Types of investments	Fixed term Deposits Deposits at call, two or seven day notice Corporate bonds Money market funds UK Government bonds and Supranational Bank bonds.	
Credit Ratings	<p>Building Societies All Building Societies with ratings of BBB or above. Building Societies with no ratings. Money Market Funds AAA credit rating Local Authorities or UK Government No rating required</p> <p>Non-Building Societies Short term rating F1 by Fitch or equivalent. Short term rating F2 by Fitch or equivalent for liquidity accounts. Long-term rating of AA- by Fitch or equivalent if the investment is longer than 1 year.</p>	
Maximum limits per counterparty (group), country or non-specified category	<p>F1+ or have a legal position that guarantees repayment for the period of the investment</p> <p>F1</p> <p>Building Society with assets over £2bn in top 25 (Currently 10)</p> <p>Building Society with assets over £1bn if in top 25 (Currently 3)</p> <p>Building Society with assets under £1bn in top 25</p> <p>Liquidity (Call) Account with a credit rating of F2 or with a legal position that guarantees repayment or a Building Society. BUT total invested with counterparty/group shall not exceed</p> <p>Money market fund AAA Credit rating</p> <p>Limit for Non-specified investments</p> <p>– £10M in time deposits more than one year</p> <p>– £5M in corporate bonds</p> <p>– £10M in any other types.</p> <p>– £15M in total</p> <p>Country limits</p> <p>– UK - unlimited</p> <p>– £5M in a country outside the EU</p> <p>– £10M in a country within the EU (excluding UK)</p> <p>– £20M in EU countries combined (excluding UK)</p> <p>No investment will be made in country with a sovereign rating of less than AA. These limits will be applied when considering any new investment from 23 February 2012. Lower limits may be set during the course of the year or for later years to avoid too high a proportion of the Council's funds being with any counterparty.</p>	<p>£5m</p> <p>£4M</p> <p>£5M</p> <p>£4M</p> <p>£3M</p> <p>£5M</p> <p>£8M</p> <p>£4m</p>
Benchmark	LGC 7 day rate	

**CIPFA Prudential Indicators for Capital Finance in Local Authorities
Prudential Indications and Treasury Management Indications for 2012/13
Comparison of actual results with limits**

PRUDENTIAL MANAGEMENT INDICATORS

1. Actual and Estimated Capital Expenditure.

	2012/13 Estimate £000	2012/13 Actual £000
Gross	19.5	8.3
Net	10.4	6.5

2. The proportion of the budget financed from government grants and council tax that is spent on interest and the provision for debt repayment.

2012/13 Estimate	2012/13 Actual
4.1%	3.6%

3. The impact of schemes with capital expenditure on the level of council tax.

This item is only provided to demonstrate affordability at budget setting and has already been superseded by the equivalent figure in the 2013/14 indicators.

4. The capital financing requirement.

This represents the estimated need for the Authority to borrow to finance capital expenditure less the estimated provision for redemption of debt (the MRP) with no allowance for funding in advance.

2012/13 Estimate £m	2012/13 Actual £m
32.0	27.0

5. Net borrowing and the capital financing requirement.

Net external borrowing as at the 31st March 2013, was £20.0m, this is £7.0m less than the capital financing requirement. Thereby confirming that the council has not borrowed for revenue purposes other than in the short-term for cash flow purposes.

6. The actual external long-term borrowing at 31 March 2013

£10m

7. Adoption of the CIPFA Code

The Council has adopted the 2011 edition of the CIPFA Treasury Management Code of Practice.

TREASURY MANAGEMENT INDICATORS

8. The authorised limit for external debt.

This is the maximum limit for borrowing and is based on a worst-case scenario.

	2012/13 Limit £m	2012/13 Actual £m
Short-Term	20	6
Long Term assuming maximum borrowing in advance	51	10
Other long-term liabilities (leases)	5	4
Total	76	20

9. The operational boundary for external debt.

This reflects a less extreme position. Although the figure can be exceeded without further approval, it represents an early warning monitoring device to ensure that the authorised limit (above) is not exceeded.

	2012/13 Limit £000	2012/13 Actual £000
Short-Term	15	6
Long Term	41	10
Other long-term liabilities (leases)	5	4
Total	61	20

Both of these actual results reflect the fact that long term rates were not considered low enough to borrow in anticipation of need

10. Exposure to investments with fixed interest and variable interest.

These limits are given as a percentage of total investments. Investments of less than 12 months count as variable rate.

		Limits		Actual
		Max.	Min.	As at 31.3.13
Borrowing: longer than 1 year	Fixed	100%	75%	100%
	Variable	25%	0%	0%
Investments: longer than 1 year	Fixed	100%	100%	100%
	Variable	0%	0%	0%

11. Borrowing Repayment Profile

The proportion of 2012/13 borrowing that matured in successive periods.

Borrowing	Upper limit	Lower limit	Actual As at 31.3.13
Under 12 months	86%	0%	37%
12 months and within 24 months	86%	0%	0%
24 months and within 5 years	86%	0%	0%
5 years and within 10 years	86%	0%	0%
10 years and above	100%	14%	63%

12. Investment Repayment Profile

Limit on the value of investments that cannot be redeemed within 364 days.

	Limit £m	Actual £m
Limit on principal invested beyond year end (31 March 2013)	32.0	5.0

**WORK PROGRAMME
(Report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services)**

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Each year the Overview and Scrutiny Panels review their programmes of studies and plan their work for the forthcoming year. This report provides the Panel with an opportunity to complete this task and establish their work priorities for 2013/14.

2. EFFECTIVENESS

- 2.1 The Panels have completed a review of their effectiveness. A summary of the findings appears in Appendix A.

