

A meeting of the **CABINET** will be held in the **CIVIC SUITE 0.1A PATHFINDER HOUSE, ST MARY'S STREET, HUNTINGDON, PE29 3TN** on **THURSDAY, 20 JUNE 2013** at **7:00 PM** and you are requested to attend for the transaction of the following business:-

APOLOGIES


**Contact
(01480)**

1. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 4)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 16th May 2013.

**Mrs H J Taylor
388008**

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. See Notes below.

**3. TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2012/13
(Pages 5 - 18)**

By way of a report by the Assistant Director Finance, to receive the annual report on treasury management.

**S Couper
388103**

**4. MEETING OUR OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEED FOR HOUSING MEMORANDUM OF CO-OPERATION - SUPPORTING THE SPATIAL APPROACH 2011-2031
(Pages 19 - 30)**

To receive a report by the Assistant Director Environment, Growth and Planning.

**S Ingram
388400**

**5. HOME IMPROVEMENT AGENCY SHARED SERVICE REVIEW AND DISABLED FACILITIES GRANT BUDGET
(Pages 31 - 38)**

To receive a report from the Housing Strategy Manager detailing the annual operating review of the Home Improvement Agency Shared Service and an update on the Disabled Facilities Grant Budget.

**Ms J Emmerton
388203**

6. HUNTINGDONSHIRE REGULATION 123 AND INFRASTRUCTURE BUSINESS PLAN 2013/14 LIST (Pages 39 - 58)

To consider a report by the Assistant Director of Environment, Growth and Planning.

**S Ingram
388400**

7. COMMUNITY RIGHT TO CHALLENGE (Pages 59 - 64)

By way of a report by the Procurement Manager to consider a timetable for the acceptance of expressions of interest under the new Community Right to Challenge initiative.

**N Arkle
388104**

8. REPRESENTATION ON ORGANISATION 2013/14 (Pages 65 - 72)

To consider a report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services in relation to the appointment/nomination of representatives to serve on a variety of organisations.

**Mrs H J Taylor
388008**

Dated this 12 day of June 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 H Taylor, Senior Democratic Services Officer, Tel No. 01480 388008/e-mail Helen.Taylor@huntingdonshire.gov.uk /e-mail: if you have a general query on any Agenda Item, wish to tender your apologies for absence from the meeting, or would like information on any decision taken by the Cabinet.

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

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

Agenda and enclosures can be viewed on the District Council's website – www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk (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.

Agenda Item 1

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of the CABINET held in the Pathfinder House, St Mary's Street, Huntingdon, PE29 3TN on Thursday, 16 May 2013.

PRESENT: Councillor J D Ablewhite – Chairman.

Councillors B S Chapman, J A Gray,
N J Guyatt, R B Howe, T D Sanderson and
D M Tysoe.

1. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 18th April 2013 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

2. MEMBERS' INTERESTS

No declarations were received.

3. APPOINTMENT OF EXECUTIVE COUNCILLORS

RESOLVED

- (a) that executive responsibilities for the Municipal Year 2013/14 be allocated as follows:-

Strategic & Delivery Partnerships	Councillor J D Ablewhite
Strategic Planning & Housing	Councillor N J Guyatt
Healthy and Active Communities	Councillor R Howe
Environment	Councillor D M Tysoe
Resources	Councillor J A Gray
Customer Services	Councillor B S Chapman
Strategic Economic Development & Legal	Councillor T D Sanderson

- (b) that the Executive Leader of the Council be appointed to serve as an ex-officio Member of the Employment Panel; and
(c) that Executive Councillors be appointed to serve as ex officio Members of the Panels as follows:

Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning and Housing	Development Management Panel
Executive Councillor for Healthy and Active Communities	Licensing and Protection Panel/ Licensing Committee.

4. HINCHINGBROOKE COUNTRY PARK JOINT GROUP

RESOLVED

that Councillors M G Baker, Mrs M Banerjee, R Howe and R J West be appointed to serve on the Hinchingsbrooke Country Park Joint Group for the ensuing Municipal Year.

5. DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICY ADVISORY GROUP

RESOLVED

that Councillors P L E Bucknell, W T Clough, D B Dew, N J Guyatt, Mrs P Longford and A Williams be appointed to serve on the Development Plan Policy Advisory Group for the ensuing Municipal Year.

6. MEMBER DEVELOPMENT WORKING GROUP

RESOLVED

that Councillors M G Baker, S Cawley, N J Guyatt, A Hansard, P Kadewere, P Reeve and R G Tuplin be appointed to serve on the Member Development Group for the ensuing Municipal Year.

7. SAFETY ADVISORY GROUP

RESOLVED

- (a) that Councillors Mrs B Boddington, J W Davies, A Hansard, Mrs P A Jordan and T V Rogers be appointed to serve on the Safety Advisory Group for the ensuing Municipal Year; and
- (b) that the Managing Director be requested to review the Panel's remit and membership.

8. ONE LEISURE HUNTINGDON SPORTS CENTRE JOINT COMMITTEE

RESOLVED

that Councillors S Cawley, R Howe and T D Sanderson be appointed to serve on the One Leisure Huntingdon Sports Centre Joint Committee for the ensuing Municipal Year.

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

Further to Minute No 12/23 and by way of a report by the Assistant Director, Environment, Growth and Planning the Cabinet were acquainted with the content of the draft Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036, together with an initial Sustainability Appraisal (copies of both

documents are appended in the Minute Book).

The Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning and Housing reported that since the first anniversary of the National Planning Policy Framework, the current Development Management Plan Document cannot be afforded significant weight in the Development Management process. As such, Councillor Guyatt indicated that the Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) should cease to be used in the consideration of planning applications. Instead, the policies in the emerging Draft Local Plan should now be used as it would give more substance to the plan preparation process.

Having regard to the key stages and timescales for the Plan's consultation and engagement process, Members noted that a consultation leaflet would be delivered to all households in the district. Residents would be able to become involved by various methods including a consultation website or in one of the eight public "drop in" sessions being held across the district. Having stressed the importance of engaging local residents in the plan making process, the Cabinet

RESOLVED

- (a) that the use of the emerging Draft Local Plan policies for development management purposes, to supersede the previous Development Management DPD be endorsed;
- (b) that the progress made to date on preparing the new Local Plan and the anticipated next steps in the consultation and plan making process be noted; and
- (c) that Officers be authorised to proceed to Stage 3 Draft Local Plan non statutory consultation stage, using appropriate consultation material the exact content of which to be agreed by the Assistant Director (Environment, Growth and Planning) after consultation with the Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning and Housing.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

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 prior to its submission to Council.

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.

ANNEX B

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.</p> <p>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		£5m
	F1+	£5m
	F1	£4M
	Building Society with assets over £2bn in top 25 (Currently 10)	£5M
	Building Society with assets over £1bn if in top 25 (Currently 3)	£4M
	Building Society with assets under £1bn in top 25	£3M
	Liquidity (Call) Account with a credit rating of F2 or with a legal position that guarantees repayment or a Building Society.	£5M
	BUT total invested with counterparty/group shall not exceed	£8M
	Money market fund AAA Credit rating	£4m
	Limit for Non-specified investments	
	– £10M in time deposits more than one year	
	– £5M in corporate bonds	
	– £10M in any other types.	
	– £15M in total	
	Country limits	
	– UK - unlimited	
	– £5M in a country outside the EU	
	– £10M in a country within the EU (excluding UK)	
	– £20M in EU countries combined (excluding UK)	
	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.	
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

**TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2012/13
(Report by the Overview & Scrutiny Panel (Economic Wellbeing)).**

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 In accordance with the CIPFA Code of Practice, the Economic Well-Being Panel has formal responsibility for scrutinising the Council's Treasury Management. At its meeting held on 6 June 2013, the Overview & Scrutiny Panel (Economic Well-Being) considered a report by the Accountancy Manager on the Council's performance of its treasury management activities for the year ending 31 March 2013.

