

A meeting of the **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (PERFORMANCE AND GROWTH)** will be held in **CIVIC SUITE, PATHFINDER HOUSE, ST MARYS STREET, HUNTINGDON PE29 3TN** on **WEDNESDAY, 7 JULY 2021** at **6:00 PM** and you are requested to attend for the transaction of the following business:-

AGENDA

APOLOGIES

1. MINUTES (Pages 5 - 8)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Performance and Growth) meeting held on 2nd June 2021.

Contact Officer: B Buddle 01223 752549

2. MEMBERS' INTERESTS

To receive from Members declarations as to disclosable pecuniary and other interests in relation to any Agenda item.

Contact Officer: B Buddle 01223 752549

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

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

**Contact Officer: H Peacey
01223 752548**

4. LOCAL CYCLING AND WALKING INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN CONSULTATION
(Pages 15 - 28)

The Panel is invited to comment on the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan set out in the Cambridgeshire County Council consultation.

**Contact Officer: C Kerr
01480 388430**

5. REVIEW OF PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCY BOUNDARIES (Pages 29 - 98)

The Panel is invited to make representations or comments on the initial proposals by the Boundary Commission for England for the new Parliamentary constituencies affecting Huntingdonshire.

Contact Officer: L Jablonska
01480 388004

6. CORPORATE PLAN REFRESH 2020/21 (Pages 99 - 114)

The Panel is invited to comment on the refresh of the Corporate Plan for 2021-22.

Contact Officer: D Buckridge
01480 388054

7. 3C LEGAL, ICT AND BUILDING CONTROL SHARED SERVICES ANNUAL REPORTS 2020/21 (Pages 115 - 144)

The 3C Legal, ICT and Building Control Shared Services Annual Report 2020/21 is to be presented to the Panel.


Contact Officer: O Morley

8. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME (Pages 145 - 152)

The Panel are to receive the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme.

Contact Officer: B Buddle
01223 752549

5 day of July 2021



Head of Paid Service

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Non-Statutory Disclosable Interests

Further information on [Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Non - Statutory Disclosable Interests is available in the Council's Constitution](#)

Filming, Photography and Recording at Council Meetings

The District Council permits filming, recording and the taking of photographs at its meetings that are open to the public. It also welcomes the use of social networking and micro-blogging websites (such as Twitter and Facebook) to communicate with people about what is happening at meetings.

Arrangements for these activities should operate in accordance with [guidelines](#) agreed by the Council.

Please contact Mrs Beccy Buddle, Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny), Tel No. 01223 752549/e-mail Beccy.Buddle@huntingdonshire.gov.uk if you have a general query on any Agenda Item, wish to tender your apologies for absence from the meeting, or would like information on any decision taken by the Committee/Panel.

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

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

Agenda and enclosures can be viewed on the [District Council's website](#).

Emergency Procedure

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

This page is intentionally left blank

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of the OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (PERFORMANCE AND GROWTH) held in the Civic Suite, Pathfinder House, St Marys Street, Huntingdon PE29 3TN on Wednesday, 2 June 2021

PRESENT: Councillor S J Corney – Chairman.

Councillors E R Butler, B S Chapman, D B Dew, Dr P L R Gaskin, M Haines, A Roberts, T D Sanderson and D J Wells.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence from the meeting were submitted on behalf of Councillors M S Grice, J P Morris and S Wakeford.

IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors R Fuller and J Neish

4 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings held on 3rd March 2021 and 19th May 2021 were approved as a correct record by the Panel.

5 MEMBERS' INTERESTS

No declarations were received.

6 NOTICE OF KEY EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

The Panel received and noted the current Notice of Key Executive Decisions (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) which had been prepared by the Executive Leader for the period 1st June 2021 to 30th September 2021.

Following a question from Councillor Wells, it was confirmed that a report on the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Consultation had been deferred to a future meeting due to a delay from Cambridgeshire County Council.

7 EAST WEST RAIL MAKING MEANINGFUL CONNECTIONS NON-STATUTORY CONSULTATION

By means of a report by the Strategic Growth Manager (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) the East West Rail Making Meaningful Connections Non-Statutory Consultation was presented to the Panel.

The Panel noted that the consultation was non-statutory and that both Councillors and residents are encouraged to submit their own responses to the consultation online.

Concerns were raised regarding the location of a viaduct in the vicinity of St Neots and the impact this may have on planned housing provision in the Local Plan. It was agreed that not enough information has been made available on this

proposal by East West Rail but that this will be investigated once it becomes available.

Further concerns were raised regarding the location of the proposed St Neots/Tempsford station, support for a station at St Neots South continues to be encouraged in order to provide maximum economic benefits for Huntingdonshire residents.

During the discussion, the biodiversity and consideration of the environmental impact of the scheme was welcomed and Councillor Dew also enquired about the use of hydrogen or electric trains as a greener option.

Although there was overall support for the proposal, Councillors expressed frustration that there is currently not enough detail provided by East West Rail on route alignments and location of stations. It was also felt that East West Rail had not made sufficient attempts to engage with the public during the consultation period.

The Strategic Growth Manager indicated that the expected timeline of the development shows finalised options in 2022 at which point a statutory consultation is anticipated.

The Panel,

RESOLVED

that the Cabinet be encouraged to endorse the recommendations contained within the report.

8 A428 DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER UPDATE AND DELEGATED AUTHORITY

With the aid of a report by the Strategic Growth Manager (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) The A428 Development Consent Order Update and Delegated Authority Report was presented to the Panel. The Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning apprised Members of the background to the report.

Councillor Chapman expressed concerns that the proposals would result in changes to the traffic flow within St Neots itself. Concern was expressed that agencies were not working collaboratively to ensure both local infrastructure and future developments were being considered.

It was thereupon,

RESOLVED

that the Cabinet be encouraged to endorse the recommendations contained within the report.

9 TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2020/21

With the aid of a report by the Chief Finance Officer (a copy of which has been appended in the Minute Book) the Treasury Management Annual Report 2020/21 was presented to the Panel by the Executive Leader.

The Managing Director stressed the difficulties that the past twelve months had presented to financial planning. There has been ongoing monitoring of the situation as income streams were not able to be predicted in the usual manner to the unprecedented global and national circumstances.

Following a comment from Councillor Wells regarding the depreciation in value of the Council's commercial estate, the Panel were advised that this was a national trend as a result of the global pandemic. Further, it was reassured that this will be monitored and assessed in the long term.

10 CORPORATE PERFORMANCE REPORT 2020/21 (QUARTER 4)

By means of a report by the Business Intelligence and Performance Manager (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book), the Corporate Performance Report 2020/21 (Quarter 4) was presented to the Panel.

The Panel welcomed the report and thanked officers for their hard work and diligence over the course of the challenging year. Members noted the transparency of the figures within the report and it was also observed that any red actions were due to unprecedented circumstances.

The Panel praised the work that has been undertaken to prevent homelessness over the past year. It was noted that although it was hoped that this would have a positive long term impact, the Council would continue to support all residents in homelessness prevention. Members were reassured that a recovery plan was in place for One Leisure and Active Lifestyles.

Following a question by Councillor Gaskin as to whether the new working practices implemented over the past 12 months had had a positive impact on the reduction in sickness absence, the Panel were advised that the figures were reflected across all departments, including those who were unable to work from home due to the nature of their role.

The reduction in staff sickness absence was noted, although it was advised that COVID related absences were not included within the figures. Following a question regarding long term plans for working practices, it was assured that working practices are being considered alongside the business needs of the Council.

11 FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2020/21 (QUARTER 4)

With the aid of a report by the Chief Finance Officer (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) the Financial Performance Report 2020/21 (Quarter 4) was presented to the Panel.

The Executive Leader advised the Panel that when the pandemic started, the Council did not have the benefit of hindsight of where we are now. The need to do the right thing for residents along with supporting local communities took precedence and that the financial support from the Government which followed was unprecedented.

Following a query by Councillor Sanderson, it was confirmed that a one off grant providing funding for the clinically and extremely vulnerable was part of a national support package giving an amount per head on residents identified by local GPs.

It was noted that to ensure recovery, financial strategies were put in place to monitor income streams throughout the pandemic. The significant achievements of the teams involved to not only support local communities but also remain under budget was noted.

The Panel welcomed the report and thanked officers for their hard work and diligence over the course of the challenging year.

12 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

With the aid of a report by the Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme was presented to the Panel.

Following changes to the membership of the Overview and Scrutiny panels, Councillor Roberts was appointed to the Markets Task and Finish Group.

Chairman

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE KEY DECISIONS INCLUDING THOSE TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE

Prepared by: Councillor R Fuller, Executive Leader of the Council
Date of Publication: 16 June 2021
For Period: 1 July 2021 to 31 October 2021

Membership of the Cabinet is as follows:-

Councillor Details		Councillor Contact Details
Councillor Mrs M L Beuttell	Executive Councillor for Operations and Environment	Care of Huntingdonshire District Council Pathfinder House St Mary's Street Huntingdon PE29 3TN Tel: 01480 388388 E-mail: Marge.Beuttell@huntingdonshire.gov.uk
Councillor S Bywater	Executive Councillor for Community Resilience and Well-Being	9 Crabapple Close Sawtry Huntingdon PE28 5QG Tel: 07984 637553 E-mail: Simon.Bywater@huntingdonshire.gov.uk
Councillor R Fuller	Executive Leader of the Council and Executive Councillor for Housing and Economic Development	8 Sarah Grace Court New Road St Ives Huntingdon PE27 5DS Tel: 01480 388311 E-mail: Ryan.Fuller@huntingdonshire.gov.uk

Councillor J A Gray	Executive Councillor for Strategic Finance	Vine Cottage 2 Station Road Catworth Huntingdon PE28 OPE Tel: 01832 710799 E-mail: Jonathan.Gray@huntingdonshire.gov.uk
Councillor D Keane	Executive Councillor for Corporate Services	1 Bells Villas Mill Street Houghton Cambridgeshire PE28 2BA Tel: 01480 467147 E-mail: David.Keane@huntingdonshire.gov.uk
Councillor J Neish	Deputy Executive Leader and Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning	7 Willow Green Needingworth St Ives Cambridgeshire PE27 4SW Tel: 01480 466110 E-mail: Jon.Neish@huntingdonshire.gov.uk
Councillor K Prentice	Executive Councillor for Leisure and Regulatory Services	2 Ushers Court 89 Great North Road Eaton Socon St Neots PE19 8EL Tel: 01480 214838 E-mail: Keith.Prentice@huntingdonshire.gov.uk

Page 10 of 178

Notice is hereby given of:

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

A notice/agenda together with reports and supporting documents for each meeting will be published at least five working days before the date of the meeting. In order to enquire about the availability of documents and subject to any restrictions on their disclosure, copies may be requested by contacting the Democratic Services Team on 01480 388169 or E-mail Democratic.Services@huntingdonshire.gov.uk.

Agendas may be accessed electronically at the [District Council's website](#).

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

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

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

Page 1 of 178

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

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

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

Subject/Matter for Decision	Decision/ recommendation to be made by	Date decision to be taken	Documents Available	How relevant Officer can be contacted	Reasons for the report to be considered in private (paragraph no.)	Relevant Executive Councillor	Relevant Overview & Scrutiny Panel
Community Chest Grant Aid Awards 2021/22	Grants Panel	21 Jul 2021 18 Aug 2021 15 Sep 2021 13 Oct 2021		Claudia Deeth, Community Resilience Manager Tel No: 01480 388233 or email: Claudia.Deeth@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		S Bywater & J Neish	Customers & Partnerships
Homelessness Review and Strategy	Cabinet	15 Jul 2021		Jon Collen, Housing Needs and Resource Manager Tel No: 01480 388220 or email: Jon.Collen@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		R Fuller	Customer & Partnerships

Page 12 of 178

Subject/Matter for Decision	Decision/ recommendation to be made by	Date decision to be taken	Documents Available	How relevant Officer can be contacted	Reasons for the report to be considered in private (paragraph no.)	Relevant Executive Councillor	Relevant Overview & Scrutiny Panel
Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Consultation	Cabinet	15 Jul 2021		Clara Kerr, Service Manager - Growth Tel No: 01480 388430 or email: Clara.Kerr@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		J Neish	Performance & Growth
Landscape and Townscape Supplementary Planning Document***	Cabinet	16 Sep 2021		Clare Bond, Planning Policy Team Leader Tel No: 01480 388435 or email: Clare.Bond@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		J Neish	Performance & Growth

Page 13 of 178

This page is intentionally left blank

Public
Key Decision - Yes

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Title/Subject Matter: Consultation on the Draft Cambridgeshire Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan

Meeting/Date: Overview & Scrutiny (Performance and Growth)
– 7th July 2021

Executive Portfolio: Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning

Report by: Strategic Growth Manager

Ward(s) affected: All Wards

RECOMMENDATION

The Overview and Scrutiny Panel is invited to review and comment on the Cabinet report attached at Appendix A relating to Cambridgeshire County Council's consultation on its Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).