3. WORK PROGRAMME

- 3.1 Members are requested to consider whether any studies or investigations of single issues within their remit might usefully be undertaken. This might be through internal scrutiny of Council functions. The Panels' remits appear in Appendix B. The Corporate Governance Panel is responsible for governance, risk management, internal and external audit, the accounts, complaints / feedback and fraud and corruption. The Employment Panel provides a strategic overview of the people management and workforce decisions and issues within the Council and conducts research on employment practice within the Council and best practice.
- 3.2 The Panels monitor the Council's performance. The development of the Delivery Plan and monitoring arrangements is being overseen by the Corporate Plan Working Group in conjunction with Executive Councillors.
- 3.3 The Panels are also able to conduct external studies. They have a wide remit to examine any issues that affect the economic, social and environmental well-being of the District.

Working Groups

- 3.4 A number of working groups already exist to undertake studies. These are listed below together with the Membership:

Working Group	Current Membership	Type
Corporate Plan	Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the three Panels	On-going
Customer Services	Councillors R B Howe and T V Rogers and Mr R Eacott	Task and Finish

Support Services	Councillors G J Bull, Greenall, R B Howe, A J MacKender-Lawrence, T V Rogers and A H Williams	Task and Finish
------------------	---	-----------------

3.5 Membership of the Panel has changed for 2013/14. Where a study is nearing its conclusion it has previously been the practice that Membership of the working group continues to its completion. The Panel is invited to review the composition of its Working Groups.

4. SCRUTINISING PARTNERSHIP WORKING / JOINT WORKING

4.1 The Panel's remit includes reference to the Local Enterprise Partnership It had previously been suggested that scrutiny of the Partnership should be undertaken on a co-ordinated area basis so that its representatives did not have to attend meetings of all the councils in the area. There has not been much enthusiasm for this amongst other authorities. The Panel might, therefore, devise its own work as necessary.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Panel is

RECOMMENDED to

- a) note the contents of the report;
- b) consider the addition of new subject areas to the programme of studies;
- c) review the composition of the Working Groups / external representation and appoint Members as necessary, and
- d) endorse the Overview and Scrutiny Protocol.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Previous reports to the Overview and Scrutiny Panels /Working Groups.
Council Constitution

Contact Officer: A Roberts (01480) 388015

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS

The outcome of that process will be reported to the Corporate Governance Panel in June. Some of the general findings about the way the Council operates, such as the reporting style will be taken up by the Corporate Governance Panel. Another aspect, engaging with the public and other stakeholders, will be the subject of an internal audit review into the Council's use of social media. The review will consider how the Council might promote public engagement. In the Meantime press releases and social media messages will be regularly released advising members of the public of the opportunity they have to attend meetings and of subjects under discussion.

Several of the findings relate to the way Overview and Scrutiny operates. With regard to asking questions, Members are reminded that submitting questions to the appropriate Officer or Executive Member in advance of the meeting if they require specific information relating to a report, will obviate the need to circulate the information at a later date and mean that it can be discussed at the meeting. The Working Group that carried out the review also stressed the importance of all Panels considering financial/economic aspects of the issues under discussion. Questions about policy should be directed to Executive Councillors.

It has generally been agreed that, rather than be presented with what are substantially finalised documents, scrutiny of policy proposals should take place early in the policy development process. The Panel Chairmen have met the Executive Leader and he has welcomed early engagement from the Panels. This will allow a Champion be appointed at this early stage to lead on a matter on behalf of the Panel. The appointment of Member Champions is something that is to be encouraged. Formal appointment of Champions will be recorded in a list established for this purpose.

Once a Panel has made recommendations to the Cabinet, the Cabinet has been asked produce a formal response to those recommendations. Further down the line update reports will be provided on service developments and agreed actions arising from Overview and Scrutiny reviews. To keep track of minor actions that arise during meetings, action logs will be introduced for the three Panels.

The final matter that arose from the review is the introduction of open public forums at each meeting. The constitutional changes required are being looked into.

At the last meeting of the Working Group that undertook the review, Members endorsed a protocol designed to put the Panels' operating practices on a more formal footing. The protocol appears below.

Overview and Scrutiny Protocol

This protocol provides a framework for the conduct of Overview and Scrutiny and is intended to assist Members, Officers, expert witnesses and members of the public with understanding the functions of scrutiny and overview bodies, including task groups, and the various processes governing these.

GENERAL

The brief of Overview and Scrutiny can be summarised as follows: -

- holding the Cabinet to account;
- scrutinising decisions, both prior to and after they are made;
- developing and reviewing policies;
- having the power to 'call in' decisions of the Cabinet;
- monitoring performance and on-going studies, and
- investigating any matter affecting the social, economic or environmental well-being of the District.

The Overview and Scrutiny Panels will abide by the Principles of Good scrutiny. These are that Scrutiny:

- provides "critical friend" challenge to executive policy-makers and decision-makers;
- enables the voice and concerns of the public and its communities to be heard;
- is carried out by "independent minded governors" who lead and own the scrutiny process, and
- drives improvement in public services.

The Cabinet and, where appropriate, the Council should take into account any views expressed by Overview and Scrutiny Panels when making decisions.

All Non-Executive Members shall have the right to request that items are included on Overview and Scrutiny Agenda, subject to the agreement of the relevant Scrutiny and Overview Chairman and Vice-Chairman and the relevance of the item to the Remit of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

CO-ORDINATION OF WORK PROGRAMMES AND BUSINESS

The Overview and Scrutiny Panels' work programmes will be co-ordinated and monitored by the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Panels in order to avoid duplication and assist in managing cross-cutting work. The Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen will determine any cases of doubt or dispute.