2. THE PANEL'S DISCUSSIONS

- 2.1 The Council's funds have performed well in 2012/13. They have significantly exceeded both the benchmark and the budgeted investment interest. This achievement is particularly noteworthy in the current economic climate. The actual net investment interest is a credit of £39,186, which is more than three times the estimated credit budget of £11,000 for the year. This is the result of higher than estimated interest rates and levels of reserves. While it might have been expected that it would be relatively easy to predict interest income from long term investments, this has not been the case because some of these investments ended during the year and new arrangements had to be made.
- 2.2 In terms of the Management of VAT, the Council's liability is reviewed annually by HMRC. The Panel has discussed whether there might be a benefit for the Council of transferring the leisure centres to a trust. The Council's VAT liability is not wholly attributable to the leisure centres as VAT is also payable on some land and property. There are other factors, which would mean there would not be a total saving of this sum, though there is the potential that it might lower the cost of VAT.
- 2.3 A number of other local authorities deal with the Co-operative Bank but the Bank is currently facing some difficulties. Attention is drawn to Annex B of the report by the Accountancy Manager, which shows that the Co-operative Bank is not one of the Council's counterparties. The counterparty list is reviewed on a monthly basis with the assistance of the Council's advisors. Annex C defines the parameters of the Council's total borrowing and investments, which safeguards the Council's investments.
- 2.4 The Treasury Management Advisory Group meets on an ad hoc basis throughout the year to monitor performance and review the Treasury Management Strategy. The kind of information it receives appears in

Annex A of the report by the Accountancy Manager. It is a commentary on the 2012/13 economic situation, which has been obtained from the Council's Treasury Advisors. There are a number of factors which might have an impact on Treasury Management in the future (for example the employment of a new Governor at the Bank of England). In the meantime, the Accountancy Manager has been asked to provide the Panel with further information on the estimated credit budget for the forthcoming year.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 The Cabinet is requested to take into consideration the views of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Economic Well-Being) as set out above when considering this item.

**COMT
OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY
CABINET**

**3rd June 2013
11th June 2013
20th June 2013**

**MEETING OUR OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEED FOR HOUSING
MEMORANDUM OF CO-OPERATION – SUPPORTING THE SPATIAL
APPROACH 2011-2031**

(Report by the Assistant Director, Environment, Growth and Planning)

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Cabinet about the joint working that has taken place, within our housing market areas, in order to enable us to appropriately assess our future housing needs.
- 1.2 This work is vital in order to ensure that we can effectively plan to meet our future additional housing needs. It also allows the Cambridgeshire, and other partner, Authorities to demonstrate that we have effectively complied with the Duty to Co-operate, as set out in the Localism Act 2011, in respect of this fundamental strategic planning issue.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF) in Paragraph 159 specifically requires that “Local Planning Authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. They should prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries.”
- 2.2 Therefore the Council, acting in respect of its role as the Local Planning Authority, has, subsequent to the withdrawal of the Regional Spatial Strategy and its inherent housing targets, to reasonably look to define its own future strategic housing targets. This robust piece of evidence based assessment work allows us to continue to undertake that task with an appropriate degree of confidence.
- 2.3 It is important to note that if we were not able to demonstrate that we were appropriately planning to meet our reasonably assessed housing needs the presumption in favour of sustainable development (as set out in NPPF Paragraph 14) would more readily apply - and that would potentially leave us open to speculative housing proposals. It has also become apparent that a number of recently submitted Local Plans have been found unsound on the basis that compliance with their duty in respect of this issue has not been demonstrated.

3. THE MEMORANDUM OF CO-OPERATION

- 3.1 Effective joint working has been taking place with all the planning authorities within our strategic housing areas, under the auspice of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Joint Strategic Planning Unit, to ensure that we can fully comply with the requirements of the NPPF.
- 3.2 That joint working has now produced a position whereby all the planning authorities within the Cambridge Sub-Region Housing Market Area,

working in collaboration with Peterborough, have been able to agree appropriate future targets for meeting our strategic housing needs.

4. CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1 The Council, acting in respect of its role as the Local Planning Authority, in order to accord with the requirements of the NPPF, now has to appropriately determine its own future housing targets. This robust piece of evidence based work allows us to do that.
- 4.2 The attached Joint Strategic Planning Unit report and the related Memorandum of Co-operation outlines the conclusions of the applicable evidence based assessments. This effective shared approach is likely to be considered to be national best practice.
- 4.3 It is important to note that the housing need assumptions which underpin the future growth proposals contained within our emerging Local Plan are in accordance with the Memorandum of Co-operation.

5. RECOMMENDATION

- 5.1 Therefore it is recommended that the Cabinet;
 - a. Notes the effective joint working that has taken place, and
 - b. Endorses the Memorandum of Co-operation.

Background Papers:

Localism Act 2011 – Duty to Co-operate - Local Planning Authorities
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/contents/enacted>

Memorandum of Co-operation – Supporting the Spatial Approach 2011-2031 – Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Strategic Planning Unit 2013
<http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/CMSWebsite/Apps/Committees/AgendaItem.aspx?agendaItemID=6847>

CONTACT OFFICER - enquiries about this report to Steve Ingram, Assistant Director, Environment, Growth and Planning on 01480 388400.

Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Joint Strategic Planning Unit

Agenda Item No: 5i)

Memorandum of Cooperation – provision of additional housing

To: Joint Strategic Planning & Transport Member Group

Date: 10th May 2013

From: Joint Strategic Planning Unit Manager

Purpose: To set out the objectively assessed need for additional housing to 2031 (and 2036) required by national planning policy to inform local plans; and to endorse formally the co-operation between authorities on the levels of provision to meet this need.

Recommendation That Members recommend to the local authorities in the Housing Market Area the level of provision of additional housing to 2031 (or 2036) based on the objectively assessed need and Duty to Co-operate, reflected in the attached joint statement.

Contact:	Name: Job Title: E-mail address: Telephone No.	John Williamson Manager, JSPU john.williamson@scambs.gov.uk 07967 543755
-----------------	---	---

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This agenda item focuses on the outputs from collaborative working between local authorities to assess future housing needs. This evidence is required by national planning policy to support local plan preparation. Collaboration in accordance with the Duty to Co-operate has taken place between all authorities in the Cambridge Housing Market Area, together with Peterborough City Council.

2. Background

- 2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local planning authorities to have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. To achieve this, they should prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries. The SHMA should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period. This is a key part of the evidence base to address the NPPF requirement of ensuring that local plans meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the Framework.
- 2.2 The Cambridge Housing Market Area includes the five Cambridgeshire districts plus Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury districts in Suffolk. Due to its historic and functional ties with Cambridgeshire, plus its own housing market area overlapping with the Cambridge Housing Market Area, Peterborough City Council has also collaborated on this work with the other local authorities.
- 2.3 These eight authorities have collaborated in recent months to meet the requirements of the NPPF. The outputs from this collaboration are a new chapter of the SHMA, which identifies the scale and mix of housing needed across the area by 2031 (and extending to 2036 for Huntingdonshire to meet its proposed local plan end date).
- 2.4 The outcome of this work is that an additional 93,000 homes are forecast to be needed across the housing market area between 2011 and 2031, as set out in the table below. An overview of the evidence from which this figure is derived will be presented under Agenda Item 4.

Objectively assessed all dwelling need 2011 to 2031

	Objectively assessed need 2011 to 2031
Cambridge	14,000
East Cambridgeshire	13,000
Fenland	12,000
Huntingdonshire	17,000 (21,000 to 2036)
South Cambridgeshire	19,000
Cambridgeshire	75,000
Forest Heath	7,000
St Edmundsbury	11,000
Housing sub-region	93,000

Source: Strategic Housing Market Assessment

3. Duty to Co-operate

- 3.1 The Localism Act 2011 places a Duty to Co-operate on local planning authorities. This requires them to engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis in the preparation of development plan documents where this involves strategic matters. National policy in the NPPF adds to this statutory duty as it expects local planning authorities to demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts.
- 3.2 As already noted, Peterborough has a functional geographic relationship with Cambridgeshire, which is reflected in a history of joint working, notably on strategic spatial planning. Peterborough is the largest urban centre within the travel to work area for the Cambridgeshire sub-region and is a major employment location with good transport links and infrastructure. It has adopted plans for the period 2009 – 2026, which include an additional 25,500 houses.
- 3.3 Under the Duty to Co-operate, the local authorities have collectively acknowledged that Peterborough, through its ambitious growth plans, has already accommodated a proportion of the housing need arising in the Cambridge Housing Market Area, amounting to approximately 2,500 homes.
- 3.4 Separately, Fenland and East Cambridgeshire District Councils have made considerable progress to date with their local plan reviews and, therefore, have established a good understanding of their areas' development opportunities and constraints. The July 2012 joint statement by Peterborough and the Cambridgeshire authorities confirmed that the 'strategy is to secure sustainable development by locating new homes in and close to Cambridge

and Peterborough and to other main centres of employment, while avoiding dispersed development’.