Public
Key Decision - Yes

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Title/Subject Matter: Consultation on the Draft Cambridgeshire Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan

Meeting/Date: Cabinet - 15th July 2021

Executive Portfolio: Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning

Report by: Strategic Growth Manager

Ward(s) affected: All Wards

Executive Summary:

The Infrastructure Act 2015 placed a duty on the Secretary of State to set Walking and Cycling Investment Strategies. The first Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy (CWIS) was published in 2017 which set out an ambition in England that by 2040 cycling or walking should be the natural choice for all short journeys or part of a longer journey.

As a key part of the CWIS, the Department for Transport (DfT) encouraged local authorities to develop Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs). The DfT made funding available in 2017 and invited local authorities to bid. Some local authorities were given a specialist consultancy to work with them to compile their LCWIP, whereas Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) was awarded a small amount of funding of £33,500, and Sustrans were appointed by the DfT to provide support for our area.

In July 2018 CCC established a working group comprising different stakeholders including County Cycling Team officers, Sustrans and representatives from Camcycle and Cycling UK, with the British Horse Society joining a few months later.

It was agreed to make the LCWIP County wide and that the plan should generate a prioritised list of cycle routes for each district. The LCWIP follows the DfT recommended approach, analysing 2011 census data to identify and map out travel to work journeys of up to 10km in order to show where investing in cycle routes would give the greatest benefits in targeting people making short trips.

In terms of walking, the work to determine the priority network has focused on key walking trip generators such as shopping centres, employment areas, bus and railway stations, leisure and community centres, and schools within Cambridge City and the larger Market Towns.

The draft Cambridgeshire LCWIP is made up of the main document and six appendices which include maps and prioritisation matrices.

This report sets out details of the draft Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) that Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) is consulting on. Members are asked to consider the draft LCWIP and the routes it proposes to prioritise.

The benefits of cycling and walking are well known and in the current climate it is even more important than ever before to encourage people to switch to non-motorised travel modes. The draft LCWIP is a useful strategy, highlighting priority infrastructure improvements that will have the most impact on improving cycling and walking. It supports the Council's aim of increasing walking and cycling in the District.

This is a draft document and, if supported, will be incorporated by CCC into other strategies and used to secure funding for improvements listed.

One of the key areas of concern is that the draft LCWIP does not include any route improvements in Ramsey. Whilst this is considered to be due to the methodology and not by design, it is hoped this will be reviewed and there will be consideration of what may be done locally to support a modal shift in the Ramsey area.

The overall benefit of the LCWIP as drafted is that it highlights key improvements to the cycling and walking network that will help to bring about with increased opportunities to access funding and deliver health and well-being benefits and help to address social exclusion.

Recommendation(s):

The Cabinet endorse:

1. The walking and cycling routes prioritised within Huntingdonshire and agree the Council's response to the LCWIP consultation at Appendix 1.
2. Continued engagement with CCC to influence the inclusion of Ramsey in successor cycling and walking infrastructure plans.

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) is consulting on the first Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) for the county and a response on behalf of Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) is set out at Appendix 1 to this report.

BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The aim of LCWIPs is to work towards achieving the Government's ambition in England that by 2040 cycling or walking should be the natural choice for all short journeys or part of a longer journey. The LCWIP is a county wide plan that includes a prioritised list of cycling and walking routes for each district. CCC is seeking views on the routes identified and whether people think it has the right priorities. CCC states that:

'The LCWIP is a method by which funding can be sought for improvements to the walking and cycling network for all of the County districts in order to increase physical activity and therefore support the County's Health and Wellbeing Strategy aims of encouraging healthy lifestyles and behaviours and creating a sustainable environment.'

It is, therefore, important that the District Council's priorities for cycling and walking are reflected in the LCWIP. It can have direct impact on the ability to deliver health and well-being outcomes for the area and support elements of the Covid-19 recovery programme. It also follows the policies of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Local Transport Plan (2020) relating to increasing walking and cycling.

- 2.2 CCC states, in a report to its Highways and Transport Committee held on 19th January 2021, that:

'The LCWIP follows the DfT recommended approach, analysing 2011 census data to identify and map out travel to work journeys of up to 10km in order to show where investing in cycle routes would give the greatest benefits in targeting people making short trips.'

In terms of walking, the work to determine the priority network has focused on key walking trip generators such as shopping centres, employment areas, bus and railway stations, leisure and community centres, and schools within Cambridge City and the Market Towns.'

- 2.3 The draft LCWIP includes detail on the prioritised cycle routes and how these were scored (see Appendices 1 and 2 to this report).

ANALYSIS

- 3.1 The draft LCWIP includes a list of priorities for Huntingdonshire (see Appendices 2 and 3 of the LCWIP). It includes 16 cycling routes for the district, of which ten have been prioritised, and maps of prioritised walking routes in Huntingdon, St Ives and St Neots.

- 3.2 Overall, the options appear to reflect sensibly where improvements are likely to make a notable difference in the ability of walkers and cyclists to travel between key employment, school, leisure and shopping destinations and favours routes to schools.
- 3.3 This iteration does not include any improvements at Ramsey. This is due to the methodology followed, in line with DfT guidelines, which uses national census data relating to existing journeys to work using usual residence and place of work details. This enabled nodes and links between these to be identified. A map showing these nodes and linkages is included in the report. It shows Ramsey has having far less nodes and linkages at present. A 'propensity to cycle' tool (PtCT) was used, which looked at trips based on the distance people would realistically cycle. PtCT, as a result of the methodology, favours urban areas and main corridors that pick-up people along the way. Therefore, as Ramsey is more rural, it shows as having a lower propensity to cycle (PtCT).
- 3.4 Walking was assessed differently, by identifying a core walking zone for each location and mapping the main walking routes to these. It has used the footway highway maintenance hierarchy classification in identifying routes. Cross referencing to CCC's other strategies also took place, including Market Town Transport Strategies. Some schemes are identified for Ramsey and so it is a missed opportunity to highlight these. Other opportunities to address cycling and walking within Ramsey may be available such as through the Transport Investment Plan (TIP), Market Town Transport Strategies and emerging Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy. It also worth noting that, as the town grows and other schemes in the LCWIP are delivered, schemes within Ramsey may later become prioritised and included in future versions of the LCWIP.
- 3.5 Some points of concern to note include:
- Lack of mention of Ramsey, despite areas in the north of the county being acknowledged as having greater social exclusion and deprivation, where access to good cycling and walking options could make a difference to peoples' lives.
 - Justification for the exclusion of Ramsey has not been provided, despite significant growth planned through the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 2018 -2036 that would see the size of the town increase to a level similar to Chatteris at present, which is included.
 - Although just outside the standard 10km considered the maximum distance most people would be willing to cycle, due to the greater challenges to the north of the District, should links to nearby settlements including Yaxley (and on to Peterborough), Whittlesey and Chatteris have been considered?
 - Clarification on what leisure destinations have been included and why; e.g. it is unclear if country parks have been included.
 - St Ives bus station has not been included on the map as a node, although it is within the town centre area.
- 3.6 Having a draft list has already been useful, for example, in proposing improvements under the Active Travel Fund introduced by Government

to encourage people to travel by foot or cycle to minimise the spread of Covid-19.

- 3.7 The list includes schemes between Buckden and Huntingdon and it is worth noting that Buckden has produced its own LCWIP that this document will complement.

COMMENTS OF OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY

- 4.1 The comments of the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel will be included in this section prior to its consideration by the Cabinet.

KEY IMPACTS / RISKS

- 5.1 Having an agreed list of priorities for walking and cycling route improvements through the LCWIP will aid CCC in future bids for funds and budgeting to deliver schemes. It has already proved a useful tool in terms of the response to Covid-19. Not having an LCWIP reduces access to funds for improvements. By commenting on the draft LCWIP and its priorities the Council increases the likelihood that it will be agreed by CCC and used in future plans and strategies.

WHAT ACTIONS WILL BE TAKEN/TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 6.1 The consultation on the Draft LCWIP is to run to the 13th July 2021. Following Cabinet, officers will respond to the consultation within the consultation period, with the letter set out at Appendix 1 if the recommendation is approved.
- 6.2 CCC will then report the results of the consultation to its Highways and Transport Committee (correct at time of writing) and an updated document will be presented to it.
- 6.3 Government guidance on LCWIPs states that it is '*envisaged that the LCWIP will need to be reviewed and updated approximately every four to five years to reflect progress made with implementation. LCWIPs should also be updated if there are significant changes in local circumstances, such as the publication of new policies or strategies, major new development sites, or new sources of funding.*' The document now being consulted on states that '*The LCWIP is not a static document and will be reviewed and updated as work such as the Market Town strategies, High Street funding bids and Prospectuses for Growth progress and circumstances change.*'

LINK TO THE CORPORATE PLAN, STRATEGIC PRIORITIES AND/OR CORPORATE OBJECTIVES

- 7.1 This helps to deliver across several of the Council's priorities for 2018 - 2022 but specifically:
- Support development of infrastructure to enable growth.
 - Improving the quality of the environment, by including infrastructure that supports people to walk and cycle.

- 7.2 The LCWIP supports the Council's Covid-19 Recovery programme, which includes measures to increase connectivity by non-motorised modes.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 None at present.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 None at present, however, the publication of an LCWIP covering the District will potentially aid with bids for funding the priority schemes listed.

HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The LCWIP is a method by which funding can be sought for improvements to the walking and cycling network for all the County districts in order to increase physical activity and, therefore, supports encouragement of healthy lifestyles and behaviours and creating a sustainable environment including reducing green gas emissions.

OTHER IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 Government guidance on embedding LCWIPs advises that there should be a clear link between LCWIPs and other strategic transport planning documents. It advises incorporating LCWIPs into supplementary planning guidance '*where this would build on the policies of the Local Plan. Local Authorities may also wish to refer to LCWIPs in Area Action Plans and Neighbourhood Plans.*' This is something that can be considered in any future Local Plan review and as and when Neighbourhood Plans are proposed.

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISIONS

- 12.1 The LCWIP links to the Council's Covid-19 Recovery Programme to enhance connectivity through active travel. Access to high quality cycle routes to key destinations for work, education and health care will help to address social exclusion in parts of the District. Furthermore, by increasing modal share and spreading the culture of cycling out to the districts will help mitigate growth and improve health outcomes for residents in the District.
- 12.2 The priorities listed have been reached using recognised methods and census data. District documents have also been taken into consideration such as the Huntingdonshire Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Prospectuses for Growth for some of the market towns.
- 12.3 Although supportive overall of the document it is disappointing that no cycling or walking priorities have been listed for Ramsey. In relation to walking, Ramsey has not been included in the market towns considered when all other market towns and Cambourne have been included. This does not seem to consider planned growth at Ramsey or neighbouring

Bury. Noting the points at paragraphs 3.3 -3.5, it is suggested that in the response CCC be asked to reconsider the exclusion of Ramsey and whether any schemes could be included using the PtC tool and walking methodology. The District Council would welcome the opportunity to continue to work with CCC to implement the LCWIP and to ensure that opportunities are consistently identified through other transport strategies and policies, the Council's own work, and with Ramsey Town Council to influence successor documents. The response could include a list of projects identified elsewhere previously, such as in the CCC Transport Investment Plan and the Huntingdonshire Infrastructure Delivery Plan and emerging Neighbourhood Plans, and request that these be considered through the LCWIP process prior to the document being finalised.