Overview and Scrutiny Chairmen and Vice Chairmen shall maintain regular contact with the Chief Officers Management Team. In consultation with Chairmen and Vice Chairmen, it shall be the responsibility of the Scrutiny and Review Manager and Democratic Services Officers to ensure that those who need to know of matters being considered, or for possible future consideration, are so informed.

The Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen will ensure the Panels adhere to the Study Methodology, which has previously been adopted – see Annex.

The relevant Executive Councillor and Chief Officers Management Team will be given an opportunity to discuss the remit of studies when they commence. They will also be provided with draft interim reports and draft final study reports before they are published.

The Cabinet may consult and involve the relevant Panel in developing draft policies.

Overview and Scrutiny Panels will receive feedback from the Cabinet on items recommendations made by them.

Members' enquiries about overview and scrutiny functions and business will normally be directed to the appropriate Scrutiny and Overview Chairman or Vice-Chairman or the Scrutiny and Review Manager.

ATTENDANCE AT SCRUTINY MEETINGS BY EXECUTIVE MEMBERS AND COUNCIL OFFICERS

Overview and Scrutiny Panels or their Chairmen may require Executive Members to attend their meetings to answer questions and offer advice.

Executive Members and Council Officers required to attend Overview and Scrutiny Panel meetings to answer questions and will be given at least five working days' notice, together with an indication of the issues being raised and the likely line of questioning. Where possible, Members are asked to pre-notify the Democratic Services Section of any specific factual information required in advance of the meeting.

NON-EXECUTIVE MEMBERS, OUTSIDE BODIES AND INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE INVITED TO GIVE ORAL OR WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

From time to time, outside bodies and individuals will be invited to provide information, evidence, views or advice to the Overview and Scrutiny Panels.

In such circumstances outside bodies or individuals will:

- receive adequate notice of the invitation to attend and this will not normally be less than 1 week
- be provided with an adequate brief of the process being undertaken and the nature of the information, evidence or advice being sought
- be advised whether oral or written submissions are desired and of the likelihood of supplementary questions being asked
- be entitled to receive a compensatory payment in recognition of the expenses or income loss they may have incurred while assisting in a review
- be invited to comment on a draft summary note of the evidence, information or advice given and/or be provided with a copy of the final report presented to the Cabinet and/or to Council

WORKING / ADVISORY GROUPS

- A Panel may set up a Working / Advisory Group to carry out a specific piece of work
- Membership of Working / Advisory Groups will be politically balanced unless political group leaders agree otherwise, and shall comprise non-Executive Members

- Task Groups will present interim and final reports to Panels
- When any Overview and Scrutiny body is considering the performance or proposals of a person, or of a body which includes any of its Members, such person or Members shall not take part in that consideration in the capacity of Members of the scrutiny body.

INFORMAL WORKING GROUPS

A Panel may appoint an informal Member led Working Group from within its own Membership to carry out a piece of work e.g. in preparing a report on a specific issue for the Panel.

WORKING WITH OFFICERS

The Overview and Scrutiny Panels or their Chairmen acting on their behalf, may require Officers to attend Scrutiny and Overview meetings to answer questions. Junior Officers would not normally be expected to give evidence.

All requests for Officer attendance at meetings should be made to Chief Officers / Heads of Service in the first instance

When making requests for reports or for Officer attendance, Overview and Scrutiny Members shall have regard to the work programme and workload of Officers

It is recognised that Officers appearing before a Scrutiny and Overview body may often be those who have advised the Cabinet, or another part of the Council, on the matter under investigation.

In giving evidence, Officers must not be asked to give party political views.

Officers should respect Members in the way in which they respond to questions. There is an expectation that Officers will be well briefed, able to answer questions and, if unable to provide information at any meeting, if requested, will respond with such information to Panel Members within a reasonable time.

Officers should be questioned in a courteous and professional manner.

Questions should not be asked about matters of an employment or disciplinary nature, unless that is the matter under consideration.

Overview and Scrutiny proceedings must not be used to question the capability or competence of Officers. Chairmen and Members need to make a distinction between reviewing the policies and performance of the Council and its services, and appraising the personal performance of staff, which is not a Scrutiny and Overview function.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY STUDY TEMPLATE

AREA OF REVIEW	DETAILS/COMMENTS
Title of Study (name of Working Group)	
Appointing Panel	
Members Assigned (including date Working Group appointed)	
Executive Councillor	
Possible Co-Options to the Group	
Interests Declared	
Rapporteur	
Senior Management Representative	
Other Officer Support	
Purpose of Study / Objective (specify exactly what the study should achieve)	
Rationale (key issues and/or reason for conducting a study)	
Terms of Reference	
Links to Council Policies/Strategies	

Methodology / Approach (what types of enquiries will be used to gather evidence)	
External/Specialist Support	
Existing Documentation	
Evidence to be Obtained (e.g. witnesses, documents, site visits, consultation, research, etc)	
Reference Sites	
Investigations	
Witnesses	
Site Visits (if necessary) (where and when)	
Meetings of the Working Group	
Costs (resource requirements, additional expenditure, time)	
Possible Barriers to the Study (potential weaknesses)	
Projected Timescale (Start and end times)	

**TERMS OF REFERENCE OF OVERVIEW AND
SCRUTINY PANELS**

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL	SCOPE
SOCIAL WELL BEING	<p>Private sector housing</p> <p>Caravan sites Community Safety Community initiatives Leisure Development Air quality/noise/pollution Animal welfare/pest control Commercial: health and safety promotion/food safety Infectious diseases Smoke free initiatives Corporate Health and Safety</p> <p>CCTV</p> <p>Housing strategy / policies Housing providers / associations</p> <p>Housing register / nominations Homelessness Housing grants Disabled facilities grants Home Improvement Agency Private Sector Housing</p> <p>Huntingdon / St Neots / St Ives Ramsey /Sawtry</p> <p>Democratic Services Elections / Electoral Registration Member Support</p> <p>Licensing</p> <p>Safeguarding Diversity and Equalities</p>