- 3.7 Therefore, based on this background and the co-operation between authorities, it is proposed that, in their Local Plans, provision should be made for 11,000 dwellings in Fenland and 11,500 dwellings in East Cambridgeshire, rather than the full identified need set out in the table above. This leaves 90,500 dwellings to be provided in the Cambridge Housing Market Area to ensure that the full objectively assessed need for housing in the Area will be met in forthcoming Local Plan reviews. The details of these figures are set out in the table below.

	All dwelling provision 2011 to 2031
Cambridge	14,000
East Cambridgeshire	11,500
Fenland	11,000
Huntingdonshire	17,000 (21,000 to 2036)
South Cambridgeshire	19,000
Cambridgeshire	72,500
Forest Heath	7,000
St Edmundsbury	11,000
Total	90,500

4. Recommendation

- 4.1 While this Joint Member Group has no formal decision-making powers, it is an appropriate body to endorse collectively the co-operation that has taken place between authorities. It will be for individual authorities to determine housing targets in their local plans, taking account of the requirements of national policy and local circumstances.
- 4.2 Accordingly, Members are invited to agree that the above levels of housing provision are recommended to the authorities in the Housing Market Area - reflecting the objectively assessed need and co-operation over provision - and that the attached joint statement is agreed now as a way of formally recording the co-operation that has taken place.

Appendix 1

Objectively Assessed Need for Additional Housing – Memorandum of Co-operation between the local authorities in the Cambridge Housing Market Area

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local planning authorities to have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. To achieve this, they should prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries. The SHMA should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period¹. This is a key part of the evidence base to address the NPPF requirement of ensuring that Local Plans meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the Framework².

1.2 The Localism Act 2011 places a Duty to Co-operate on local planning authorities³. This requires them to engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis in the preparation of development plan documents where this involves strategic matters. National policy in the NPPF adds to this statutory duty as it expects local planning authorities to demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts.

2.0 The Cambridge Sub-Region Housing Market Area

2.1 The Cambridge Sub Region Housing Market Area comprises all five Cambridgeshire districts (Cambridge City, East Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire, Fenland and South Cambridgeshire), plus the west Suffolk districts of Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury. Due to its historic and functional ties with Cambridgeshire, plus its own housing market area overlapping with the Cambridge Housing Market Area, Peterborough City Council has also collaborated with these local authorities.

3.0 Demonstrating the Duty to Co-operate

3.1 The seven districts within the housing market area, together with Peterborough City Council, have collaborated in recent months to meet the requirements of the NPPF set out in section 1.0. The outputs from this collaboration are a new chapter of the SHMA, which identifies the scale and mix of housing needed across the area by 2031 (and extending to 2036 for Huntingdonshire to meet its proposed local plan end date). Integral to this is a separate Technical Report, which provides an overview of the national, sub-national and local data drawn upon to inform the levels of housing need set out in the SHMA.

¹ National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 159.

² NPPF, paragraph 47.

³ Localism Act 2011, section 110.

- 3.2 The outcome of this work is that an additional 93,000 homes are forecast to be needed across the housing market area between 2011 and 2031. The table below sets out the breakdown of this total figure in more detail.

All dwelling change 2011 to 2031	
District	All dwelling change 2011 to 2031
Cambridge	14,000
East Cambridgeshire	13,000
Fenland	12,000
Huntingdonshire	17,000 (21,000 to 2036)
South Cambridgeshire	19,000
Cambridgeshire	75,000
Forest Heath	7,000
St Edmundsbury	11,000
Housing sub-region	93,000

Source: Strategic Housing Market Assessment

- 3.3 In determining housing targets in their local plans, local authorities should take account of the requirements of national policy and local circumstances.
- 3.4 In this regard, it should be noted that the Peterborough housing market area overlaps into Cambridgeshire. Peterborough is the largest urban centre within the travel to work area for the Cambridgeshire sub-region and is a major employment location with good transport links and infrastructure. On the basis of currently available figures, it has a net daily in-commute from Cambridgeshire of around 7,000 people. Peterborough has an up to date Local Plan (Core Strategy adopted in 2011 and a Site Allocations DPD adopted in 2012) with a substantial housing growth target of 25,450 between 2009-26.
- 3.5 Based on this background and engagement between all the local authorities listed in section 2.0, under the Duty to Co-operate, it is acknowledged by the authorities that Peterborough, in its up to date Local Plan, has already accommodated a proportion of the housing need arising in the Cambridge Housing Market Area, and it has been agreed that this proportion could reasonably be assumed to amount to approximately 2,500 homes (i.e. around 10% of its overall housing target).
- 3.6 Separately, Fenland and East Cambridgeshire District Councils have made considerable progress to date with their local plan reviews and, therefore, have established a good understanding of their areas' development opportunities and constraints. They have also taken account of the July 2012 joint statement by Peterborough and the Cambridgeshire authorities which confirmed that the 'strategy is to secure sustainable development by locating

new homes in and close to Cambridge and Peterborough and to other main centres of employment, while avoiding dispersed development⁴.

- 3.7 Based on all of the above, and agreement between all the local authorities working within the Duty to Co-operate, it has been agreed that, in their Local Plans, provision should be made for 11,000 dwellings in Fenland and 11,500 dwellings in East Cambridgeshire, rather than the full identified need set out in the table above.
- 3.8 Overall, and taking account of the 2,500 dwelling element of the Cambridge HMA's need already met in Peterborough's Local Plan, this leaves 90,500 dwellings to be provided in the Cambridge HMA to ensure that the full objectively assessed need for housing in the Cambridge HMA will be met in forthcoming Local Plan reviews. The level of provision to be made by district is set out in the table below.

All dwelling provision 2011 to 2031

District	All dwelling provision 2011 to 2031
Cambridge	14,000
East Cambridgeshire	11,500
Fenland	11,000
Huntingdonshire	17,000 (21,000 to 2036)
South Cambridgeshire	19,000
Cambridgeshire	72,500
Forest Heath	7,000
St Edmundsbury	11,000
Total	90,500

4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1 The purpose of this memorandum is formally to record and make public the local authorities' agreement under the Duty to Cooperate to the position as set out in this Memorandum, subject to ratification by their full Council as part of their individual Local Plan preparation.
- 4.2 The eight authorities that form signatories to this memorandum agree, therefore, that the figures in the table above (and taking account of provision already met within Peterborough) represent the agreed level of provision by district in order to meet the overall identified need for additional housing within the Cambridge Sub Region Housing Market Area.

⁴ Joint Statement on the Development Strategy for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough by the local authorities, July 2012.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MEETING OUR OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEED FOR HOUSING: MEMORANDUM OF
CO-OPERATION – SUPPORTING THE SPATIAL APPROACH 2011-2031
(Report by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being))**

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 At its meeting held on 11th June 2013, the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Environmental Well-Being) considered a report by the Assistant Director for Environment, Growth and Planning on the joint work that has taken place which has enabled the Council appropriately to assess the District's future housing needs.

2. THE PANEL'S DISCUSSIONS

2.1 The Memorandum of Co-operation refers to the Council's joint working with other Partner authorities in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to assess each authority's future housing needs. The Council can now set its own future housing targets, which is a requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework. This work has been undertaken to comply with the Duty to Co-operate contained in the Localism Act 2011.