LIST OF APPENDICES INCLUDED

Appendix 1 – Response on Behalf of Huntingdonshire District Council

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Draft LCWIP https://consultcambs.uk.engagementhq.com/ccc-local-cycling-and-walking-infrastructure-plan-consultation-2021?tool=survey_tool#tool_tab

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Local Transport Plan [Local Transport Plan | Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority \(cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk\)](#)

DfT LCWIPs Technical Guidance for Local Authorities https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/908535/cycling-walking-infrastructure-technical-guidance-document.pdf

CONTACT OFFICER

Name/Job Title: Melissa Reynolds / Senior Implementation Officer
Tel No: 01223 616842
Email: melissa.reynolds@huntingdonshire.gov.uk

Appendix 1 – Response on Behalf of Huntingdonshire District Council

FAO Miss Clare Rankin
Cambridgeshire County Council

Sent by email to: transport.delivery@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

Re. Cambridgeshire Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Consultation

Dear Miss Rankin,

I am writing on behalf of Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) in response to Cambridgeshire County Council's (CCC) consultation, running until 13th July 2021 in relation to the proposed Cambridgeshire Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). This matter was considered by Cabinet Members at their meeting on the 15th July as agreed with CCC.

Generally, the Council is very supportive and agrees with the routes prioritised. Responses on behalf of HDC to the survey questions can be found at the end of this letter.

The prioritisation of walking and cycling routes is welcomed; and links well to HDC's Corporate Plan objectives. The LCWIP will support a holistic package of measures, including Active Lifestyles and CCC's public health work. The Council is also pleased that the draft document has proven useful in considering priorities for funding through the Covid-19 Active Travel Fund. This highlighted that the document will be useful in developing future policies and strategies and enables the councils to respond quickly to funding opportunities as they arise.

The Council has a number of questions regarding elements of the methodology:

- a) It is unclear from the document whether links referred to between railway stations are cycle and walking links – If not it is unclear how these aid planning for walking and cycling.
- b) It is noted that, although the Propensity to Cycle tool does not highlight much activity in the Ramsey area, there is scope to make improvements there as part of wider transport strategy, and note potential links to reducing social deprivation and improve health etc.
- c) Does the mapping re. leisure centres include country parks and recreation sites? If not, this is considered a missed opportunity.
- d) What are the routes identified to be improved based on Healthy Streets principles?
- e) St Ives bus station has not been included on the map as a node, although it is within the town centre area.
- f) The walking map for St Ives (LCWIP Appendix 4) show a train station at the St Ives Park and Ride serving the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway. Has it been considered as a train station?

HDC request's that schemes identified previously for the Ramsey area are reviewed and considered under the LCWIP methods. The Council would welcome the opportunity to continue to collaborate with CCC on this.

The Council is pleased to note that the LCWIP acknowledges that horse riders, pedestrians, wheelchair users and mobility scooter users all need to be considered when designing cycle routes.

The Council looks forward to working with CCC on incorporating the LCWIP into strategies and policies and aiding in future funding bids if needed. It is requested that CCC keeps the Council updated of next steps.

Lastly, the Council would like to thank CCC for its close working and engagement in the lead up to the draft being agreed for consultation.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C. Kerr'.

Clara Kerr

Strategic Growth Manager

Enc: Huntingdonshire District Council LCWIP Survey question responses

LCWIP Survey Responses

QUESTION 1 - Please view our Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.

How far do you support the plan as a method of prioritising funding for strategic walking and cycling routes?

Strongly support.

QUESTION 2 - How far do you agree the chosen cycle routes are the right ones to encourage more people to cycle more often?

Huntingdonshire – Strongly agree.

QUESTION 3 - Please give details of important cycle links you think we may have missed and/or alternative routes which you believe would be preferable to the one/s chosen.

Routes in Ramsey should have been considered in addition to those already proposed through the LCWIP. Ramsey is the only market town in the County that has been excluded from the process. It is due to grow as a result of planned development identified in the adopted Local Plan. HDC's Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2017 identifies potential routes that could be additional priorities within the LCWIP.

QUESTION 4 - How far do you agree the chosen walking routes are the right ones to encourage more people to walk more often?

Huntingdonshire – Strongly agree.

QUESTION 5 - Please give details of important walking links you think we may have missed and/or alternative routes which you believe would be preferable to the one/s chosen.

Routes in Ramsey should have been considered in addition to those already proposed through the LCWIP. Ramsey is the only market town in the County that has been excluded from the process. It is due to grow in size as a result of planned development identified in the adopted Local Plan. HDC's Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2017 identifies potential routes that could be additional priorities within the LCWIP.

QUESTION 6 - We have a duty to ensure that our work promotes equality and does not discriminate or disproportionately affect or impact people or groups with protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010. Please comment if you feel any of the proposals would either positively or negatively affect or impact on any such person/s or group/s.

The LCWIP will be beneficial to several groups with protected characteristics. It is noted that the LCWIP does identify that horse riders, pedestrians, wheelchair users and mobility scooter users all need to be considered when designing cycle routes. Detailed design standards, such as LTN 1/20, will need to be applied when any improvements as a result of the LCWIP are able to be implemented. It is suggested that the Police Designing Out Crime Team be consulted on any detailed design proposals.

QUESTION 7 & 8 - We welcome your views. If you have any other comments on the Plan, please add them in the space below. Alternatively, you can upload files with your feedback to the Plan.

See comments in the letter.

QUESTION 9 - Do you have a disability which influences the way you travel?

N/A.

QUESTION 10 - Please indicate your age range

N/A.

QUESTION 11 - Please indicate how you usually travel

N/A.

QUESTION 12 - Are you in education, employed, self-employed, unemployed, a home-based worker, a stay at home parent, carer or similar, retired, prefer not to say, other (please specify)

N/A.

QUESTION 13 - How often do you use walking routes for leisure?

N/A.

QUESTION 14 - How often do you use walking routes for commuting/as your main mode of transport?

N/A.

QUESTION 15 - How often do you use cycling routes for leisure?

N/A.

QUESTION 16 - How often do you use cycling routes for commuting/as your main mode of transport?

N/A.

QUESTION 17 - Please state your postcode (this is to identify concerns by location)

N/A.

QUESTION 18 - Are you responding as an individual, on behalf of a group or business, as an elected representative

Group?

QUESTION 19 - If you are responding as an elected Councillor or on behalf of an organisation, please state your name/organisation's name.

Huntingdonshire District Council.

This page is intentionally left blank

Public
Key Decision - Yes

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Title/Subject Matter: Review of Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries

Meeting/Date: Overview & Scrutiny Panel (Performance & Growth) – 7th July 2021
Cabinet – 15th July 2021

Executive Portfolio: Executive Leader – Councillor R Fuller

Report by: Elections & Democratic Services Manager

Ward(s) affected: All

Executive Summary:

The Boundary Commission for England (BCE) have published initial proposals for new Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England on 8th June 2021. This publication marked the start of an eight-week period of consultation on the BCE's initial proposals ending on 2nd August 2021.

The BCE are inviting comments on the proposals to capture the views and knowledge of local residents to ensure that the proposals take account of local ties and best reflect the geography on the ground.

The initial proposals for the Eastern region have resulted in an allocation of 61 constituencies and the impact in Huntingdonshire is the splitting of the District across three Parliamentary constituencies.

Recommendation:

The Panel/Cabinet is

RECOMMENDED

to consider whether they wish to make any representations or comments to the Boundary Commission for England on the initial proposals for new Parliamentary constituencies affecting Huntingdonshire.

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise Members of the initial proposals as set out by the Boundary Commission for England for new Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England and specifically draw Members' attention to the proposed impact within Huntingdonshire.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 On 8th June 2021 the Boundary Commission for England (BCE) published initial proposals for new Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England. The BCE have responsibility for reviewing the boundaries of all Parliamentary constituencies in England. The BCE must make recommendations for new Parliamentary constituency boundaries by 1st July 2023.
- 2.2 The overall number of constituencies across the UK will be retained at 650, with the resultant impact in England of increasing the number of constituencies from 533 to 543. The rules require that every recommended constituency across the UK, apart from five specified exceptions, must have an electorate that is no smaller than 69,724 and no larger than 77,062.
- 2.3 The electorate figures that are used for the review are the Parliamentary electors on the electoral register on 2nd March 2020.

3. CONSULTATION

- 3.1 The publication of the initial proposals commenced the start of an eight-week consultation period and the BCE have requested comments by 2nd August 2021. Details of the full Guide to the 2023 Review of Parliamentary Constituencies published by the BCE are available on the Commission's website, together with an interactive mapping of the proposals at www.bcereviews.org.uk
- 3.2 The BCE are asking for views on the initial proposals, specifically giving consideration to using wards as the basic building blocks for designating constituencies and therefore any proposed changes. Other factors that may be taken into account are –
- any special physical geographical considerations, (size, shape and accessibility) such as rivers and major roads;
 - any local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies and the inconveniences associated with such changes.
- 3.3 In the naming of a constituency, the BCE generally considers that the existing constituency name, if largely unchanged, remains the same and that the name should normally reflect the main populations centre(s) contained in the constituency.

4. PROPOSALS FOR HUNTINGDONSHIRE

- 4.1 The initial proposals for new Parliamentary constituency boundaries in the Eastern region are attached as Appendix A to this report. The Eastern region has been allocated 61 constituencies, an increase of three from the current number. In Cambridgeshire (comprising the county of Cambridgeshire and unitary authority of Peterborough) it is proposed to maintain a pattern of constituencies wholly contained within the boundary of the county.
- 4.2 In terms of the impact in Huntingdonshire, there is a new proposed St Neots constituency that includes all four District wards covering St Neots and the District wards of Great Paxton and Fenstanton, all currently located within the Huntingdon constituency. The map of the proposed St Neots constituency is attached at Appendix B.
- 4.3 The electorates of the existing Huntingdon constituency (85,109) and North West Cambridgeshire constituency (95,684) are significantly above the permitted range for the new proposed constituencies. This has meant that the proposals include the transferring of the District wards of Holywell-cum-Needingworth, Somersham, Warboys and Sawtry from the existing North West Cambridgeshire constituency to the proposed Huntingdon constituency. No further changes are proposed to northern part of the North West Cambridgeshire constituency. Maps of the proposed Huntingdon constituency and North West Cambridgeshire constituency are attached at Appendices C and D respectively.

5. COMMENTS OF OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY

- 5.1 The comments of the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel will be included in this section prior to its consideration by the Cabinet.

6. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 6.1 The BCE are required to make a formal final report to the Speaker of the House of Commons before 1st July 2023.

7. CONSULTATION

- 7.1 The full Guide to the 2023 Review of Parliamentary Constituencies published by the BCE details the process for developing proposals. Following this initial consultation period, there then follows a secondary consultation period that will include public hearings in each region. This period will allow further representations to be made on the initial proposals. The BCE will then develop and publish revised proposals for further consultation and will then make final decisions and recommendations for the Government to consider and will take effect at the next General Election.

8. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 The law governing Parliamentary constituency reviews and redistribution can be found under the provisions of the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 (as amended by the Boundary Commissions Act 1992, the 2011 Act and the 2020 Act).

9. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISIONS

- 9.1 The consultation period by the BCE commenced on 8th June 2021 and the closing date for submissions is 2nd August 2021.
- 9.2 Members are requested to consider whether they wish to make any representations or comments to the BCE on the initial proposals for changes to the Parliamentary constituencies affecting Huntingdonshire.