<p>ENVIRONMENTAL WELL BEING</p>	<p>Streetscene Car Park management Grounds maintenance / grass cutting Parks and Countryside Emergency Planning Waste stream policy Refuse collection Recycling Vehicle fleet management Abandoned vehicles Cleaving</p> <p>Environmental Strategy Home energy conservation Business energy conservation Water strategy Renewable energy Building Control / Dangerous Structures / Access for disabled people Residual Highways responsibilities / public utilities Street naming and numbering Land drainage</p> <p>Planning Policy / Development Plans Planning studies / monitoring Site and area planning briefs / Masterplans Neighbourhood Plans Development Management / Planning Enforcement Conservation / Listed Buildings Trees and footpaths Transportation</p>
--	---

<p>ECONOMIC WELL BEING</p>	<p>Website / intranet Freedom of Information ICT Network & Systems Local Land & Property Gazetteer Business Analysis / Improvement</p> <p>Financial forecasting Budget preparation and monitoring Final Accounts Financial advice Payment of creditors Audit Risk management Procurement Treasury Management (borrowing and investments) Debt Recovery</p> <p>Call Centre Customer Service Centre Information Centres Local Taxation Revenue collection Benefits assessments / payments / fraud National Non Domestic Rates</p> <p>Land Charges Legal advice Conveyancing Prosecutions and litigation Planning advocacy Data protection / Regulation of Investigatory Powers Contracts Document Centre</p> <p>Communication & marketing Corporate policy / research Corporate performance management Localism Economic Development Investment Estate</p> <p>Facilities Management Operational Estate Project / Contractual management Engineering and architectural design</p>
-----------------------------------	---

This page is intentionally left blank

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANELS
(SOCIAL WELL-BEING)
(ECONOMIC WELL-BEING)
(ENVIRONMENTAL WELL-BEING)

4 JUNE 2013
6 JUNE 2013
11 JUNE 2013

WORK PLAN STUDIES
(Report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services)

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Members of studies being undertaken by the other Overview and Scrutiny Panels.

2. STUDIES

- 2.1 The Council has a duty to improve the social, environmental and economic well-being of the District. This gives the Overview and Scrutiny Panels a wide remit to examine any issues that affect the District by conducting in-depth studies.
- 2.2 Studies are allocated according to the Overview and Scrutiny remits. Details of ongoing studies being undertaken by the two other Panels are set out in the attached Appendix.
- 2.3 Members are reminded that if they have a specific interest in any study area which is not being considered by their Panel there are opportunities for involvement in all the studies being undertaken.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 The Panel is requested to note the progress of the studies selected.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Minutes and Reports from previous meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Panels.

Contact Officers: Miss H Ali, Democratic Services Officer
01480 388006

Mrs C Bulman, Democratic Services Officer
01480 388234

ONGOING STUDIES

STUDY	OBJECTIVES	PANEL	STATUS	TYPE
Social Value	To consider the development of a methodology for the quantification of Social Value.	Social Well-Being	Working Group will focus on three key areas; namely social, health and financial benefits of the Council's activities. Officers have been tasked with attaching financial values to these benefits.	Working Group
CCTV Provision within the District	To review the impact of the Council's proposal to cease the CCTV service with effect from April 2012.	Social Well-Being	A report on changes to the CCTV service in 2012/13 will be submitted to the Panel in July 2013.	Whole Panel Study.
Consultation Processes	To assist the Corporate Team with its review of the Council's Consultation and Engagement Strategy.	Social Well-Being	Strategy and Guidance being updated by the Corporate Office to incorporate comments suggested by the Working Group. Draft considered by Working Group in January 2013. Further work to refine both documents is being undertaken. Expected to be presented to the Panel and Cabinet at their September 2013 meetings.	Working Group.
Great Fen	To monitor the latest developments in respect of the Great Fen.	Environmental Well-Being	Site visits undertaken by the Panel in July 2010 and October 2012. A Socio-Economic Study was	Whole Panel.

			presented to the Panel at its March 2013 meeting. Further updates will continue to be provided to the Panel at appropriate times. Site visit to be held in September 2013.	
Tree Strategy	To form a strategy in conjunction with the Tree Officers for the retention and planting of trees.	Environmental Well-Being	Work is yet to commence on the Draft Tree Strategy. Owing to resource constraints within the Planning Department alternative ways of finalising the Tree Strategy are being considered. A proposal for a programme of work to complete the Strategy is awaited from the consultant. Likely timescales to be advised in due course.	Working Group.
Rural Transport	To review the provision of transportation in rural areas.	Environmental Well-Being	Transport for Cambridgeshire report received in July 2011. Comments conveyed to Cabinet. Cllr Mrs Banerjee, as the Panel's appointed representative, attended a Cambridgeshire Future Transport meeting on 27th March 2013 and reported upon its outcome at the Panel's April 2013 meeting.	To be determined.