2.2 There will be a need for 93,000 homes across the Cambridge Sub-Region Housing Market Area between 2011 and 2031. Peterborough's housing market area overlaps into Cambridgeshire, and as Peterborough has already accommodated a proportion of the housing need, its contribution is assumed to amount to approximately 2,500 homes. This means that 90,500 dwellings are required in the Cambridge Sub-Region Housing Market Area, with Huntingdonshire contributing 17,000 homes by 2031 and 21,000 homes by 2036. In Huntingdonshire 10,000 of these homes will roll forward from the former Core Strategy and there are currently planning applications for around 11,000 dwellings within the planning system. It is, therefore, expected that the 21,000 homes allocation for Huntingdonshire will be achieved by 2036.

2.3 The Planning Service Manager (Policy) has confirmed that the housing need assumptions which underpin the future growth proposals contained within the emerging Local Plan are in accordance with the Memorandum of Co-operation.

2.4 Huntingdonshire is the only authority to identify housing allocations up to 2036 because it already had a Local Plan in place to 2026 and there is a requirement that the new Plan will last for at least a further 15 years. The District's housing needs have, therefore, been forecast for the period to 2036.

2.5 Having been advised of the methodology employed to determine allocations across each local authority area and of the factors that are likely to produce an increase in demand for housing including fluctuations in birth rates, the ageing population and local economic pressures, the Panel has noted that the Council collaborates with Partner authorities on other infrastructure issues such as local bus services and the rail network.

2.6 The Panel has endorsed the recommendations contained within the report by the Assistant Director for Environment, Growth and Planning.

3. RECOMMENDATION

3.1 The Cabinet is invited to take into account the views of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Environmental Well-Being) as part of its deliberations on the report by the Assistant Director for Environment, Growth and Planning.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Minutes and Reports of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Environmental Well-Being) held on 11th June 2013.

Contact Officer: Miss H Ali, Democratic Services Officer
☎ 01480 388006
✉ Habbiba.Ali@huntingdonshire.gov.uk

**OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL
(SOCIAL WELL BEING)**

04 JUNE 2013

CABINET

20 JUNE 2013

**HOME IMPROVEMENT AGENCY SHARED SERVICE REVIEW
AND DISABLED FACILITIES GRANT BUDGET
(Report by the Housing Strategy Manager)**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report provides Members with a progress review of the Home Improvement Agency (HIA) shared service following one year of operation. The report also considers the ongoing demand for Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs).

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 The HIA shared service was developed during 2011/12 in partnership with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. The new HIA is called 'Cambs HIA' and went 'live' on 1st April 2012.

- 2.2 Cambs HIA is a partnership based shared service with staff being employed by Cambridge City Council, their main office being located within South Cambridgeshire's offices in Cambourne (with hot desking at other locations) and with the IT systems and support being provided by this Council.

- 2.3 One of the main aims of the Cambs HIA is to help people live independently by helping them to access DFGs. The Housing Grants, Construction and Regeneration Act 1996 sets out the Council's duties to provide DFGs. The Council must award a DFG for work to achieve one or more of a set of purposes defined by statute. DFGs are awarded on the recommendation of an Occupational Therapist (OT) and fund aids and adaptations like ramps, stair lifts and level access showers. The maximum DFG is £30k and DFGs for adults are subject to a means test. DFGs for children are not means tested. The Council must be satisfied that a DFG is necessary and appropriate and that to carry it out is reasonable and practicable. At the current time, the responsibility for validating and approving DFGs sits with the Strategic Housing Service at this Council.

- 2.4 DFGs form part of a wider strategic approach to helping improve the health and well being of people in Huntingdonshire. Along with other low level interventions, DFGs can enable elderly and disabled people to live independently and help to avoid emergency hospital admissions and inappropriate and expensive care placements. DFGs are therefore a 'preventative' service and help to implement the aims of the countywide Health and Well Being Strategy.

- 2.5 Members have previously been concerned about waiting times for OT assessments in the district. The OT service remains the responsibility of the County and not the District Council. OT waiting times have been reduced from 8 months in March 2012 to 4 months in March 2013. The monitoring statistics also demonstrate that the waiting

times in Huntingdonshire have been brought into line with the rest of the County so at the current time, equity has been achieved.

- 2.6 As a result of the waiting times in the OT service, in March 2013, there were 73 adult cases and 77 children's cases awaiting OT assessment. These cases contribute to the 'backlog' referred to at paragraph 4.3.
- 2.7 The OT service is currently provided by Cambridgeshire Community Services (CCS). As CCS did not receive 'Foundation Status' it is being disbanded and the options for the future of CCS's services, including the OT service, are currently being appraised. Inevitably, any organisational change may cause short term disruption to services and this may affect the forecasts presented in this report.

3. CAMBS HIA - REVIEW AFTER ONE YEAR OF OPERATION

- 3.1 When considering progress against agreed objectives, it is important to understand the challenges involved in forming a shared service. The focus in the first year has been on integrating the team and establishing new shared IT and working procedures. A key learning point is that combining three services into one is a huge challenge and was perhaps underestimated. There was therefore a slower start than had been hoped for, but the team is now in place and working together with a professional and businesslike approach.

- 3.2 When the HIA was formed, a number of key objectives were agreed. Progress on each of these is set out below:

Deliver cost savings over time for both district and county commissioners.

- 3.3 The savings identified for the Council of moving to a shared service were anticipated to be minimal, if any, in the first two years. The HIA's Year 1 budget included two issues that should not affect future year's budgets. These were:

1. the impact of the 'clawback' agreement whereby the HIA paid back to each Council the sum that reflected the casework that was partly completed at the time the HIA 'went live'. For HDC, this amounted to £70k.
2. The HIA's earned fee income was low in the first two quarters as a result of the dip in productivity (and therefore fee income) whilst the HIA established itself.

- 3.4 As a result of these issues, the HIA costs exceeded income by £71k, and HDC contributed £35k to the deficit under the pre-agreed cost-sharing agreement. In common with all fee-earning businesses, issue 2. above remains a risk to the HIA. That said, assuming predicted levels of workload are completed in 2013/14, this year's budget predicts a surplus which will be shared, proportionate to workload, between the three Councils in the partnership.

- 3.5 Despite the budget issues set out above, the actual operational costs of the shared service in Year 1 have been less than the operational costs of three separate HIAs. The most obvious saving relates to the reduction in HIA Managers. Other indirect savings relate to office accommodation and back office support services. These savings are

not immediately cashable but they will inevitably contribute towards efficiency savings over time.

- 3.6 There is further scope for improving efficiencies arising from the ability to bulk purchase aids and adaptations across the HIA area. This forms a work stream for the HIA Management Board in Year 2.

Improve operational resilience and opportunities for cross boundary working.

- 3.7 The new team is now fully operational as a single service with a shared IT system. Staff capacity is being used flexibly across the district boundaries and increased caseloads have been accommodated, particularly in Huntingdonshire.

- 3.8 An evaluation of the caseload management and throughput reveals a need to increase the staffing resources that are deployed to manage the workload in Huntingdonshire. An additional Surveyor has been recruited to focus on Huntingdonshire and bring the caseload up to date.

- 3.9 The objective to improve resilience and work across boundaries has therefore been met.

Provide a platform for improved performance and efficiency over time.

- 3.10 The HIA experienced some early issues relating to the integration of IT systems across the three teams and ensuring staff were fully trained on the use of them (including paperless processes). However a fully integrated shared data system now operates between Cambs HIA and the three Councils' grants officers and has been positively received.

- 3.11 Joint working with Occupational Therapists (OTs) has started e.g. the establishment of a shared DFG leaflet and simplified procedures. More joint working and further improvements with OTs are planned.

- 3.12 The platform for improved performance and efficiency has therefore been established.