10. LIST OF APPENDICES INCLUDED

- Appendix A – Boundary Commission for England: Initial Proposals for new Parliamentary constituency boundaries in the Eastern region – June 2021
- Appendix B – St Neots County Constituency map proposal
- Appendix C – Huntingdon County Constituency map proposal
- Appendix D – North West Cambridgeshire County Constituency map proposal


11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Boundary Commission for England: Guide to the 2023 Review of Parliamentary Constituencies – May 2021

CONTACT OFFICER

Name/Job Title: Lisa Jablonska, Elections & Democratic Services Manager
Tel No: (01223) 739952
Email: lisa.jablonska@huntingdonshire.gov.uk

Initial proposals for new Parliamentary constituency boundaries in the **Eastern** region



Contents

	Summary	2
	Who we are and what we do	2
	The 2023 Review	2
	Initial proposals	2
	What is changing in the Eastern region?	2
	How to have your say	3
1	What is the Boundary Commission for England?	4
2	Background to the 2023 Review	5
	The rules in the legislation	6
	Timetable for our review	7
	Stage one – development of initial proposals	7
	Stage two – consultation on initial proposals	8
	Stage three – consultation on representations received	8
	Stage four – development and publication of revised proposals	9
	Stage five – development and publication of the final report and recommendations	9
3	Initial proposals for the Eastern region	10
	Initial proposals for the Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire sub-region	12
	Initial proposals for the Cambridgeshire sub-region	15
	Initial proposals for the Essex and Suffolk sub-region	18
	Initial proposals for the Norfolk sub-region	23
4	How to have your say	25
	How can you give us your views?	26
	What do we want views on?	27
	Appendix: Initial proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates	28
	Glossary	57

Summary

Who we are and what we do

The Boundary Commission for England (BCE) is an independent and impartial non-departmental public body, which is responsible for reviewing Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England.

The 2023 Review

We have the task of periodically reviewing the boundaries of all the Parliamentary constituencies in England. We are currently conducting a review on the basis of legislative rules most recently updated by Parliament in 2020. Those rules tell us that we must make recommendations for new Parliamentary constituency boundaries by 1 July 2023. While retaining the overall number of constituencies across the UK at 650, the rules apply a distribution formula that results in an increase in the number of constituencies in England (from 533 to 543). The rules also require that every recommended constituency across the UK – apart from five specified exceptions (two of them in England) – must have an electorate that is no smaller than 69,724 and no larger than 77,062.

Initial proposals

We published our initial proposals for the new Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England on 8 June 2021. Information about the proposed constituencies is now available on our website at www.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk

What is changing in the Eastern region?

The Eastern region has been allocated 61 constituencies – an increase of three from the current number.

Our proposals leave one of the 58 existing constituencies wholly unchanged, and ten unchanged except to realign constituency boundaries with new or prospective local government ward boundaries.

As it has not always been possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual counties, we have grouped some county council and unitary authority areas into sub-regions. The number of constituencies allocated to each sub-region is determined by the combined electorate of the local authorities they contain.

Consequently, it has been necessary to propose some constituencies that cross county or unitary authority boundaries, although we have sought to keep such crossings to a minimum.

Sub-region	Existing allocation	Proposed allocation
Bedfordshire ¹ and Hertfordshire	17	18
Cambridgeshire ²	7	8
Essex ³ and Suffolk	25	26
Norfolk	9	9

In Cambridgeshire and Norfolk it has been possible to propose a pattern of constituencies that are wholly contained within the boundaries of each county.

In the Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire, and Essex and Suffolk sub-regions, it has been necessary to propose constituencies that cross county boundaries. We have proposed one constituency that contains electors from both Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire, which includes three wards from the Central Bedfordshire unitary authority in a constituency with the town of Hitchin in Hertfordshire. We have also proposed one constituency that contains electors from Essex and Suffolk, which includes a number of wards from the Braintree district, including the town of Halstead, with a number of wards from the West Suffolk district, including the town of Haverhill.

How to have your say

We are consulting on our initial proposals for an eight-week period, from 8 June 2021 to 2 August 2021. We encourage everyone to use this opportunity to help us shape the new constituencies – the more responses we receive, the more informed our decisions will be when considering whether to revise our proposals. Our consultation portal at www.bcereviews.org.uk has more information about our proposals and how to give us your views on them. You can also follow us on Twitter @BCEReviews or at facebook.com/BCEReviews.

¹ Comprising the three unitary authorities of Bedford, Central Bedfordshire and Luton, hereafter together referred to as Bedfordshire.

² Comprising the county of Cambridgeshire and the unitary authority of Peterborough, hereafter together referred to as Cambridgeshire.

³ Comprising the county of Essex, and the unitary authorities of Southend-on-Sea and Thurrock, hereafter together referred to as Essex.

1 What is the Boundary Commission for England?

- 1 As already mentioned, BCE is an independent and impartial non-departmental public body, which is required to review Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England. We must conduct a review of all the constituencies in England every eight years. Our role is to make recommendations to Parliament for new constituency boundaries.
- 2 The Chair of the Commission is the Speaker of the House of Commons, but by convention he does not participate in the review. The Deputy Chair and two further commissioners take decisions on proposals and recommendations for new constituency boundaries. Further information about the commissioners can be found on our regular website.

You can find further information on our regular website at www.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk, or on our consultation portal at www.bcereviews.org.uk. You can also contact us with any general enquiries by emailing information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.uk, or by calling 020 7276 1102.

2 Background to the 2023 Review

- 3 We are currently conducting a review of Parliamentary constituency boundaries on the basis of rules most recently updated by Parliament in 2020.⁴ These rules require us to make more equal the number of electors in each constituency. This report covers only the work of the Boundary Commission for England (there are separate commissions for Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales) and, in particular, introduces our initial proposals for the Eastern region.
- 4 The legislation states that there will be 650 Parliamentary constituencies covering the UK – the same as the current number. England has been allocated 543 constituencies for the 2023 Review, ten more than there are currently. There are also other rules that the Commission has regard to when conducting the review – a full set of the rules can be found in our Guide to the 2023 Review⁵ published in May 2021, but they are also summarised later in this chapter. Most significantly, the rules require every constituency we recommend (with the exception of two covering the Isle of Wight) to contain no fewer than 69,724 electors and no more than 77,062.
- 5 This is a significant change to the old rules under which Parliamentary boundary reviews took place, in which achieving as close to the average number of electors in each constituency was an aim, but there was no statutory fixed minimum and maximum number of electors. This, together with the passage of time since constituencies were last updated (based on data from 2000), means that in England, existing constituencies currently range from 54,551 to 111,716 electors. Achieving a more even distribution of electors in every constituency across England, together with the increase in the total number of constituencies, means that a significant amount of change to the existing map of constituencies is inevitable.
- 6 Our Guide to the 2023 Review contains further detailed background information, and explains all of the policies and procedures that we are following in conducting the review. We encourage anyone wishing to respond to the review to read this document, which will give them a greater understanding of the rules and constraints placed on the Commission, especially if they are intending to comment on our initial proposals and/or make their own counter-proposals.

⁴ The Parliamentary Constituencies Act 2020, available at www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2020/25/contents

⁵ Available at www.bcereviews.org.uk and at all places of deposit.

The rules in the legislation

- 7 As well as the primary rule that constituencies must have no fewer than 69,724 electors and no more than 77,062, the legislation also states that, when deciding on boundaries, the Commission may take into account:
 - special geographical considerations, including in particular the size, shape and accessibility of a constituency;
 - local government boundaries which existed, or were prospective, on 1 December 2020;
 - boundaries of existing constituencies;
 - any local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies; and
 - the inconveniences attendant on such changes.
- 8 In relation to local government boundaries in particular, it should be noted that for a given area, where we choose to take account of local government boundaries, if there are prospective boundaries (as at 1 December 2020), it is those, rather than existing boundaries, of which account may be taken. This is a significant change to the former legislation, which referred only to the local government boundaries as they actually existed on the relevant date.
- 9 Our initial proposals for the Eastern region (and the accompanying maps) are therefore based on local government boundaries that existed, or – where relevant – were prospective, on 1 December 2020. Our Guide to the 2023 Review outlines further our policy on how, and to what extent, we take into account local government boundaries. We have used the existing and prospective wards as at 1 December 2020 of unitary authorities, and borough and district councils (in areas where there is also a county council) as the basic building blocks for our proposals.
- 10 In a number of existing constituencies, changes to local government wards since those constituencies were last updated (in 2010) have resulted in the new ward effectively being split, between the constituency the old ward was wholly a part of, and at least one other existing constituency. As part of our proposals, we will by default seek to realign the boundaries of constituencies with up-to-date ward boundaries, thus reuniting wards that are currently divided between existing constituencies. In places where there has been only minor change to a ward, this may see an existing constituency boundary change only very slightly to realign with the new ward. However, where wards in an area have been changed more significantly, this may result in the area covered by the new ward becoming part of a different constituency than the one in which the area was previously.

- 11 Although the 2023 Review of Parliamentary constituencies will inevitably result in significant change, we have also taken into account the boundaries of existing constituencies so far as we can. We have tried to retain existing constituencies as part of our initial proposals wherever possible, as long as the other factors can also be satisfied. This, however, has proved difficult. Our initial proposals retain just under 2%⁶ of the existing constituencies in the Eastern region – the remainder are new constituencies (although in a number of cases the changes to the existing constituencies are fairly minor).
- 12 Our proposals are based on the nine English regions as defined in the legislation; a description of the extent of each region also appears in the Guide to the 2023 Review. This report relates to the Eastern region. There are eight other separate reports containing our initial proposals for the other regions. You can find more details in our Guide to the 2023 Review and on our website. While our use of the regions does not prevent anyone from making proposals to us that cross regional boundaries (for example, between the Eastern and East Midlands regions), very compelling reasons would need to be given to persuade the Commission to depart from the region-based approach. The Commission has previously consulted on the use of the English regions as discrete areas, and this was strongly supported.

Timetable for our review

Stage one – development of initial proposals

- 13 We began this review in January 2021. We published electorate data from 2 March 2020 (the relevant date specified by the legislation) for each local government ward in England, including – where relevant – wards that were prospective on 1 December 2020. The electorate data were provided by local authorities and the Office for National Statistics. These are available on our website and are the data that must be used throughout the remainder of the review process. The Commission has since then considered the statutory factors outlined above and drawn up the initial proposals. We published our initial proposals for consultation for each of England’s nine regions on 8 June 2021.

⁶ This figure excludes constituencies that have been changed only to realign with changed local government boundaries.

- 14 We ask people to be aware that, in publishing our initial proposals, we do so without suggesting that they are in some way definitive, or that they provide the ‘right answer’ – they are our starting point for consulting on the changes. We have taken into account the existing constituencies, local government boundaries and geographical features, to produce a set of constituencies that are within the permitted electorate range and that we consider to be the best balance between those factors at this point. What we do not yet have is sufficient evidence of how our proposals reflect or break local community ties, although we have drawn on evidence of such ties provided in previous reviews. One of the most important purposes of the consultation period is to seek up-to-date evidence that will enable us to test the strength of our initial proposals, and revise them where appropriate.

Stage two – consultation on initial proposals

- 15 We are consulting on our initial proposals for eight weeks, from 8 June 2021 until 2 August 2021. Chapter 4 outlines how you can contribute during the consultation period. Once the consultation has closed, the Commission will collate all the responses received.

Stage three – consultation on representations received

- 16 We are required to publish all the responses we receive on our initial proposals. This publication will mark the start of a six-week ‘secondary consultation’ period, which we currently plan to take place in early 2022. The purpose of the secondary consultation is for people to see what others have said in response to our initial proposals, and to make comments on those views, for example by countering an argument, or by supporting and reinforcing what others have said. You will be able to see all the comments on our website, and use the site to give us your views on what others have said. We will also be hosting between two and five public hearings in each region, where you will be able to give your views directly to one of our assistant commissioners. We will publish the exact number, dates and venues for those hearings nearer the time.

Stage four – development and publication of revised proposals

- 17 Once we have all the representations and comments from both the initial and secondary consultation periods, the Commission will analyse those representations and decide whether changes should be made to the initial proposals. If we decide that the evidence presented to us persuades us to change our initial proposals, then we must publish our revised proposals for the areas concerned, and consult on them for a further period of four weeks. This is likely to be towards the end of 2022. When we consult on our revised proposals, there will be no further public hearings. You will be able to see all our revised proposals, and give us your views on them, on our website.

Stage five – development and publication of the final report and recommendations

- 18 Finally, following the consultation on revised proposals, we will consider all the evidence received at this stage, and throughout the review, before determining our final recommendations. The recommendations will be set out in a published report to the Speaker of the House of Commons, who will lay it before Parliament on our behalf, at which time we will also publish the report. The legislation states that we must submit that report to the Speaker by 1 July 2023. Further details about what the Government must then do with our recommendations in order to implement them are contained in our Guide to the 2023 Review.
- 19 Throughout each consultation we will be taking all reasonable steps to publicise our proposals, so that as many people as possible are aware of the consultation and can take the opportunity to contribute to our review of constituencies.