Review of Neighbourhood Forums in Huntingdonshire	To undertake a review of the Neighbourhood Forums in Huntingdonshire.	Social Well-Being	Cabinet agreed to hold a pilot in the Norman Cross County Division. Panel requested to undertake a review of the pilot during its 12 months of operation. Pilot meeting held on 7th November 2012. Informal discussion held with various Members and the Leader/Deputy Executive Leader prior to Council in April 2013. Matter is still under discussion.	Working Group
Maintenance of Water Courses	To receive a presentation on the maintenance arrangements in place for Water Courses within the District.	Environmental Well-Being	<p>Following consideration of the St Neots Surface Water Management Plan and discussions on widespread drainage problems within the District, a working group was convened to engage with Anglian Water in order to establish their general powers, responsibilities and the limitations on its ability to prevent flooding.</p> <p>Meetings have been held with representatives from Anglian Water and the Environment Agency. The Working Group has produced a report on its findings. Panel has received an update on the outcome of negotiations between</p>	Working Group

			Anglian Water and the County Council on drainage in Yaxley. This was delivered to the Panel at its January 2013 meeting and a further update has been requested for July 2013.	
Design Principles for Future Developments	To examine issues that have arisen at Loves Farm, St Neots and to make recommendations to inform future developments.	Environmental Well-Being	The Working Group has produced a report detailing its findings to date. The Working Group will now focus on detailed aspects of the design guide with the Council's Urban Design, Trees and Landscape Team Leader. This is expected to be made available to the Working Group in due course.	Working Group.
Equality Framework for Local Government	To review the action plan arising from the Equality Framework for Local Government peer assessment.	Social Well-Being	Annual Equality Progress Report submitted to Panel in February 2013. The Working Group will continue to meet to monitor progress against the Action Plan.	Working Group
Corporate Plan	To assist the Corporate Office with the development of a new Corporate Plan.	All O&S Panels	Executive Leader's Strategy Group considered the Council Delivery Plan on 14th January 2013 with a view to taking responsibility for the actions contained therein. A programme of bi-monthly meetings of the	Working Group

			<p>Working Group will be arranged over the course of the next year with a view to holding Executive Members to account. The Delivery Plan is currently undergoing refinement by the Corporate Office.</p> <p>An initial meeting of the Working Group will be held on 13th June.</p>	
Delivery of Advisory Services Across the District	To consider the social implications of the announcement made by the Huntingdonshire CAB to go into voluntary liquidisation and to monitor the performance of the voluntary organisations awarded grant aid by the Council in 2013-2015.	Social Well-Being	<p>Executive Leader provided an update to the Panel in October, November and December 2012. A report on interim arrangements for Jan-Mar 2013 and grant aid awards for 2013/14 was submitted to the Panel at its January 2013 meeting. Voluntary Sector Working Group met in March to consider concerns raised at the February 2013 meeting of Council. Working Group will meet with each voluntary organisation in July 2013 to review their progress with a further meeting to be arranged 6 months thereafter.</p> <p>Annual Report on organisations supported by grants through Service</p>	Working Group.

			Level Agreements to be presented to Panel in November 2013.	
Hinchingbrooke Hospital	To monitor Circle Healthcare's progress and plans for Hinchingbrooke Hospital.	Social Well-Being	<p>Representatives of Circle and Hinchingbrooke Hospital attended Panel's March 2013 meeting to deliver an update on the Hospital's progress and plans for the future. Representatives will return in a year's time to provide a further update.</p> <p>Joint Working Group established with the County Council's Cambridgeshire Adults Wellbeing and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee to monitor the financial and operational performance of the Hospital.</p> <p>6 monthly reports on the performance of the Hospital will be provided by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group. Next report to be delivered to the Panel in July 2013.</p>	Whole Panel

Waste Collection	To identify options for improving the Council's waste collection and recycling arrangements and for enhancing public satisfaction with the service.	Environmental Well-Being	<p>The Working Group has decided to focus on how best to engage with residents as to what should be placed in which bin. The Group may go on to study waste collection procedures in more detail, this is dependent on the work of RECAP. An update was delivered in April 2013. A further report on the Whole Waste System Approach will be delivered in October 2013.</p> <p>The Panel expressed its support for the use of wheelie bin stickers to convey messages with community benefits, such as speed restrictions. In January 2013, representatives of Speedwatch and Hilton Parish Council presented a proposal intended to reduce speeding within the village to the Panel. A written proposal was submitted to the Panel at its meeting in April 2013. The proposal was endorsed by the Panel and the Executive Councillor for Environment.</p>	Working Group
------------------	---	--------------------------	--	---------------

Housing Benefit Changes and the Potential Impact Upon Huntingdonshire	To monitor the effect of Government changes to the Housing Benefit System arising from the Welfare Reform Act.	Social Well-Being	Quarterly reports presented to the Panel. Members of the Economic Well-Being Panel will be invited to attend. Next report expected in July 2013.	Whole Panel
Local Plan 2036 – Provision of Social and Affordable Housing and Impact Upon Homelessness	To explore how the new Local Plan would help to address housing and homelessness needs within the District.	Social Well-Being	An outline of how the new Local Plan will help to address housing and homelessness needs within the District was delivered to the Panel. Regular updates to be provided. Next update expected September 2013.	Whole Panel.
Disabled Facilities Grants	To review the level of expenditure on Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs)	Social Well-Being	Concerns raised by Members over the level of expenditure on DFGs. Panel agreed to include this within their work programme. Update to be delivered to Panel in June 2013 during consideration of the Annual Home Agency Shared Service Review report.	Whole Panel.
Grounds Maintenance - Service Standards	To review the Council's expenditure on grounds maintenance.	Environmental Well-Being	Matter raised at the O&S Joint Chairmen's Briefing as an area for the Panel to review. Panel agreed at its March 2013 meeting that they will include this within their work programme. A report is due to be	Whole Panel.

			submitted by the Head of Operations to the Panel at its June 2013 meeting.	
Update on Redesign of Mental Health Services	To receive an update on the redesign of mental health services.	Social Well-Being	Representatives of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group (C&P CCG) to attend the Panel's September 2013 meeting.	Whole Panel.