- 3.13 The Cambs HIA Management Board (of which we are a partner), has agreed the Business Plan for the next year. The work plan for 2013/14 includes:

- Further consolidation of the service currently delivered, including a review of staffing structures and caseloads
- A review of contractor lists and procurement of works to deliver greater efficiencies
- Increasing fee income and effective use of resources
- Improved marketing and developing a marketing strategy
- Holding the first annual public stakeholder event
- Considering opportunities to broaden the service and to deliver additional services i.e. handyperson.

4.0 REVIEW OF DEMAND FOR CAPITAL GRANT FOR DFGs

- 4.1 Demand for DFG remains strong in Huntingdonshire for a number of reasons including people's aspirations to live at home for longer, an increase in DFGs for children, increased longevity, and an overall increase in the number of older people in the district. Office for National Statistics projections show that the proportion of people aged over 65 in the district is predicted to increase from 16% of our population in 2011 (27,700 people) to 21% of our population by 2021 (38,300 people). Therefore long term demand for DFG and other services that support older people, is expected to continue to grow.
- 4.2 A review modelling demand for DFG has been carried out and it is estimated that 30 new OT referrals will be received each month. Approximately 70% of these proceed to a DFG. The average DFG costs £5.8k. Therefore the need for DFG in an average year is estimated to be £1,400k. Obviously if any of the variables stated above change, then demand for DFG could increase or decrease accordingly.
- 4.3 When the new HIA was formed it took time to get up to full operational capacity. As a result, a backlog of cases has built up and in May there were 124 cases being progressed through to approval. When the HIA was in-house, we would have expected an active caseload of about 90. Additionally, there are 150 cases at the OT service awaiting assessment (see paragraph 2.6). The speed at which these can be progressed is uncertain, partly because of the organisational changes affecting the OT service (see paragraph 2.7). Referrals rates will therefore need to be closely monitored over the coming months.
- 4.4 In order that we could be in a strong position to address any backlog of cases at the HIA and OT service, an additional £500k was incorporated into the MTP in 2013/14. This forward thinking will give the HIA the budget flexibility to potentially complete about 90 more DFGs than we would anticipate in a 'normal' year. Cambs HIA are confident they can manage the increase in workload in 2013/14 due to the increased staffing resources detailed at paragraph 3.8.
- 4.5 Service delivery rates over recent years, plus a prediction for this year is as follows:

	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14 Predicted DFGs generated in year	2013/14 Additional DFG to cover increased demand from backlog
No. DFGs completed	179	284	261	189	Approx 250	Approx 90
Total spend on DFGs	£970k	£1,480k	£1,600k	£1,200k	£1,450k	£520k

4.6 The DFG budget, in the Council's MTP is as follows:

	2013/14 MTP	2013/14 Updated with actuals	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17
Assumption on contribution from central Government	£400k	£456k	£400k	£400k	£400k
HDC contribution	£1,550k	£1,494k	£1,250k	£1,250k	£1,250k
Total DFG budget	£1,950k		£1,650k	£1,650k	£1,650k

4.7 After the backlog is reduced, and assuming the variables set out at paragraph 4.2 hold true, then a DFG budget in the region of £1,400k could be required in future years. Demand for DFG will continue to be monitored and longer term trends will be identified over the summer to feed into the Council's MTP process in September.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.1 To date, Cambs HIA has been successful. There have been issues relating to staffing and IT which resulted in reduced throughput of DFGs in the first half of 2012/13. These have now been addressed and the HIA is operating effectively. The objectives which were set when the shared service was established have been achieved, or the foundations have been laid for achievement of them over time.

5.2 The Council's MTP budget for DFG is appropriate to manage the current demand placed upon it. The increased budget in 2013/14 provides the budgetary flexibility for the HIA to reduce the backlog of cases. Thereafter it is anticipated that OT referrals and DFG completions could return to the levels set out at paragraph 4.2.

5.3 Further work will be done over the summer to monitor OT referrals and work flow, and predict future trends. This will feed into the Council's MTP process in September 2013.

6. RECOMMENDATION

6.1 It is recommended that:

- Overview & Scrutiny (Social Well Being), and Cabinet note this report;
- additional modelling of current and future demand is undertaken over the summer to feed into the Council's MTP process in September 2013; and
- that a further report is brought to Members after two years of Cambs HIA operation.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- Overview & Scrutiny Panel Report - 06 Sept 2011 – Shared HIA Services
<http://applications.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=10103&MId=4415&Ver=4>
- The Housing, Grants, Construction and Regeneration Act 1996
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1996/53/contents>
- Cambridgeshire Health and Well Being Strategy 2012-17
<http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/NR/ronlyres/15D48C47-A6F7-4C35-B540-F0FA5168D988/0/CambridgeshireHealthWellbeingStrategy20122017.pdf>

**Contact Officers: Trish Reed, Housing Strategy Manager
Jo Emmerton, Lead Housing Strategy Manager,
01480 388203**

**HOME IMPROVEMENT AGENCY SHARED SERVICE REVIEW AND DISABLED
FACILITIES GRANT BUDGET
(Report by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being))**

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 At its meeting held on 4th June 2013, the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) considered a report by the Housing Strategy Manager detailing the outcome of a review of the Home Improvement Agency (HIA) shared service following one year of its operation and the ongoing demand for Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs).
- 1.2 The Deputy Executive Leader was in attendance at the meeting, together with Councillor T V Rogers. This report summarises the Panel's discussions.

2. THE PANEL'S DISCUSSIONS

- 2.1 The HIA is the Council's first shared service. Whilst some problems have been experienced in the first 6 months, the service currently is operating as intended and has since exceeded expectations. The Council has made a commitment to meet demand for DFGs but there are considerable difficulties in forecasting future levels of demand and the financial impact upon the Council.
- 2.2 DFGs are only awarded for adaptation works in excess of £1,000. Significant progress has been made against the HIA's agreed key objectives and further development work is planned over the course of the ensuing year. Attempts will be made to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the service; for example, by introducing competitive tendering for equipment and the procurement of adaptation works from local businesses.
- 2.3 Waiting times for Occupational Therapists (OT) have successfully been reduced from eight months in March 2012 to four months in March 2013. Despite the improvements made to reduce OT waiting times, the Panel is keen to see further reductions in the future. Four months is likely to appear to applicants to be a significant time to wait. The HIA Manager intends to prioritise further improving these times. In addition, there is some concern over the impending dissolution of Cambridgeshire Community Services and future OT service provision. Meetings are being held with relevant parties to address this issue.
- 2.4 On a related matter, clarification has been received that the additional Surveyor recruited to assist with the current backlog of casework in Huntingdonshire has been appointed on a temporary contract.
- 2.5 The Panel has discussed a number of matters including the feedback received from clients who have had works carried out on their homes, which reveals very high levels of satisfaction with the service they have received. Members have also considered a suggestion that homeowners might be encouraged to utilise the value of their properties as a means of funding adaptations in the future, the reasons why only 70% of DFG applications are fully completed, the point at which OT assessments are undertaken, the charges placed on properties where

owner occupiers receive a DFG in excess of £10,000 for adaptations relating to garage or outbuilding conversions and/or extensions and the point in the process at which applicants are means tested. On the latter, the Panel has expressed the view that means testing should take place at the start of the process so that works are not undertaken on cases that do not proceed because the applicant is not eligible for assistance.

2.6 With regard to the DFG budget, clarification has been received that “HIA earned fee income” refers to the 10% of the capital grant that the Council pays to the HIA for running the service. Comment has been made upon the need for the Council to review its commitment to financing DFG adaptations in the future. It has also been suggested that the budget forecast should be reviewed to reflect a more realistic view of demand. Past trends show a continuous increase in demand and, given projected demographic changes, this increase is likely to continue in the future.

2.7 A review of contractor lists will be undertaken in 2013/14. It is suggested that the option of establishing an in-house service to carry out adaptation works should be explored.

2.8 The Panel has endorsed the recommendations contained within the report by the Housing Strategy Manager.

3. RECOMMENDATION

3.1 The Cabinet is invited to take into account the views of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) as part of its deliberations on the report by the Housing Strategy Manager.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Minutes and Reports of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) held on 4th June 2013.