3 Initial proposals for the Eastern region

- 20 The Eastern region comprises: the three unitary authority areas of Bedford, Central Bedfordshire and Luton;⁷ the county council areas of Cambridgeshire, and the unitary authority area of Peterborough;⁸ the county council area of Essex, and the unitary authority areas of Southend-on-Sea and Thurrock;⁹ and the county council areas of Hertfordshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk.
- 21 The Eastern region currently has 58 constituencies. Of these constituencies, 25 have electorates within the permitted electorate range. The electorates of seven constituencies currently fall below the 5% limit, while the electorates of 26 constituencies are above the 5% limit.
- 22 Our initial proposals for the Eastern region are for 61 constituencies, an increase of three.
- 23 In seeking to produce 61 constituencies within the electorate range, our first step was to consider whether local authorities could be usefully grouped into sub-regions. We were mindful of seeking to respect, where we could, the external boundaries of local authorities. Our approach in attempting to group local authority areas together in sub-regions was therefore based both on trying to respect county boundaries wherever possible and in achieving (where we could) obvious practical groupings such as those dictated in some part by the geography of the area.
- 24 Our division of the Eastern region into sub-regions is a practical approach. We welcome counter-proposals from respondents to our consultation, based on other groupings of counties and unitary authorities, if the statutory factors can be better reflected in those counter-proposals.
- 25 The distribution of electors across the six counties of the Eastern region is such that allocating a whole number of constituencies to each county, with each constituency falling within the permitted electorate range, is not possible.
- 26 Cambridgeshire has an electorate of 591,247 resulting in a mathematical entitlement to 8.06 constituencies. We have therefore considered Cambridgeshire as a sub-region in its own right and have allocated eight whole constituencies, an increase of one. The electorate of Norfolk at 675,778 results in a mathematical entitlement to 9.21 constituencies. We have therefore considered Norfolk as a sub-region in its own right and have allocated nine whole constituencies, the same as the existing number.

⁷ Hereafter together referred to as Bedfordshire.

⁸ Hereafter together referred to as Cambridgeshire.

⁹ Hereafter together referred to as Essex.

- 27 Bedfordshire has an electorate of 467,322 resulting in a mathematical entitlement to 6.37 constituencies, meaning that it is not possible for Bedfordshire to be considered as a sub-region in its own right. A cross-county boundary constituency is therefore required. The electorate of Hertfordshire at 841,457 results in a mathematical entitlement to 11.47 constituencies. While it is possible for Hertfordshire to be considered as a sub-region in its own right, it would be extremely difficult in practice to construct constituencies that would each be within the permitted electorate range. We have therefore proposed a cross-county boundary constituency between Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire, which groups three wards from the Central Bedfordshire unitary authority with the Hertfordshire town of Hitchin. This results in the Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire sub-region being allocated 18 constituencies, an increase of one.
- 28 Essex has an electorate of 1,348,788 resulting in a mathematical entitlement to 18.38 constituencies, meaning that it is possible for Essex to be considered as a sub-region in its own right. The electorate of Suffolk at 557,535 results in a mathematical entitlement to 7.60 constituencies, meaning that it is not possible for Suffolk to be considered as a sub-region in its own right. A cross-county boundary constituency is therefore required. We have proposed that Essex, rather than Cambridgeshire or Norfolk, be included in a sub-region with Suffolk. We consider that a county boundary crossing between Essex and Suffolk is potentially less disruptive than any other county boundary crossing, and we consider this better reflects the statutory criteria. We have therefore proposed a cross-county boundary constituency between Essex and Suffolk, which contains a number of wards from Braintree district, including the town of Halstead, and a number of wards from West Suffolk district, including the town of Haverhill. This results in the Essex and Suffolk sub-region being allocated 26 constituencies, an increase of one.

Initial proposals for the Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire sub-region

Bedfordshire

- 29 There are currently six constituencies in Bedfordshire, one of which has an electorate within the permitted electorate range, two of which fall below and the remaining three are above the range. In our proposals, none of the six existing constituencies in Bedfordshire remain wholly unchanged, although the existing Bedford constituency is unchanged except to realign constituency boundaries with new local government ward boundaries. However, there is only minor change across each of the other existing constituencies.
- 30 In the south of the county, our proposals mean that only two wards change between the three proposed constituencies of Luton North, Luton South and South Bedfordshire, and Dunstable and Leighton Buzzard. The only change to the existing Luton North constituency is the inclusion of the Stopsley ward from the existing Luton South constituency. Although there are no direct, internal road links between the ward and the rest of the Luton North constituency, there are road links only a short distance across the constituency boundary. Furthermore, we consider the alternatives, such as the inclusion of the rural Toddington ward to the north, the dividing of the town of Dunstable, or dividing a ward in central Luton, would be unsatisfactory. The only other change to the existing Luton South constituency, other than to realign constituency boundaries with new local government ward boundaries, is the inclusion of the Eaton Bray ward from the existing South West Bedfordshire constituency. While this adds a large, rural element to a mostly urban constituency, we consider that there are no reasonable alternatives. Due to these changes, we consider that the existing constituency name is no longer appropriate, and we propose this constituency be called Luton South and South Bedfordshire, to reflect the areas the constituency covers. The only other change to the existing South West Bedfordshire constituency is a realignment with new local government ward boundaries. However, we propose it be called Dunstable and Leighton Buzzard, to reflect the main population centres included in the constituency.

- 31 As mentioned previously, the existing Bedford constituency is unchanged in our proposals other than to realign its boundaries with new local government boundaries. The only changes to the existing North East Bedfordshire constituency, other than realignment with new local government boundaries, are the inclusion of the Kempston Rural ward in the constituency, and the exclusion of the Stotfold and Langford, and Arlesey wards (which form part of the proposed cross-county boundary constituency with Hertfordshire). We consider that the reconfiguration of the constituency makes North Bedfordshire a more appropriate name than the existing name of North East Bedfordshire. The only change to the existing Mid Bedfordshire constituency, other than to realign it with local government ward boundary changes, is the exclusion of the Shefford ward (which again forms part of the proposed cross-county boundary constituency with Hertfordshire).

Hertfordshire

- 32 There are currently 11 constituencies in Hertfordshire, eight of which have electorates that are within the permitted electorate range, with the remaining three constituencies all above the range. In our proposals, none of the existing Hertfordshire constituencies are wholly unchanged, although four constituencies are unchanged except to realign their boundaries with local government ward boundary changes. There are considerable reconfigurations for two of the existing constituencies in order to minimise change throughout the rest of the county.

- 33 One of the areas of largest change in our proposals for Hertfordshire is the cross-county boundary constituency with Bedfordshire. We propose a Hitchin constituency that combines the Hertfordshire town of Hitchin with three Central Bedfordshire unitary authority wards (Stotfold and Langford, Arlesey, and Shefford). We consider these areas have established road links and local ties.
- 34 The existing constituencies of North East Hertfordshire, Stevenage and Welwyn Hatfield are unchanged in our proposals, except to realign the constituency boundaries with new local government boundaries. There is relatively minor change to the existing Hertford and Stortford constituency, with the three wards of Stanstead Abbots, Great Amwell, and Hertford Heath no longer included in the constituency, in order to bring the electorate within the permitted range. These three wards are instead included in the neighbouring Broxbourne constituency. The only other change to the existing Broxbourne constituency is the exclusion of the Welwyn Hatfield borough ward of Northaw & Cuffley, which we propose be included in the Hertsmere constituency.
- 35 The other area of large change in our proposals for Hertfordshire is in the south-western part of the county. We consider that a substantial reconfiguration of the existing South West Hertfordshire constituency is necessary to limit further change elsewhere in the county. The existing north-south configuration of the constituency runs from Tring, through Berkhamsted, to Rickmansworth. We instead propose a constituency named Harpenden and Berkhamsted, which has an east-west configuration from Tring, through Berkhamsted, to Harpenden. The constituency also includes the two Borough of Dacorum wards of Watling and Ashridge.
- 36 The transfer of the Borough of Dacorum wards of Watling and Ashridge to the proposed Harpenden and Berkhamsted constituency from the existing Hemel Hempstead constituency means that, to bring the Hemel Hempstead constituency within the permitted electorate range, we propose the inclusion of the ward of Bovingdon, Flaunden and Chipperfield, currently in the existing South West Hertfordshire constituency. We also propose the Hemel Hempstead constituency no longer includes the Kings Langley ward, which under our initial proposals is included in the proposed Three Rivers constituency. While this leaves the Kings Langley ward as the only Borough of Dacorum ward in a constituency otherwise wholly coterminous with Three Rivers district (known as an orphan ward¹⁰), it is necessary in order to bring the constituency within the electorate range, and unites the village of Kings Langley, including the train station, in the same constituency.

¹⁰ 'Orphan ward' refers to a ward from one local authority, in a constituency where the rest of the wards are from at least one other local authority.

- 37 In our proposals, the reconfigured Watford constituency includes no wards from Three Rivers district. Instead, it contains the whole of the Borough of Watford, plus the Hertsmere borough ward of Bushey North, from the existing Hertsmere constituency. As is the case with the Kings Langley ward, while this creates an orphan ward, it is necessary to bring the constituency within the electorate range. We also consider the Bushey North ward has good road links with Watford. The only other change to the existing Hertsmere constituency is the inclusion of the Welwyn Hatfield borough ward of Northaw & Cuffley, which is currently included in the existing Broxbourne constituency.
- 38 The existing St Albans constituency is unchanged except to realign the constituency boundaries with new local government ward boundaries to the west of the constituency.

Initial proposals for the Cambridgeshire sub-region

- 39 Cambridgeshire currently has seven constituencies, only one of which has an electorate within the permitted range, and the remaining six all above. The number of constituencies above the electorate range has led to the sub-region being allocated an entire additional constituency, which in turn means substantial change across the area is unavoidable. In our proposals none of the existing constituencies are wholly unchanged, although one constituency is only changed to realign its boundaries with new local government ward boundaries.
- 40 The existing Peterborough constituency is the only constituency in Cambridgeshire currently within the electorate range, and in our proposals it remains unchanged, other than to realign with new local government ward boundaries. We identified that it is possible to create a Peterborough constituency that is more compact around the city centre, crossing the River Nene. However, we consider that the constituency remaining unchanged more closely reflects the statutory criteria, especially given the knock-on impacts such a reconfiguration would have on the North West Cambridgeshire and Huntingdon constituencies.

- 41 In our proposals there is minimal change to the existing North East Cambridgeshire constituency, which becomes wholly coterminous with the District of Fenland. The three East Cambridgeshire district wards of Sutton, Downham Villages, and Littleport, currently included in the existing North East Cambridgeshire constituency, are instead included in our proposed East Cambridgeshire constituency. Further changes are required to bring the East Cambridgeshire constituency within the permitted electorate range, with a number of South Cambridgeshire district wards no longer included. This allows the constituency to become coterminous with East Cambridgeshire district, other than the inclusion of the two South Cambridgeshire district wards of Milton & Waterbeach, and Cottenham, both of which have road connections with Ely via the A10. These changes mean that the existing name of South East Cambridgeshire becomes less appropriate, and we therefore propose it be called East Cambridgeshire to better reflect the configuration of the constituency.
- 42 The only change to the existing Cambridge constituency in our proposals, other than to realign with new local government ward boundaries, is the inclusion of the Cherry Hinton ward in the South Cambridgeshire constituency. It was not possible to include all the wards of the City of Cambridge in the Cambridge constituency, with two wards required to be included in another constituency. The inclusion of the Cherry Hinton ward in the South Cambridgeshire constituency allows us to combine in the same constituency the area of Cherry Hinton that is located in the South Cambridgeshire district with the area of Cherry Hinton that is located within the City of Cambridge local authority. This arrangement also allows for the Trumpington ward to remain in the Cambridge constituency; despite local government ward boundary changes, the area to the north of the ward has strong links to, and is only a short distance from, Cambridge city centre. While the Queen Edith's ward undoubtedly has strong local ties to Cambridge, it is not included in the existing Cambridge constituency. We consider that the issue of which of the three wards of Queen Edith's, Cherry Hinton, and Trumpington should be included in the Cambridge constituency is a finely balanced argument, and we welcome views on this during the public consultation.