Progress Report

<p>13/05/09</p> <p>10/01/13</p>	<p><u>Customer Services</u></p> <p>Quarterly performance reports to be circulated informally to the Panel twice per year and formally twice per year.</p> <p>Agreed to establish a working group to assist with the development of a new Customer Services Strategy and interrelated Strategy for Channel Migration.</p>	<p>Latest report considered in January 2013. Next report due in July 2013.</p>	<p>Meetings of the Working Group have been held on 13th February, 26th March and 21st May 2013. Representatives of the Working Group have also visited the Customer Services Centre at Newport. Officers will now undertake further work and the Group will reconvene once a draft proposal has been developed prior to its consideration by Overview & Scrutiny and the Cabinet.</p>	<p>04/07/13</p>
<p>16/05/13</p>	<p><u>Corporate Plan</u></p> <p>Councillors Rogers and Harrison have been appointed to the Corporate Plan Working Group.</p>		<p>The new Council Delivery Plan was endorsed by the Executive Leaders Strategy Group on 26th March 2013. A programme of bi-monthly meetings of the Corporate Plan Working Group will be arranged over the course of the year with a view to holding Executive Members to account. A meeting of the Working Group will be held on 13th June 2013 at 6pm.</p>	
<p>06/10/11</p>	<p><u>Cambridgeshire Public Sector Asset Management Strategy</u></p> <p>Requested a report outlining the progress made on the Huntingdonshire projects in six months time.</p>	<p>Progress report submitted to June 2012 meeting.</p>	<p>Managing Director (CPP) to report back at a future meeting on the development of the business case methodology. A report on the Strategic Way Forward will be submitted to the Panel's September meeting.</p>	<p>05/09/13</p>

07/07/11	<p><u>District Council Support Services</u></p> <p>Agreed to establish a Working Group to review the Document Centre and its costs to form a view on its efficiency and cost effectiveness.</p>		<p>The report of the Working Group was considered by the Cabinet at their meeting on 21st March. The Cabinet has asked the Managing Director, in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Resources and the Panel's Document Centre Champion, to consider the Group's recommendations. The Panel has requested a report on progress in six months.</p>	
02/11/11	<p><u>Scrutiny of Partnerships</u></p> <p>Following a review of the Strategic Partnership, the Overview & Scrutiny Chairmen and Vice Chairman agreed that responsibilities should be divided as follows:-</p> <p>Social Well Being</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Community Safety ❖ Children & Young People ❖ Health & Well-Being <p>Environmental Well Being</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Growth & Infrastructure <p>Economic Well Being</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Local Enterprise Partnership 		<p>The Panel has already received two presentations on the Local Enterprise Partnership. A presentation on the Local Enterprise Zone was given to the Panel's meeting in November 2011.</p> <p>Little appears to be being done to develop a area approach to scrutinise the Local Enterprise Partnership. This will be revisited in the new Municipal Year but the Panel could undertake its own work in this respect.</p>	

Progress Report

<p>14/06/12</p>	<p><u>Economic Development</u></p> <p>Agreed that the update of the Council's Economic Strategy should be submitted to a future meeting</p>		<p>The findings from the local economic assessment were presented to the Panel's November meeting. A presentation on the Huntingdonshire Economic Growth Plan 2013-2023 will be given to the Panel's July meeting.</p>	<p>04/07/12</p>
<p>05/01/12</p>	<p><u>Housing Benefit Changes</u></p> <p>Agreed to receive a further report drawing together the wider housing policy implications for the Council arising from the Government's Welfare Reform Bill be submitted to a future meeting of the Panel.</p>		<p>Report considered by the Overview & Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) at their meeting on 8th January 2013. Further reports to be submitted on a quarterly basis and Members of the Panel will be invited to attend.</p>	<p>02/07/13</p>
<p>12/07/12</p>	<p>Requested that a report on rental rates and rent costs be submitted to the Panel on a quarterly basis.</p>	<p>Second report submitted to January meeting.</p>	<p>Agreed that future reports should be presented every six months. Next report due in July.</p>	<p>04/07/13</p>
<p>12/07/12</p>	<p><u>Use of Consultants</u></p> <p>Received a report outlining the progress which had been made on agreeing, modifying and implementing the Panel's previous recommendations.</p>	<p>Agreed that further reports detailing expenditure on consultants, hired and temporary staff should be submitted to the Panel on an annual basis. This report should include a breakdown of revenue and capital.</p>	<p>Next report due July 2013.</p>	<p>04/07/13</p>

<p>06/09/12</p>	<p><u>Borrowing</u></p> <p>In considering the Financial Forecast, agreed to establish a Working Group to develop an understanding of the District Council's approach to borrowing and to identify the terms of a Panel debate.</p>	<p>Working Group to comprise Councillors L Duffy, P G Mitchell, M F Shellens and A H Williams.</p>	<p>The Panel's report was considered by the Cabinet at their meeting on 18 April 2013. The Cabinet has endorsed the view that there should be a limit for borrowing costs of 15% of net revenue spending, which can only be exceeded with the approval of full Council.</p> <p>With regard to the Panel's recommendation that a narrower definition of capital expenditure should be used for funding from borrowing and that the remainder should be funded from revenue, the Cabinet has agreed to reconsider this issue when a balanced budget has been achieved.</p>	
<p>04/04/13</p>	<p><u>Budget</u></p> <p>Reviewed the suggestions that had been made as part of their informal discussions to enable Members to identify potential budgetary savings. Identified a number of priority areas for consideration by the Cabinet.</p>		<p>The Panel's report was considered by the Cabinet at their meeting on 18 April 2013. In response, the Cabinet has:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ requested the Employment Panel to review the use of consultants and agency staff; ▪ referred the issue of training to the Member Development Working Group; ▪ agreed to convene an informal meeting of Executive Councillors, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Economic Well-Being) and the Managing Director to discuss shared services, the Council's electoral arrangements and improved procurement. 	