Contact Officer: Miss H Ali, Democratic Services Officer
☎ 01480 388006
✉ Habbiba.Ali@huntingdonshire.gov.uk

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
- http://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/SiteCollectionDocuments/HDCCMS/Documents/Planning%20Documents/PDF%20Documents/Local%20Development%20Framework/core_strategy_final.pdf
- CIL Examination documents, which can be found on the HDC website at <http://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/Planning/Community%20Infrastructure%20Levy/Pages/CommunityInfrastructureLevyExamination.aspx>
- Draft Regulation 123 List

- http://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/SiteCollectionDocuments/HDCCMS/Documents/Planning%20Documents/PDF%20Documents/Local%20Development%20Framework/Draft%20Reg%20123%20List%202013_14.pdf
-
- Huntingdonshire Infrastructure Business plan
 - http://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/SiteCollectionDocuments/HDCCMS/Documents/Planning%20Documents/PDF%20Documents/Local%20Development%20Framework/Infrastructure%20Business%20Plan%202013_14.pdf

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

Representations on the Draft Huntingdonshire CIL Regulation 123 List

42

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. • <u>Section 3, Table 3.1</u> 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.	

This page is intentionally left blank

**HUNTINGDONSHIRE REGULATION 123 AND INFRASTRUCTURE BUSINESS
PLAN 2013/14
(Report by the Overview & Scrutiny (Economic Well-Being))**

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 At its meeting held on 6 June 2013, the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Economic Well-Being) has received an update on the outcome of the public consultation on the Draft Huntingdonshire CIL Regulation 123 List. The List sets out the infrastructure that will be funded in whole or in part by the Community Infrastructure Levy to ensure that there is no duplication between CIL and S106 Contributions. This report summarises the Panel's discussions.

2. THE PANEL'S DELIBERATIONS

- 2.1 The Government continues to change the regulations surrounding the Levy. Specifically, it is considering proposals to exempt self-build properties from Levy. The Deputy Executive Leader has responded to the Government's consultation on this proposal on the basis that this should not be permitted because small sites constitute a significant proportion of development within the District, which would make delivering strategic infrastructure more difficult. Furthermore, it could create a mechanism through which CIL might be avoided and it could affect the meaningful proportion (of 15 -20%) which is allocated to Town and Parish Councils.
- 2.2 The preparation of an Infrastructure Business Plan for 2013/14 is the first stage of a much longer process. The Plan will present a long term vision, which will be updated on an annual basis. Work has already started on the next iteration of the Business Plan and one of the major challenges will be to find alternative sources of funding to address the gap in funding for strategic infrastructure. The fact that a number responses to the consultation were made before the announcement of proposals for the new Local Plan should not cause a problem because the Business Plan will be updated.
- 2.3 Work is also needed to develop the way in which the District Council works with Town and Parish Councils on how their contributions will be spent. This process has now started. A series of briefings for parish and town council have already been held and the Planning Policy Manager has attended a number of Parish Council meetings to talk about the way in which this might move forward parishes to achieve a shared priority. Members have welcomed the dialogue which has been opened with Parish Councils, particularly in view of the concerns which they have previously expressed about the absence within the CIL governance structure of local community representatives.
- 2.3 In considering the contents of the report and having acknowledged that the District Council will be the collecting body for CIL expenditure, Members have stressed the need for there to be an audit trail for how CIL money is

distributed and spent. The Panel has been assured that Partner agencies will be required to provide details of how the funds are spent. Although Town and Parish Councils will have the autonomy to spend their contributions in the way in which they see fit, they will be required to provide an audit trail. Monies will be paid to Parish Councils in line with the phasing of developments.

- 2.4 A comment has been made by a Member that infrastructure negotiated by communities through already existing Urban Design Frameworks might not now be delivered. It is not possible to give guarantees, but best endeavours will be made to meet the commitments already made.
- 2.5 Having been informed that developments of 200 dwellings or more will be liable to pay both S106 contributions and CIL, the Panel has drawn attention to the importance of ensuring there are strict governance arrangements in place to avoid any inferences of bribery.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 The Cabinet is invited to
 - (a) consider the discussions of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Economic Well-Being) as part of their deliberations on this item; and
 - (b) approve the revised Regulation 123 List incorporating the Huntingdonshire Infrastructure Business Plan 2013/14.

Contact Officer: **A Roberts, Scrutiny & Review Manager**
☎ **01480 388015**
✉ Anthony.Roberts@huntingdonshire.gov.uk

Chief Officer's Management Team
Cabinet

10 May 2013
20 June 2013

Community Right To Challenge Report by the Procurement Manager

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Localism Act 2011 introduced a right for defined organisations and persons to submit an Expression of Interest in taking over the provision of a service on behalf of the Council. Where a valid expression of interest is received, the Council is required to undertake a procurement exercise for that service, which may lead to the Council awarding a contract for the provision of that service.
- 1.2 A report to Cabinet on 18th October recommended the arrangements which the Council should adopt in order to operate the new Community Right to Challenge and required the production of a timetable for the acceptance of expressions of interest. This report details that timetable (attached at Annex A) and explains its development.

2. TIMETABLE

- 2.1 Valid expressions of interest would generate significant workload in both the procurement exercise (which in most cases would be sufficiently large as to require a formal EU procurement process) and the preparation of an in-house bid submission. The regulations allow us to spread the potential workload by publishing a timetable whereby Community proposals would not be accepted at other times.
- 2.2 A timetable has been developed in consultation with Heads of Service, which considered:
- ◆ A logical grouping of activities to fit with the structure of the Service.
 - ◆ The number of staff likely to be affected by TUPE.
 - ◆ The current cost which determine which procurement thresholds apply.
 - ◆ Major contracts where complexity/dependencies would impact on the procurement exercise.
 - ◆ Potential organisational restructuring.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet note the content of this report and the

timetable attached as Annex A.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

- ◆ Sections 81 - 86 of the Localism Act 2011
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/part/5/chapter/2/enacted>
- ◆ The Community Right to Challenge (Expressions of Interest and Excluded Services) (England) Regulations 2012 [SI 2012 No. 1313]
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/1313/made>
- ◆ The Community Right to Challenge (Fire Services and Rejection of Expressions of Interest) (England) Regulations 2012 [SI 2012 No. 1647 - DCLG Statutory Guidance
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/community-right-to-challenge-statutory-guidance>

Contact Officer: Nigel Arkle,

Procurement Manager, ☎ 01480 388104

Community Right to Challenge – Timetable

Notes:

- (1) Expressions of Interest may be submitted at any point during the calendar month.
- (2) Except where the relevant body is permitted additional time in accordance with the Act the procurement exercise will start within a month after the acceptance of a valid expression of interest.

Month/ Year	Service	Section	Activity
	Service Management Division	Operations & Development	Work operations & development.
Jul 13	Corporate Office		Communications, policy & support, economic development & industrial estates.
	Financial Services	Accountancy	Accountancy & income
Sep 13	Environmental Management	Environmental Team	Energy efficiency projects
Oct 13	Legal & Democratic Services	Democratic Services & Scrutiny	Elections / Committee support
Nov 13	Customer Services	Customer Service Centre	Front of house.
Jan 14	Environmental and Community Health Services	Community Health	Animal welfare & pest control team
Mar 14	Operations Division	Operations	Vehicle workshop
May 14	Customer Services	Fraud Team	Fraud Investigation
Jul 14	Legal & Democratic Services	Elections & Land charges	
Sep 14	Legal & Democratic Services	Legal Services	Legal Support
Oct 14	Environment, Growth & Planning	Housing Strategy	Housing Strategy
Dec 14	Environmental Management	Facilities	Facilities, janitorial, caretakers
Feb 15	Operations Division	Countryside	Countryside parks
Apr 15	Operations Division	CCTV	CCTV
May 15	Environmental & Community Health Services	Community Safety	Community Safety

Month/ Year	Service	Section	Activity
Sep 15	Environmental Management	Projects	Projects & Asset Management
Nov 15	Customer Services	Benefits	Benefits administration
Dec 15	One Leisure	5 Leisure centres	Operation of Leisure centres
Jan 16	Legal & Democratic Services	Document Centre	Print & design; post handling
Mar 16	Operations Division	Green Spaces	Green spaces
Apr 16	Environmental & Community Health Services	Commercial	'Food Safety' & 'Health and Safety' enforcement
May 16	Environment, Growth & Planning Services	Planning Dev Man	Development Management
Jul 16	Customer Services	Local Tax	Council Tax, NNDR, Recovery
Sep 16	One Leisure	Call centre	Customer Bookings & services
Oct 16	Operations Division	Operations	Refuse & Recycling
Nov 16	Environment Management	Building Control	Building Control
Jan 17	Operations Division	Street-scene	Street Rangers
Feb 17	Environmental & Community Health Services	Neighbourhoods	Nuisance abatement, planning/development advice, private sector housing standards
Mar 17	Environment, Growth & Planning	Planning services	Policy
Apr 17	Customer Services	Call Centre	Call handling / queries / payments
May 17	Operations Division	Street-scene	Markets
	Environmental & Community Health Services	Environmental Protection	Nuisance monitoring & abatement; contaminated land remediation.