- 43 In addition to the inclusion of the Cherry Hinton ward, further changes are required to the existing South Cambridgeshire constituency to bring it within the permitted electorate range. In our proposals, the South Cambridgeshire district wards of Fen Ditton & Fulbourn, Balsham, and Linton are included in the South Cambridgeshire constituency. Furthermore, a number of wards in the northern part of South Cambridgeshire district are included in the proposed St Neots constituency. The proposed St Neots constituency also includes the Huntingdonshire town of St Neots and the village of Fenstanton, both currently included in the existing Huntingdon constituency. We consider the A428 and A14 roads provide transport links across the Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire district boundary, and throughout the majority of the St Neots constituency. The electorates of the existing Huntingdon constituency (85,109), and particularly the existing North West Cambridgeshire constituency (95,684), are significantly above the permitted range. This means that substantial change is inevitable. In addition to realigning with new local government boundaries, in our proposals the Huntingdonshire district wards of Holywell-cum-Needingworth, Somersham, Warboys, and Sawtry are transferred from the existing North West Cambridgeshire constituency to the proposed Huntingdon constituency. No further changes are required to the northern part of the North West Cambridgeshire constituency, other than to realign the constituency boundaries with local government ward boundary changes.

Initial proposals for the Essex and Suffolk sub-region

Essex


- 44 There are currently 18 constituencies in Essex, ten of which have electorates that are within the permitted electorate range, three fall below and five are above. In our proposals, none of the existing Essex constituencies remain wholly unchanged, although two are unchanged except to realign with new local government ward boundaries. However, there are only minimal changes to the majority of the existing constituencies. The most substantial change is to the existing Braintree constituency, as a result of the cross-county boundary constituency with Suffolk.
- 45 The only change to the existing Clacton constituency in our proposals is to realign it with new local government ward boundaries near the villages of Weeley and Tendring. The neighbouring Harwich and North Essex constituency is also affected by these ward boundary changes, and in our proposals there are further changes to the west of the constituency. The Prettygate ward, in the existing Colchester constituency, is included in the Harwich and North Essex constituency, thereby bringing the Colchester constituency within the permitted electorate range without any further changes required, other than the realignment with new local government ward boundaries to the south and west of the constituency. Furthermore, given the lack of direct road access over the River Colne between the Mersea & Pyefleet ward and the rest of the Harwich and North Essex constituency, we propose this ward is included instead in the Witham constituency, to better reflect the transport links in this area. The only other changes to the existing Witham constituency are to realign the boundaries with the new local government ward boundaries to the north-west of the constituency, and the exclusion of the Braintree district ward of Hatfield Peverel & Terling (which is now included in our proposed Braintree constituency), in order to bring the Witham constituency within the electorate range.
- 46 The only change to the existing Chelmsford constituency in our proposals is the exclusion of the Galleywood ward (which is now included in our proposed Maldon constituency), in order to bring the Chelmsford constituency within the permitted electorate range. The transfer of the Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon ward to the proposed Braintree constituency is the only other change to the existing Maldon constituency.

- 47 The existing Castle Point constituency is currently under the permitted electorate range, and therefore an additional ward needs to be included. The Thurrock unitary authority wards to the west either have too large electorates or have no direct road links. The inclusion of any of the wards from the Rochford district to the north would divide the town of Rayleigh, and the Lodge ward has no direct road access. We therefore propose to include the Southend-on-Sea unitary authority ward of West Leigh, currently in the Southend West constituency, in the Castle Point constituency. While we acknowledge this is not ideal, we consider that no alternatives would provide a superior solution regarding the statutory factors.
- 48 The Southend West constituency is also under the permitted electorate range, therefore further change is required. Due to the relatively large electorate size of the wards in the Southend-on-Sea unitary authority, minimising disruption is difficult. We therefore propose that five wards be transferred between the Southend West, and Rochford and Southend East constituencies, in order for them to both be within the permitted electorate range. The Eastwood Park and St. Laurence wards are transferred from the Southend West constituency to the Rochford and Southend East constituency, with the A127 road to the south of the two wards forming a large part of the boundary between the two constituencies. The St. Luke's, Victoria, and Milton wards are transferred from the Rochford and Southend East constituency to the Southend West constituency. We did consider an alternative that would have divided the West Leigh ward between constituencies and would have minimised changes to existing constituencies in this area. However, this alternative would mean that only two polling districts from the Southend-on-Sea unitary authority would be included in a constituency that would otherwise be wholly coterminous with the Borough of Castle Point. We consider the inconveniences that are likely to be attendant from this to be greater than the benefits of minimising change to existing constituencies. We have proposed one further change to the Rochford and Southend East constituency, with the inclusion of the Roche North & Rural ward from the Rayleigh and Wickford constituency. This brings both constituencies within the electorate range, with no further change required to the existing Rayleigh and Wickford constituency, and brings together parts of the town of Rochford in a single constituency that would otherwise have been divided between constituencies due to local government ward boundary changes.

- 49 The electorate of the existing Thurrock constituency is currently above the permitted range. We therefore propose the inclusion of the two wards of Tilbury St. Chads, and Tilbury Riverside and Thurrock Park, which are in the existing Thurrock constituency, in the South Basildon and East Thurrock constituency, uniting the Tilbury Docks with the villages of West and East Tilbury. In order to bring the South Basildon and East Thurrock constituency within the permitted electorate range, the Vange ward is included in the Basildon and Billericay constituency. The existing Basildon and Billericay constituency is otherwise unchanged.
- 50 We propose the inclusion, from the existing Brentwood and Ongar constituency, of the two wards of Moreton and Fyfield, and High Ongar, Willingale and The Rodings, in the Saffron Walden constituency. We consider that this change makes the existing constituency name of Brentwood and Ongar less appropriate, and therefore we propose it simply be called Brentwood. The only change to the existing Epping Forest constituency is to transfer the Broadley Common, Epping Upland and Nazeing ward to the Harlow constituency: we consider the ward has links with the wards of Roydon and Lower Nazeing that are currently within the Harlow constituency. The inclusion of this ward in the Harlow constituency results in the electorate of the Harlow constituency being within the permitted electorate range without dividing the town of Waltham Abbey, or having knock-on effects on the proposed Saffron Walden constituency. No further changes are required to the existing Harlow constituency, other than minor realignments with new local government ward boundaries.
- 51 The electorate of the existing Saffron Walden constituency at 86,605 is currently significantly above the electorate range, and therefore substantial change is required. As mentioned previously, we have proposed that two wards be transferred from the Brentwood constituency to the Saffron Walden constituency. Furthermore, we propose that the four City of Chelmsford wards of Writtle, Chelmsford Rural West, Broomfield and The Walthams, and Boreham and The Leighs, which are currently within the existing Saffron Walden constituency, be included in the Braintree constituency. Further change is proposed to the existing Braintree constituency, as ten wards, including the town of Halstead, are included in the cross-county boundary constituency between Essex and Suffolk. Additionally, the Hatfield Peverel & Terling ward is included in the proposed Braintree constituency, and there are also changes to realign constituency boundaries with new local government ward boundaries. While the change to the existing Braintree constituency is significant, it avoids a 'domino effect' of changes to a series of constituencies that would otherwise be caused by the cross-county boundary constituency. Furthermore, the town of Braintree remains united within a single constituency, and the A131 provides road connections with the rest of the constituency.

Suffolk

- 52 There are currently seven constituencies in Suffolk, two of which are within the permitted electorate range, and the other five constituencies are all above the range. Of the two existing constituencies within the range, the existing Ipswich constituency is retained wholly unchanged in our proposals, while the existing South Suffolk constituency is unchanged except to realign with local government ward boundary changes.
- 53 We propose a cross-county boundary constituency that includes wards from the districts of West Suffolk and Braintree for a number of reasons. First, it allows the existing South Suffolk constituency to remain unchanged, other than to realign its boundaries with local government ward boundary changes. Second, it minimises change throughout the two counties more than the other options we identified. Also, the River Stour provides a less defined boundary between Essex and Suffolk near the town of Haverhill than elsewhere, and the surrounding wards share similar rural characteristics. We propose this constituency, which includes 13 West Suffolk district wards, including the town of Haverhill, and ten Braintree district wards, including the town of Halstead, be named Haverhill and Halstead.

- 
- 54 The towns of Bury St Edmunds and Newmarket are included in a constituency we propose be named Bury St Edmunds and Newmarket. This avoids either of the two historic Suffolk towns being included in a cross-county boundary constituency with Essex. The two towns also have road connections along the A14. The town of Mildenhall, and the surrounding wards in the northern part of West Suffolk district, currently in the existing West Suffolk constituency, remain in a constituency with the town of Newmarket.
- 55 The existing Ipswich constituency remains wholly unchanged. In our proposals, the wards of Kelsale & Yoxford, and Halesworth & Blything are no longer included in the Suffolk Coastal constituency. The only other change to the existing Suffolk Coastal constituency is near the village of Wickham Market, in order to realign the constituency boundaries with new local government ward boundaries. There is minimal change to the existing Waveney constituency in our proposal, with the Bungay & Wainford ward no longer being included, in order to bring the constituency within the electorate range. However, we also propose the name be changed from Waveney to Lowestoft, as the district the constituency was named after no longer exists, and the new name reflects the main population centre in the constituency.
- 56 There are three wards in the northern part of the Borough of Ipswich that are not included in the existing Ipswich constituency: Whitehouse, Castle Hill and Whitton. In our proposals, these wards continue to not be included in the Ipswich constituency. Instead they, along with a number of Mid Suffolk district wards and three East Suffolk district wards (Carlford & Fynn Valley, Kesgrave, and Rushmere St. Andrew), all of which are also currently in the existing Central Suffolk and North Ipswich constituency, are included in a constituency with the town of Stowmarket. We propose that the constituency be named Ipswich North and Stowmarket in order to reflect the main population centres covered by this constituency.
- 57 We also propose a North Suffolk constituency that includes wards from the north-eastern part of West Suffolk district, across to the towns of Framlingham and Bungay in East Suffolk district. This constituency also includes the Kelsale & Yoxford, and Halesworth & Blything wards that are currently in the existing Suffolk Coastal constituency. While this constituency contains wards from three local authorities, we consider them all to have a shared rural character and have good road connections along the A143 and B1117.
- 58 In formulating our initial proposals we did identify some alternative configurations in this part of the county. One configuration used the River Deben as a boundary between a constituency containing Borough of Ipswich wards of Gainsborough, Priory Heath, and Bixley in south-east Ipswich and the town of Felixstowe, and an East Suffolk constituency. However, we considered this resulted in unnecessarily large changes to both the existing Ipswich and Suffolk Coastal constituencies. Another configuration attempted to minimise change to the existing Central

Suffolk and North Ipswich constituency. However, this created a particularly narrow-shaped constituency, which included wards from northern Ipswich up to Bungay in the north of the county, which we considered did not reflect the statutory requirements as closely as the proposed North Suffolk constituency.

Initial proposals for the Norfolk sub-region

- 59 There are currently nine constituencies in Norfolk, three of which have electorates that are within the permitted electorate range, two fall below and four above. In our proposals, none of the existing Norfolk constituencies are wholly unchanged, although one is unchanged except to realign its boundaries with local government ward boundary changes. However, there are no substantial changes to any existing constituencies.
- 60 While it is possible to retain the existing Great Yarmouth constituency wholly unchanged, remaining coterminous with the Great Yarmouth borough boundaries, this would result in more significant changes to constituencies throughout the county. This is because Norfolk's mathematical entitlement to 9.21 constituencies means that the average electorate size of the nine constituencies needs to be at the upper end of the permitted electorate range. A wholly unchanged Great Yarmouth constituency would have a particularly low electorate of 70,077, increasing the electorate size of the remaining constituencies further, and causing significant disruption. As such, in our proposals the wards of Hickling and Stalham, currently in the existing North Norfolk constituency, and which have local ties and road links to the neighbouring Great Yarmouth borough wards of East Flegg and West Flegg via the A149, are included in the Great Yarmouth constituency. This change is compensated for by the inclusion of the town of Fakenham in the North Norfolk constituency.
- 61 The existing Norwich North constituency is below the permitted electorate range and therefore change is required. In order to avoid the constituency extending into the rural areas to the north, which we consider would also weaken internal transport links for the Broadland constituency, we have proposed the inclusion of the Thorpe Hamlet ward – which is currently in the Norwich South constituency – in the Norwich North constituency. While this does involve dividing part of the city centre, and Norwich Cathedral being located in the Norwich North constituency rather than Norwich South constituency, the majority of the ward is north of the River Wensum and has links to the area of Thorpe St Andrew to the east. This also allows us to include the South Norfolk district wards of Old Costessey and New Costessey in the Norwich South constituency. No further changes are proposed to the two Norwich constituencies.