07/03/13	<u>Loves Farm Community Centre</u> Received an update on the current position regarding funding for the Centre. Made a number of comments which have been forwarded to the Managing Director.		Discussions are taking place with Cambridgeshire County Council about joint use of the site. St Neots Town Council have requested the transfer of the land and Section 106 money so that they can provide the facility themselves. No decisions will be taken until a response has been received from the County Council.	
-----------------	---	--	---	--

This page is intentionally left blank

Decision Digest

Edition 134

Monthly summary of the decisions taken at meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Overview & Scrutiny and other Panels for the period 25th March to 21st May 2013.

HEALTHWATCH CAMBRIDGESHIRE

The Chairman of Healthwatch Cambridgeshire gave a presentation to the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) on the process undertaken to establish a local Healthwatch scheme. The organisation will be accountable to Cambridgeshire County Council and is established as a company limited by guarantee. It will involve a Board comprising 4 non-Executive Directors and 5 members of staff; one Chief Executive and four Healthwatch Co-ordinators.

Healthwatch Cambridgeshire is established under the Social Care Act 2012. The organisation will seek to become the new independent consumer champion for users of health and social care services. Key functions will include signposting and the provision of advocacy services.

The Panel asked a number of questions and received a response to each query raised. Matters that were discussed included the methods of engagement to be employed by Healthwatch Cambridgeshire, the role of Healthwatch England, the proposal to develop role descriptions for volunteers and the importance of working in partnership with interested stakeholders, including the voluntary and community sectors.

HOUSING BENEFIT CHANGES AND THE POTENTIAL IMPACT UPON HUNTINGDONSHIRE

The Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) continues to monitor the effect of Government changes to the Housing Benefits system arising from the Welfare Reform Act. The Panel was concerned that claimants renting in the private sector might not be fully aware of the impact of the changes as only a small proportion of residents had made contact with the Council to date. There was further concern that such claimants were building up rent arrears on their homes.

The Panel has discussed a number of matters relating to various aspects of the reforms. Information on the Call Centre's performance in the week prior to the 1st April 2013, together with details of the Council's Rent Deposit scheme and homelessness budget will be circulated to Panel Members outside of the meeting. The Panel has further suggested that a more collaborative approach to the reforms should be adopted by all Registered Providers operating within the District.

Monthly updates on the impact of the reforms will be provided in the Member's Brief.

SOCIAL VALUE WORKING GROUP

An update on the progress of investigations undertaken by the Social Value Working Group was reported to the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being). The Working Group will now attempt to attach a financial value to the social, financial

and health benefits of One Leisure and produce a detailed account of the methodology used to undertake this work.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (SOCIAL WELL-BEING) - PROGRESS

The Panel has requested an update on the impact of the redesign of mental health services across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough for submission to a future meeting.

Having expressed their disappointment over the lack of progress with the North West Huntingdonshire pilot Local Joint Committee, the Panel will be requesting the Cabinet to reconsider its original proposals to establish a series of pilot Local Joint Committee's across the District.

BORROWING

The Economic Well-Being Panel has considered the deliberations of its Working Group, which had been established to identify the terms of a debate on the Council's policy on borrowing and to develop an understanding of the District Council's approach to it. The Executive Councillor for Resources was in attendance and took part in discussion.

Following a lengthy debate on the matter, the Cabinet has been asked to:

- ❖ consider whether there are any capital items that are currently funded through borrowing, which should be funded from revenue when this is affordable; and
- ❖ agree a limit on the cost of borrowing of 15% of net revenue spend. The limit could then only be exceeded with the approval of Council.

In considering the Panel's view that there does not appear to be any constraints on long-term borrowing, the Cabinet has supported a limit for borrowing cost of 15% of net revenue spending which could only be exceeded with the approval of Council

With regard to the Panel's recommendation that a narrower definition of capital expenditure should be used for funding from borrowing and the remainder should be funded from revenue, Executive Councillors concurred with the Panel that in the current financial situation this cannot realistically be achieved. The Cabinet has agreed to reconsider this issue when a balanced budget has been achieved.

BUDGET

During the 2013/14 budget setting process, the Overview & Scrutiny Panel (Economic Well-Being) held two informal discussions to enable Members to identify potential budgetary savings. Representatives from the Liberal Democrats and the UKIP were also invited to present their views on the Council's Budget and Medium Term Plan. At the subsequent Panel meeting the Panel reviewed all the suggestions that had been made.

The Panel has discussed the principles that should be adopted towards identifying spending adjustments. Members have suggested that generally there should be a 'top down' approach and that the Council should look at ways of achieving adjustments in the short and longer terms. The focus should be on the areas of highest cost. It was recognised that given the order of savings that are required, it is likely that the Council will have to consider ceasing some activities.

In considering the Panel's recommendations, the Cabinet were of the opinion that the proposals relating to selling advertising space on Council's car parks, greater enforcement of Council's car parks and alternative use of the shopmobility portakabin were managerial issues and should be dealt with as such.

The Cabinet acknowledges that better Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) particularly with respect to on street parking would be beneficial. However, extra work is required regarding the financial impact on the authority of pursuing CPE before any further discussions can be undertaken.

In discussing the use of consultants, the Cabinet recognised that there were occasions when this was necessary, primarily to provide expertise not available "in-house" such as undertaking supporting research for local plan purposes and upholding the Council's position in respect of planning and other appeals. Having mentioned also the use of agency staff by the Operations team, the Cabinet felt that both these issues should be referred to the Employment Panel.