Annex A

Jun 17	Financial Services	Audit/Procurement	Audit, risk management & insurance. Procurement
Jun 17	Customer Services	Housing	Housing Register, Homelessness, advice & options

CABINET

20th JUNE 2013

REPRESENTATION ON ORGANISATIONS (Report by the Head of Legal & Democratic Services)

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Council's representation on a variety of organisations and partnerships is reviewed annually. Listed in the attached schedule are those organisations/partnerships to which the Council appoints representatives for 2013/14: Part 1 refers to partnerships and Part 2 to general external bodies/groups.
- 1.2 A rolling review of partnerships – primarily to ensure that they have appropriate governance and contribute to Council or community objectives – is in place. For appointments to organisations, following the review of the Council's democratic structure a number of changes have been introduced including cross party consultation and the compilation of additional information from organisations as to their aims and any implications of representation. External organisations are requested also to provide an induction process for newly appointed members.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The Cabinet are therefore invited to make their nominations were required to the organisations referred to in the schedule appended hereto.
- 2.2 In the event that changes or new appointments are required to the District Council's representation during the course of the year, the Head of Legal and Democratic Services, after consultation with the Deputy Executive Leader, be authorised to nominate alternative representatives as necessary.

Contact Officer: Helen Taylor, Senior Democratic Services Officer
(01480) 388008

This page is intentionally left blank

PROPOSED REPRESENTATION ON ORGANISATIONS 2013/14

Part 1

PARTNERSHIPS	Nominating/ Appointing Panel	Approx No. of Meetings Per Annum	Allowance Payable S – Subsistence T - Travelling	Representative(s) 2012/2013	Proposed Representative(s) 2013/2014	HDC Contact Officer
Cambridgeshire Health and Well-Being Board	Cabinet			None	Cllr R J West	Head of Environmental and Community Health Services ☎ 388280
Cambridgeshire Horizons	Cabinet		S&T	Cllr N J Guyatt	Cllr N J Guyatt	Managing Director (Communities, Partnerships and Projects) ☎ 388301
Cambridgeshire Older People's Partnership Board	Cabinet	4	S & T	Cllr R West	Cllr R West	Housing Strategy Manager ☎ 388203
Cambridgeshire Community Safety Strategic Board (subject to review)	Cabinet	3/4		Cllr T D Sanderson	Cllr R Howe	Head of Environmental and Community Health Services ☎ 388280
Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel	Cabinet	5	S & T	Councillor J D Ablewhite and Councillor S Criswell (Substitute)	Councillor J D Ablewhite and Councillor S Criswell (Substitute)	Managing Director (Communities, Partnerships and Projects) ☎ 388301
Consultation on Treasury Matters (Treasury Management Group)	Cabinet			Cllrs J D Ablewhite, J A Gray, N J Guyatt and T V Rogers	Cllrs J D Ablewhite, J A Gray, N J Guyatt and T V Rogers	Head of Financial Services ☎ 388103
East of England Local Government Association	Cabinet	4/5		Cllr J D Ablewhite	Cllr J D Ablewhite	PA to the Executive Leader ☎ 388002
Great Fen Project Steering Committee	Cabinet	11	S & T	Cllr D B Dew and Mr S Ingram	Cllr D B Dew and Mr S Ingram	Head of Planning and Housing Strategy ☎ 388400

PARTNERSHIPS	Nominating/ Appointing Panel	Approx No. of Meetings Per Annum	Allowance Payable S – Subsistence T - Travelling	Representative(s) 2012/2013	Proposed Representative(s) 2013/2014	HDC Contact Officer
Huntingdonshire Local Strategic Partnership – Children and Young People	Cabinet	4	S & T	Cllr T D Sanderson	Cllr R Howe	Corporate Team Manager ☎ 388263
Growth & Infrastructure		4		Cllr N J Guyatt	Cllr N J Guyatt	Head of Planning Services ☎ 388400
Health and Well-Being		4		Cllr T D Sanderson	Cllr R Howe	Head of Environmental and Community Health Services ☎ 388280
Huntingdonshire Community Safety Partnership		6		Cllr T D Sanderson	Cllr R Howe	Head of Environmental and Community Health Services ☎ 388280
Huntingdonshire Strategic Partnership Board	Cabinet	4/5 various locations – hosted by main partners	S & T	Cllrs J D Ablewhite and N J Guyatt	Cllrs J D Ablewhite and N J Guyatt	Corporate Team Manager ☎ 388263
Joint Strategic Planning Member Board	Cabinet	6	S & T	Cllr J D Ablewhite, N J Guyatt and M Shellens	Cllr J D Ablewhite, N J Guyatt and M Shellens	Managing Director (Communities, Partnerships and Projects) ☎ 388301
Local Area Agreement Board for Cambridgeshire	Cabinet	6	S & T	Leader of the Council	Leader of the Council	Managing Director (Communities, Partnerships and Projects) ☎ 388301
Neighbourhood Management Group - Eynesbury	Cabinet	6	S & T	Cllr A Hansard	Cllr A Hansard	Community Health Manager ☎ 388377
North Huntingdon (including the Oxmoor SRB Project Area and additional targeted areas in the North & East Huntingdon)		6	S & T	Cllrs P Kadewere and A Mckender- Lawrence	Cllrs P Kadewere and A Mckender-Lawrence	Community Health Manager ☎ 388377
Recycling in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Board (formerly Waste Management and Environment Forum)	Cabinet	6	S & T	Cllr D M Tysoe	Cllr D M Tysoe	Head of Operations ☎ 388635

Part 2

ORGANISATION	Nominating/ Appointing Panel	Approx No. of Meetings Per Annum	Allowance Payable S – Subsistence T - Travelling	Representative(s) 2012/2013	Proposed Representative(s) 2013/2014	HDC Contact Officer
Cambridgeshire Chambers of Commerce – Huntingdonshire Area	Cabinet	12 (1 st Wed of every month at 8.30am)	S & T	Cllr J D Ablewhite	Cllr T D Sanderson	Corporate Team Manager ☎ 388263
Cambridgeshire Armed Forces Community Covenant Board	Cabinet	4	S & T	Cllr R Harrison	Cllr R Harrison	Managing Director (Communities, Partnerships and Projects) ☎ 388301
Cromwell Museum Management Cttee	Cabinet	2	S & T	Cllrs M G Baker and Mr J Morgan	Cllrs M G Baker and Mr J Morgan	Senior Democratic Services Officer ☎ 388008
Domestic Homicide Review Panel	Cabinet	Meets as and when not a permanent panel	S & T	Cllrs C R Hyams and D B Dew	Cllrs C R Hyams and D B Dew	Head of Environmental and Community Health Services ☎ 388280
Envar Ltd, St Ives Composting Facility – Site Liaison Forum	Cabinet	1	S & T	Cllr G J Bull	Cllr G J Bull	Head of Environmental and Community Health Services ☎ 388280
Fenland Association of Community Transport	Cabinet		S & T	Cllr Ms L Kadić	Cllr Ms L Kadić	Transport Team Leader ☎ 388387
Huntingdon Business Against Crime	Cabinet	20	S & T	Cllr Mackender- Lawrence	Cllr Mackender-Lawrence	Head of Environmental and Community Health Services ☎ 388280
Huntingdon Freeman's' Trust	Cabinet	12	S & T	Mr J D Fell	Mr J D Fell	Senior Democratic Services Officer ☎ 388008
Huntingdonshire Flood Forum	Cabinet	2	S & T	Cllr D M Tysoe	Cllr D M Tysoe	Project and Assets Manager ☎ 388380
Huntingdonshire Volunteer Centre - District	Cabinet	3 & AGM	S & T	Cllr D Harty/ Mr L M Simpson	Cllr D Harty/ Mr L M Simpson	Community Health Manager ☎ 388377
.....				