- 62 The electorate of the existing South Norfolk constituency at 86,421 is significantly above the permitted electorate range. The inclusion of the Old Costessey ward in the Norwich South constituency means that the transfer of the Easton ward to the Mid Norfolk constituency is the only other ward change required to bring the South Norfolk constituency within the permitted electorate range. We propose that the Mid Norfolk constituency be extended further south, to the border with Suffolk. Although this would exceed the permitted electorate range, the electorate of the Mid Norfolk constituency is reduced by transferring the Breckland district wards of Upper Wensum and Lincoln to the Broadland constituency (to compensate for the transfer of Fakenham to North Norfolk), and the wards of Hermitage, Launditch, and Necton to the South West Norfolk constituency. This brings all three constituencies within the permitted electorate range.
- 63 The North West Norfolk constituency is unchanged except to realign its boundaries with new local government ward boundaries to the south of the constituency.

4 How to have your say

- 64 We are consulting on our initial proposals for an eight-week period, from 8 June 2021 to 2 August 2021. We encourage everyone to give us their views on our proposals for their area – the more public responses we receive and the more local information that is provided, the more informed our decisions will be when analysing all the responses we have received.
- 65 On our interactive consultation website, at www.bcereviews.org.uk, you can see what constituency you will be in under our proposals, and compare it with your existing constituency and local government boundaries. You can also easily submit your views on our proposals through that consultation website.
- 66 When making comments on our initial proposals, we ask people to bear in mind the tight constraints placed on the Commission by the rules set by Parliament, discussed in chapter 2 and in our Guide to the 2023 Review. Most importantly, in the Eastern region:
- we cannot recommend constituencies that have electorates that contain more than 77,062 or fewer than 69,724 electors
 - we are basing our initial proposals on local government ward boundaries (existing or – where relevant – prospective) as at 1 December 2020 as the building blocks of constituencies – although where there is strong justification for doing so, we will consider dividing a ward between constituencies (see the Guide to the 2023 Review for more detailed information)
 - we have constructed constituencies within regions, so as not to cross regional boundaries – very compelling reasons would need to be given to persuade us that we should depart from this approach.

- 67 These issues mean that we encourage people who are making a comment about their local area to bear in mind any consequential effects for neighbouring areas that might result from their suggestions. The Commission must look at the recommendations for new constituencies across the whole region (and, indeed, across England). What may be a better solution for one location may have undesirable consequences for others. We therefore ask everyone wishing to respond to our consultation to bear in mind the impact of their counter-proposals on neighbouring constituencies, and on those further afield across the region.

How can you give us your views?

- 68 Views on our initial proposals should be given to the Commission initially in writing. We encourage everyone who wishes to comment on our proposals in writing to do so through our interactive consultation website¹¹ at www.bcereviews.org.uk – you will find all the details you need and be able to comment directly through the website. The website allows you to explore the map of our proposals and get further data, including the electorate sizes of every ward. You can also upload text or data files you may have previously prepared setting out your views.
- 69 We encourage everyone, before submitting a representation, to read our approach to protecting and using your personal details (available at www.bcereviews.org.uk). As these consultations are very much concerned with a respondent's sense of place and community, when publishing responses (which the law requires us to do), we will associate the response with the general locality of the respondent's address, but we will not publish a respondent's name or detailed address with their response, unless they specifically ask us to do so.
- 70 It is important to stress that all representations, whether they have been made through our website or sent to us in writing, will be given equal consideration by the Commission.
- 71 As noted above, there will be an opportunity to make an oral response to our initial proposals – and comment on the responses of others – during the secondary consultation stage. We will therefore publish further details about these public hearings, and how you can make a contribution to one, closer to the dates of the secondary consultation period.

¹¹ Our website has been designed to maximise accessibility for all users, in line with the Public Sector Bodies (Websites and Mobile Applications) (No.2) Accessibility Regulations 2018.

What do we want views on?

- 72 We would particularly like to ask two things of people responding to our consultation. Firstly, if you support our proposals, please tell us so. Past experience suggests that too often people who are happy with our proposals do not respond in support, while those who object to them do respond to make their points. That can give a distorted view of the balance of public support or objection to proposals, and those who, in fact, support our initial proposals may then be disappointed if those proposals are subsequently revised in light of the consultation responses. Secondly, if you are considering objecting to our proposals, do please use the resources (such as maps and electorate figures) available on our website and at the places of deposit¹² to put forward counter-proposals that are in accordance with the rules to which we are working.
- 73 Above all, however, we encourage everyone to have their say on our initial proposals and, in doing so, to become involved in drawing the map of new Parliamentary constituencies. The more views and information we receive as a result of our initial proposals and through the subsequent consultation phases, the more informed our consideration in developing those proposals will be, and the better we will be able to reflect the public's views in the final recommendations that we present in 2023.

¹² The legislation requires our proposals to be made available in at least one 'place of deposit' open to the public in each proposed constituency. A list of these places of deposit is published on our website.

Appendix: Initial proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
Basildon and Billericay BC			76,993
	Billericay East	Basildon	9,370
	Billericay West	Basildon	9,454
	Burstead	Basildon	8,796
	Crouch	Basildon	6,651
	Fryerns	Basildon	10,110
	Laindon Park	Basildon	9,808
	Lee Chapel North	Basildon	9,687
	St. Martin's	Basildon	6,319
	Vange	Basildon	6,798
Bedford BC			70,068
	Brickhill	Bedford	6,190
	Castle	Bedford	5,355
	Cauldwell	Bedford	5,661
	De Parys	Bedford	4,621
	Goldington	Bedford	6,362
	Harpur	Bedford	5,417
	Kempston Central and East	Bedford	4,900
	Kempston North	Bedford	2,806
	Kempston South	Bedford	2,992
	Kempston West	Bedford	3,636
	Kingsbrook	Bedford	5,709
	Newnham	Bedford	5,313
	Putnoe	Bedford	5,749
	Queens Park	Bedford	5,357
Braintree CC			70,454
	Bocking Blackwater	Braintree	7,264
	Bocking North	Braintree	4,129
	Bocking South	Braintree	4,301
	Braintree Central & Beckers Green	Braintree	6,076
	Braintree South	Braintree	4,521
	Braintree West	Braintree	4,632
	Great Notley & Black Notley	Braintree	7,371

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Hatfield Peverel & Terling	Braintree	4,659
	Rayne	Braintree	2,239
	Boreham and The Leighs	Chelmsford	4,800
	Broomfield and The Walthams	Chelmsford	7,336
	Chelmsford Rural West	Chelmsford	2,369
	Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon	Chelmsford	6,593
	Writtle	Chelmsford	4,164
Brentwood CC			71,298
	Brentwood North	Brentwood	5,293
	Brentwood South	Brentwood	4,498
	Brentwood West	Brentwood	5,470
	Brizes and Doddinghurst	Brentwood	4,817
	Herongate, Ingrave and West Horndon	Brentwood	3,107
	Hutton Central	Brentwood	2,967
	Hutton East	Brentwood	2,997
	Hutton North	Brentwood	3,147
	Hutton South	Brentwood	3,009
	Ingatestone, Fryerning and Mountnessing	Brentwood	5,076
	Pilgrims Hatch	Brentwood	4,579
	Shenfield	Brentwood	4,282
	South Weald	Brentwood	1,481
	Tipps Cross	Brentwood	3,155
	Warley	Brentwood	4,886
	Chipping Ongar, Greensted and Marden Ash	Epping Forest	3,451
	Lambourne	Epping Forest	1,619
	North Weald Bassett	Epping Forest	3,688
	Passingford	Epping Forest	1,919
	Shelley	Epping Forest	1,857
Broadland CC			73,822
	Lincoln	Breckland	4,268
	Upper Wensum	Breckland	5,037
	Acle	Broadland	2,324
	Aylsham	Broadland	6,998
	Blofield with South Walsham	Broadland	4,887
	Brundall	Broadland	4,963

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Burlingham	Broadland	2,142
	Buxton	Broadland	2,133
	Coltishall	Broadland	2,120
	Drayton North	Broadland	2,206
	Drayton South	Broadland	1,969
	Eynesford	Broadland	2,532
	Great Witchingham	Broadland	2,182
	Hevingham	Broadland	2,307
	Horsford and Felthorpe	Broadland	4,072
	Marshes	Broadland	2,527
	Plumstead	Broadland	2,650
	Reepham	Broadland	2,139
	Spixworth with St. Faiths	Broadland	4,463
	Taverham North	Broadland	3,977
	Taverham South	Broadland	3,646
	Wroxham	Broadland	4,280
Broxbourne CC			75,454
	Broxbourne and Hoddesdon South	Broxbourne	7,154
	Cheshunt North	Broxbourne	6,384
	Cheshunt South and Theobalds	Broxbourne	6,297
	Flamstead End	Broxbourne	6,698
	Goffs Oak	Broxbourne	7,233
	Hoddesdon North	Broxbourne	7,119
	Hoddesdon Town and Rye Park	Broxbourne	6,396
	Rosedale and Bury Green	Broxbourne	6,744
	Waltham Cross	Broxbourne	6,890
	Wormley and Turnford	Broxbourne	7,730
	Great Amwell	East Hertfordshire	2,163
	Hertford Heath	East Hertfordshire	2,345
	Stanstead Abbots	East Hertfordshire	2,301
Bury St Edmunds and Newmarket CC			75,055
	Abbeygate	West Suffolk	3,747
	Brandon Central	West Suffolk	2,062
	Brandon East	West Suffolk	2,133
	Brandon West	West Suffolk	2,163
	Eastgate	West Suffolk	1,718
	Exning	West Suffolk	1,682

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Iceni	West Suffolk	3,293
	Kentford & Moulton	West Suffolk	2,192
	Lakenheath	West Suffolk	4,019
	Manor	West Suffolk	1,982
	Mildenhall Great Heath	West Suffolk	1,959
	Mildenhall Kingsway & Market	West Suffolk	2,096
	Mildenhall Queensway	West Suffolk	1,653
	Minden	West Suffolk	4,286
	Moreton Hall	West Suffolk	5,597
	Newmarket East	West Suffolk	3,711
	Newmarket North	West Suffolk	3,223
	Newmarket West	West Suffolk	3,625
	Risby	West Suffolk	2,332
	Southgate	West Suffolk	3,230
	St. Olaves	West Suffolk	3,236
	The Fornhams & Great Barton	West Suffolk	3,380
	The Rows	West Suffolk	3,599
	Tollgate	West Suffolk	4,228
	Westgate	West Suffolk	3,909
Cambridge BC			72,560
	Abbey	Cambridge	6,629
	Arbury	Cambridge	5,869
	Castle	Cambridge	4,205
	Coleridge	Cambridge	5,959
	East Chesterton	Cambridge	6,042
	King's Hedges	Cambridge	6,051
	Market	Cambridge	6,226
	Newnham	Cambridge	5,962
	Petersfield	Cambridge	6,626
	Romsey	Cambridge	6,350
	Trumpington	Cambridge	6,447
	West Chesterton	Cambridge	6,194
Castle Point BC			76,569
	Appleton	Castle Point	5,333
	Boyce	Castle Point	5,286
	Canvey Island Central	Castle Point	5,076
	Canvey Island East	Castle Point	4,815
	Canvey Island North	Castle Point	5,266