On the issue of prioritising training, Executive Councillors discussed the cost of and attendance at member training. Having mentioned the timing of training sessions and perceived difficulty in encouraging all Members to attend, the Cabinet agreed that this matter be referred to the Member Development Working Group for further discussion.

With regard to the other suggestions relating to shared services, the Council's electoral arrangements and improved procurement, the Cabinet has agreed to discuss these further at a meeting of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Panel and the Managing Director.

MONITORING OF THE REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME

The Assistant Director, Finance and Resources has drawn the Cabinet's attention to spending variations in the Revenue Budget for the current year and modifications to the approved Capital Programme.

COUNCIL CONSTITUTION

The Corporate Governance Panel has endorsed a number of recommendations which were referred to the Council in relation to proposed changes to the constitution. These involved the Codes of Financial Management and Procurement and a number of other constitutional issues relating to key decisions, executive decision making, access to information arrangements, the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules, appointment of Honorary Alderman and the terms of reference for the Corporate Governance Panel. In addition, the Panel has agreed that six key delegations relating to employment matters be given to the Head of Paid Service.

The Panel has discussed proposed changes relating to arrangements for a recorded vote and agreed to leave unchanged the current rule which allows for a vote to be taken and entered into the Minutes if at least one third of Members present demand it before the vote is taken.

GRANT CERTIFICATION 2011/12

A report from the external auditor detailing the certification of specific grants received by the Council in 2011/12 has been presented to the Corporate Governance Panel.

EXTERNAL AUDIT PLAN 2012/13

The content of the draft External Audit Plan for 2012/13 has been noted by the Corporate Governance Panel. Key risk areas were discussed and the Panel's views on fraud were sought by the external auditors.

ANNUAL EQUALITY PROGRESS REPORT 2012

Progress made to date in respect of the achievement of the Council's Single Equality Scheme and associated Action Plan was noted by the Corporate Governance Panel.

ACCOUNTING POLICIES FOR THE STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS 2012/13

The Corporate Governance Panel has been informed of six changes to the accounting policies, only one of which was considered to be significant, based on which the 2012/13 accounts will be produced.

PROGRESS REPORT ON ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN THE ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT

Progress made to date in respect of the achievement of the action plans supporting the Annual Governance Statement and the Council's improvement plan has been noted by the Corporate Governance Panel.

PUBLIC SECTOR INTERNAL AUDIT STANDARDS

The Corporate Governance Panel has approved the adoption of Public Sector Audit Standards together with proposals for the discharge of the Panel's responsibilities. The Standards which come into force from 1st April 2013 will be recognised as proper non-statutory practice.

Members' attention was drawn to two significant changes relating to the definition of conflicts of interest for internal auditors and the need to appoint a Chief Audit Executive as the person for managing internal audit. It was explained that the management of internal audit, risk management and insurance services will remain the responsibility of the Internal Audit Manager.

RISK REGISTER UPDATE

The attention of the Corporate Governance Panel has been drawn to the high "red" risks highlighted in the Risk Register, the basis on which the Register had been compiled and the process by which those risks identified had been reviewed.

INTERNAL AUDIT SERVICE: INTERNAL AUDIT PLAN AND AUDIT CHARTER

Members of the Corporate Governance Panel have approved the contents of the Internal Audit Charter and Plan for 2013.

EXTERNAL AUDITOR ISA260 REPORT: IMPLEMENTATION OF 2011/12 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Corporate Governance Panel has noted significant progress to date to implement the recommendations of the Council's External Auditor, PricewaterhouseCoopers, following the audit of the 2011/2012 Statement of Accounts.

HUNTINGDONSHIRE LOCAL PLAN TO 2036 STAGE 3 DRAFT LOCAL PLAN, CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

The Cabinet has received an update on the new Huntingdonshire Local Plan.

Having been satisfied that local residents will be encouraged to become involved in the consultation process, Executive Councillors have authorised Officers to proceed to stage 3, the non-statutory consultation stage.

Members' attention was drawn to the impact of the National Planning Policy Framework which has led to the Development Management Plan Document carrying less weight in the Development Management process. As a result, the Cabinet has endorsed the use of the emerging Draft Local Plan policies when considering planning applications.

REVIEW OF 'LOCAL LIST' APPLICATION VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS

The Development Management Panel has endorsed a proposal to undertake consultation with the local community (including agents and town and parish councils) as part of a review of the information necessary to validate a planning application. The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No 3) Order 2012 requires that an up to date validation criteria needs to be in place by 31st July and reviewed and republished at 2 yearly intervals thereafter. The existing criteria will be used as the basis for consultation although the Panel has already recognised the amendments which will need to be made to this to remove reference to Planning Policy Guidance Notes, Planning Policy Statements and Regional Strategies. It is expected that the new check list will refer to policies on town centres, transport, open space, flood risk and heritage issues. The outcome of the consultation will be reported to the July meeting.

REVIEW OF PRE APPLICATION ADVICE PROCEDURES

Following consultation with developers and agents, the Development Management Panel has approved revised procedures for the provision of pre application advice. The main changes affect charges for written advice and meetings with officers. The authority will also continue to offer the opportunity for meetings with relevant parties on major development in accordance with a range of specified charges.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRESS REPORT: 1ST JANUARY – 31ST MARCH 2013

In their review of the activities of the Development Management Service, the Panel was advised that performance against targets for the determination of minor applications had fallen slightly. However, a significant increase in income from planning fees over the quarter as a result of the submission of applications for major housing development had given the service the opportunity to advertise for two new posts to respond to these minor applications.

DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

Over two meetings the Development Management Panel has determined a total of 11 applications and included within these were applications for seventy eight dwellings at Yaxley and four wind turbines on land at St Mary's Road, Ramsey.

This page is intentionally left blank