ORGANISATION	Nominating/ Appointing Panel	Approx No. of Meetings Per Annum	Allowance Payable S – Subsistence T - Travelling	Representative(s) 2012/2013	Proposed Representative(s) 2013/2014	HDC Contact Officer
Internal Drainage Boards – Alconbury and Ellington	Cabinet	4	S & T	Cllrs K M Baker, M G Baker, Messrs C Allen, E K Heads and L M Simpson	Cllrs K M Baker, M G Baker, Messrs C Allen, E K Heads and L M Simpson	Project and Assets Manager ☎ 388380
Benwick		2	S & T	Mr P Lummis	Mr P Lummis	Project and Assets Manager ☎ 388380
Bluntisham		2	S & T	Mr P Lummis	Mr P Lummis	Project and Assets Manager ☎ 388380
Conington and Holme		½	S & T	Cllr P G Mitchell and Mr J S Watt together with Mr C Allen	Cllr P G Mitchell and Mr J S Watt together with Mr C Allen	Project and Assets Manager ☎ 388380
Ramsey First (Hollow)		2	S & T	Mr N Orr	Mr N Orr	Project and Assets Manager ☎ 388380
Ramsey Fourth (Middle Moor)		2	S & T	Mr P A Swales and Mr N Orr	Mr N Orr	Project and Assets Manager ☎ 388380
Ramsey, Upwood and Great Raveley		4	S & T	Cllr P L E Bucknell, Mr P A Swales and Mr C Allen	Cllr P L E Bucknell and Mr C Allen	Project and Assets Manager ☎ 388380
Sawtry		1	S & T	Cllrs R G Tuplin and D Tysoe, Mr C Allen, *** Chairman of Sawtry Parish Council and Mrs J Day	Cllrs R G Tuplin and D Tysoe, Mr C Allen, *** Chairman of Sawtry Parish Council and Mrs J Day	Project and Assets Manager ☎ 388380
Sutton and Mepal		2	S & T	Mr P Lummis	Mr P Lummis	Project and Assets Manager ☎ 388380
The Ramsey		4	S & T	Cllr E R Butler, Mr P A Swales and Mr N Orr	Cllr E R Butler and Mr N Orr	Project and Assets Manager ☎ 388380
Warboys, Somersham and Pidley		2	S & T	Cllrs G J Bull and Criswell and Mr P Lummis and Mr M F Newman	Cllrs G J Bull and Criswell and Mr P Lummis and Mr M F Newman	Project and Assets Manager ☎ 388380
Whittlesey	4	S & T	Mr C Allen	Mr C Allen	Project and Assets Manager ☎ 388380	

ORGANISATION	Nominating/ Appointing Panel	Approx No. of Meetings Per Annum	Allowance Payable S – Subsistence T - Travelling	Representative(s) 2012/2013	Proposed Representative(s) 2013/2014	HDC Contact Officer
Holmewood & District		1	S & T	Mr M F Newman or Cllr M F Bull	Mr M F Newman or Cllr M F Bull	Project and Assets Manager ☎ 388380
Little Gransden Aerodrome Consultative Committee	Cabinet	2	S & T	Cllr R J West	Cllr R J West	Head of Planning Services ☎ 388400
Local Water Forum	Cabinet	4	S & T	Cllr D M Tysoe	Cllr D M Tysoe	Managing Director (Communities, Partnerships and Projects) ☎ 388301
Local Government Association – Rural Commission	Cabinet	2	S & T	Cllr K M Baker	Cllr K M Baker	Managing Director (Communities, Partnerships and Projects) ☎ 388301
Local Government Association – Urban Commission	Cabinet	2	S & T	Cllr N J Guyatt	Cllr N J Guyatt	Managing Director (Communities, Partnerships and Projects) 388301
Luminus Homes	Cabinet	8	S & T	Cllrs M G Baker, C R Hyams, P K Ursell, M Shellens and Mr L M Simpson.	Cllrs R Fuller, N J Guyatt, M Shellens, Mr L M Simpson and one vacancy.	Housing Needs and Resources Manager ☎ 388220
Luminus group (parent)	Cabinet	10	S & T	Mr L M Simpson	Mr L M Simpson	Housing Needs and Resources Manager ☎ 388220
Oak Foundation (sheltered/charitable)		3		Cllr D Harty	Cllr D Harty	Housing Needs and Resources Manager ☎ 388220
Middle Level Commissioners	Cabinet	2 (and Annual Inspection)	S & T	Cllr P Mitchell	Cllr P Mitchell	Project and Assets Manager ☎ 388380
Oxmoor Community Action Group (OCAG)	Cabinet	12	S & T	vacancy	Cllr A Mackender-Lawrence	Senior Democratic Services Officer ☎ 388008
Pensions Consultative Group	Cabinet	2/3	S & T	Cllr T V Rogers	Cllr T V Rogers	Head of Financial Services ☎ 388103
Red Tile Wind Farm Trust Fund Ltd (formerly Red Tile Wind Farm Community Fund)	Cabinet	4	S & T	Cllr P L E Bucknell	Cllr P L E Bucknell	Head of Environmental and Community Health Services ☎ 388280

ORGANISATION	Nominating/ Appointing Panel	Approx No. of Meetings Per Annum	Allowance Payable S – Subsistence T - Travelling	Representative(s) 2012/2013	Proposed Representative(s) 2013/2014	HDC Contact Officer
Stilton Children and Young People's Facilities Association	Cabinet	4	S & T	Cllr P G Mitchell	Cllr P G Mitchell	Community Health Manager ☎ 388377
St Ives Road Safety Committee	Cabinet	4	S & T	Cllr G J Bull	No longer appoint to	Senior Democratic Services Officer ☎ 388008
Town Centre Management Initiatives/Partnerships/ Management Team – Huntingdon Town Partnership	Cabinet	11	S & T	Cllr S Cawley	Cllr T D Sanderson	Head of Planning and Housing Strategy ☎ 388400
St Ives Town Centre Management Team		11	S & T	Cllr J W Davies	Cllr J W Davies	Project and Assets Manager ☎ 388380
Trustees of Kimbolton School Foundation (3 year term expires June 2014)	Cabinet	3	S & T	Cllr J A Gray	Cllr J A Gray	Senior Democratic Services Officer ☎ 388008

Cambridgeshire Consultative Group for the Fletton Brickworks Industry	Licensing		S & T	Cllr E R Butler	Cllr E R Butler	Head of Environmental and Community Health Services - ☎ 388280
Little Barford Power Station Liaison Committee	Licensing	1	S & T	Cllr A Hansard	Cllr A Hansard	Head of Environmental and Community Health Services- ☎ 388280
Needingworth Quarry Local Liaison Committee	Licensing		S & T	Cllr T V Rogers and S J Criswell	Cllr T V Rogers and S J Criswell	Head of Environmental and Community Health Services - ☎ 388280
Warboys Landfill Local Liaison Group	Licensing	4	S & T	Cllr P L E Bucknell and Head of Environmental and Community Health Services or nominee	Cllr P L E Bucknell and Head of Environmental and Community Health Services or nominee	Head of Environmental and Community Health Services- ☎ 388280

*** Nomination should be Chairman of Sawtry Parish Council and not named individual.