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Canvey Island South	Castle Point	5,093
	Canvey Island West	Castle Point	3,876
	Canvey Island Winter Gardens	Castle Point	4,864
	Cedar Hall	Castle Point	4,982
	St. George's	Castle Point	4,562
	St. James	Castle Point	5,411
	St. Mary's	Castle Point	4,982
	St. Peter's	Castle Point	5,143
	Victoria	Castle Point	4,620
	West Leigh	Southend-on-Sea	7,260
Chelmsford BC			76,454
	Chelmer Village and Beaulieu Park	Chelmsford	8,028
	Goat Hall	Chelmsford	4,693
	Great Baddow East	Chelmsford	6,509
	Great Baddow West	Chelmsford	4,710
	Marconi	Chelmsford	5,703
	Moulsham and Central	Chelmsford	8,823
	Moulsham Lodge	Chelmsford	4,328
	Patching Hall	Chelmsford	6,676
	Springfield North	Chelmsford	7,175
	St. Andrews	Chelmsford	6,553
	The Lawns	Chelmsford	4,180
	Trinity	Chelmsford	4,566
	Waterhouse Farm	Chelmsford	4,510
Clacton CC			70,942
	Bluehouse	Tendring	4,114
	Burrsville	Tendring	4,414
	Cann Hall	Tendring	4,731
	Coppins	Tendring	5,222
	Eastcliff	Tendring	2,564
	Frinton	Tendring	5,099
	Homelands	Tendring	2,469
	Kirby Cross	Tendring	2,605
	Kirby-le-Soken & Hamford	Tendring	2,504
	Little Clacton	Tendring	2,508
	Pier	Tendring	1,876
	St. Bartholomew's	Tendring	4,771
	St. James	Tendring	5,103

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	St. John's	Tendring	5,065
	St. Osyth	Tendring	4,055
	St. Paul's	Tendring	2,236
	Thorpe, Beaumont & Great Holland	Tendring	2,668
	Walton	Tendring	2,545
	Weeley & Tendring	Tendring	2,237
	West Clacton & Jaywick Sands	Tendring	4,156
Colchester BC			74,520
	Berechurch	Colchester	7,217
	Castle	Colchester	7,337
	Greenstead	Colchester	10,536
	Highwoods	Colchester	7,071
	Mile End	Colchester	8,554
	New Town & Christ Church	Colchester	9,208
	Old Heath & The Hythe	Colchester	8,582
	Shrub End	Colchester	7,976
	St. Anne's & St. John's	Colchester	8,039
Dunstable and Leighton Buzzard CC			74,069
	Dunstable-Central	Central Bedfordshire	3,375
	Dunstable-Icknield	Central Bedfordshire	5,986
	Dunstable-Manshead	Central Bedfordshire	3,654
	Dunstable-Northfields	Central Bedfordshire	7,244
	Dunstable-Watling	Central Bedfordshire	7,300
	Heath and Reach	Central Bedfordshire	3,619
	Houghton Hall	Central Bedfordshire	6,053
	Leighton Buzzard North	Central Bedfordshire	11,056
	Leighton Buzzard South	Central Bedfordshire	10,462
	Linslade	Central Bedfordshire	9,175
	Parkside	Central Bedfordshire	3,115
	Tithe Farm	Central Bedfordshire	3,030
East Cambridgeshire CC			76,279
	Bottisham	East Cambridgeshire	4,411
	Burwell	East Cambridgeshire	4,961
	Downham Villages	East Cambridgeshire	2,369
	Ely East	East Cambridgeshire	4,330
	Ely North	East Cambridgeshire	3,044
	Ely West	East Cambridgeshire	7,169

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Fordham & Isleham	East Cambridgeshire	4,688
	Haddenham	East Cambridgeshire	2,666
	Littleport	East Cambridgeshire	6,657
	Soham North	East Cambridgeshire	4,600
	Soham South	East Cambridgeshire	4,285
	Stretham	East Cambridgeshire	5,044
	Sutton	East Cambridgeshire	4,282
	Woodditton	East Cambridgeshire	5,010
	Cottenham	South Cambridgeshire	5,012
	Milton & Waterbeach	South Cambridgeshire	7,751
Epping Forest CC			72,785
	Buckhurst Hill East	Epping Forest	3,503
	Buckhurst Hill West	Epping Forest	5,286
	Chigwell Row	Epping Forest	1,792
	Chigwell Village	Epping Forest	3,469
	Epping Hemnall	Epping Forest	4,936
	Epping Lindsey and Thornwood Common	Epping Forest	5,343
	Grange Hill	Epping Forest	4,906
	Loughton Alderton	Epping Forest	3,253
	Loughton Broadway	Epping Forest	3,312
	Loughton Fairmead	Epping Forest	3,094
	Loughton Forest	Epping Forest	3,407
	Loughton Roding	Epping Forest	3,521
	Loughton St. John's	Epping Forest	3,506
	Loughton St. Mary's	Epping Forest	3,808
	Theydon Bois	Epping Forest	3,323
	Waltham Abbey High Beach	Epping Forest	2,023
	Waltham Abbey Honey Lane	Epping Forest	4,503
	Waltham Abbey North East	Epping Forest	3,182
	Waltham Abbey Paternoster	Epping Forest	3,389
	Waltham Abbey South West	Epping Forest	3,229
Great Yarmouth CC			76,713
	Bradwell North	Great Yarmouth	5,190
	Bradwell South and Hopton	Great Yarmouth	5,785
	Caister North	Great Yarmouth	3,656
	Caister South	Great Yarmouth	3,632
	Central And Northgate	Great Yarmouth	4,709

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Claydon	Great Yarmouth	5,324
	East Flegg	Great Yarmouth	4,022
	Fleggburgh	Great Yarmouth	2,193
	Gorleston	Great Yarmouth	3,995
	Lothingland	Great Yarmouth	4,357
	Magdalen	Great Yarmouth	5,152
	Nelson	Great Yarmouth	4,295
	Ormesby	Great Yarmouth	3,638
	Southtown and Cobholm	Great Yarmouth	3,232
	St. Andrews	Great Yarmouth	3,436
	West Flegg	Great Yarmouth	4,109
	Yarmouth North	Great Yarmouth	3,352
	Hickling	North Norfolk	2,196
	Stalham	North Norfolk	4,440
Harlow CC			70,190
	Broadley Common, Epping Upland and Nazeing	Epping Forest	1,768
	Hastingwood, Matching and Sheering Village	Epping Forest	1,954
	Lower Nazeing	Epping Forest	3,314
	Lower Sheering	Epping Forest	1,731
	Roydon	Epping Forest	1,741
	Bush Fair	Harlow	5,343
	Church Langley	Harlow	6,324
	Great Parndon	Harlow	4,751
	Harlow Common	Harlow	5,309
	Little Parndon and Hare Street	Harlow	5,888
	Mark Hall	Harlow	5,067
	Netteswell	Harlow	5,345
	Old Harlow	Harlow	6,992
	Staple Tye	Harlow	4,610
	Sumners and Kingsmoor	Harlow	4,955
	Toddbrook	Harlow	5,098
Harpenden and Berkhamsted CC			71,635
	Aldbury and Wigginton	Dacorum	1,910
	Ashridge	Dacorum	2,177
	Berkhamsted Castle	Dacorum	4,655
	Berkhamsted East	Dacorum	4,718
	Berkhamsted West	Dacorum	4,766

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Northchurch	Dacorum	2,266
	Tring Central	Dacorum	3,965
	Tring East	Dacorum	2,337
	Tring West and Rural	Dacorum	4,299
	Watling	Dacorum	4,406
	Harpenden East	St Albans	5,517
	Harpenden North	St Albans	5,660
	Harpenden South	St Albans	5,437
	Harpenden West	St Albans	5,983
	Redbourn	St Albans	4,846
	Sandridge	St Albans	3,734
	Wheathampstead	St Albans	4,959
Harwich and North Essex CC			74,056
	Lexden & Braiswick	Colchester	7,347
	Prettygate	Colchester	7,955
	Rural North	Colchester	8,553
	Wivenhoe	Colchester	7,548
	Alresford & Elmstead	Tendring	5,329
	Ardleigh & Little Bromley	Tendring	2,165
	Brightlingsea	Tendring	6,746
	Dovercourt All Saints	Tendring	5,202
	Dovercourt Bay	Tendring	2,190
	Dovercourt Tollgate	Tendring	2,385
	Dovercourt Vines & Parkeston	Tendring	2,104
	Harwich & Kingsway	Tendring	2,546
	Lawford, Manningtree & Mistley	Tendring	6,559
	Stour Valley	Tendring	2,410
	The Bentleys & Frating	Tendring	2,603
	The Oakleys & Wix	Tendring	2,414
Haverhill and Halstead CC			70,787
	Bumpstead	Braintree	2,334
	Gosfield & Greenstead Green	Braintree	2,185
	Halstead St. Andrew's	Braintree	4,526
	Halstead Trinity	Braintree	4,777
	Hedingham	Braintree	4,494
	Stour Valley North	Braintree	2,312
	Stour Valley South	Braintree	2,496

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	The Colnes	Braintree	4,477
	Three Fields	Braintree	4,610
	Yeldham	Braintree	2,127
	Barrow	West Suffolk	1,992
	Chedburgh & Chevington	West Suffolk	2,209
	Clare, Hundon & Kedington	West Suffolk	6,227
	Haverhill Central	West Suffolk	2,264
	Haverhill East	West Suffolk	2,602
	Haverhill North	West Suffolk	3,150
	Haverhill South	West Suffolk	4,032
	Haverhill South East	West Suffolk	1,874
	Haverhill West	West Suffolk	4,128
	Horringer	West Suffolk	2,040
	Rougham	West Suffolk	1,930
	Whepstead & Wickhambrook	West Suffolk	2,075
	Withersfield	West Suffolk	1,926
Hemel Hempstead CC			70,496
	Adeyfield East	Dacorum	3,907
	Adeyfield West	Dacorum	4,110
	Apsley and Corner Hall	Dacorum	6,886
	Bennetts End	Dacorum	4,353
	Bovingdon, Flaunden and Chipperfield	Dacorum	6,596
	Boxmoor	Dacorum	6,691
	Chaulden and Warners End	Dacorum	6,566
	Gadebridge	Dacorum	4,020
	Grovehill	Dacorum	5,269
	Hemel Hempstead Town	Dacorum	4,296
	Highfield	Dacorum	3,746
	Leverstock Green	Dacorum	7,032
	Nash Mills	Dacorum	2,759
	Woodhall Farm	Dacorum	4,265
Hertford and Stortford CC			75,396
	Bishop's Stortford All Saints	East Hertfordshire	5,524
	Bishop's Stortford Central	East Hertfordshire	6,659
	Bishop's Stortford Meads	East Hertfordshire	4,188
	Bishop's Stortford Silverleys	East Hertfordshire	4,408
	Bishop's Stortford South	East Hertfordshire	6,697
	Hertford Bengo	East Hertfordshire	6,025
	Hertford Castle	East Hertfordshire	7,144

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Hertford Kingsmead	East Hertfordshire	4,363
	Hertford Sele	East Hertfordshire	4,084
	Hunsdon	East Hertfordshire	2,623
	Much Hadham	East Hertfordshire	2,295
	Sawbridgeworth	East Hertfordshire	6,744
	Ware Chadwell	East Hertfordshire	2,454
	Ware Christchurch	East Hertfordshire	4,176
	Ware St. Mary's	East Hertfordshire	4,017
	Ware Trinity	East Hertfordshire	3,995
Hertsmere CC			73,256
	Aldenham East	Hertsmere	3,821
	Aldenham West	Hertsmere	3,885
	Bentley Heath & The Royds	Hertsmere	4,396
	Borehamwood Brookmeadow	Hertsmere	5,485
	Borehamwood Cowley Hill	Hertsmere	5,648
	Borehamwood Hillside	Hertsmere	5,123
	Borehamwood Kenilworth	Hertsmere	5,971
	Bushey Heath	Hertsmere	3,617
	Bushey Park	Hertsmere	5,610
	Bushey St. James	Hertsmere	5,265
	Elstree	Hertsmere	3,704
	Potters Bar Furzefield	Hertsmere	4,188
	Potters Bar Oakmere	Hertsmere	4,166
	Potters Bar Parkfield	Hertsmere	3,680
	Shenley	Hertsmere	3,943
	Northaw & Cuffley	Welwyn Hatfield	4,754
Hitchin CC			72,112
	Arlesey	Central Bedfordshire	11,980
	Shefford	Central Bedfordshire	7,923
	Stotfold and Langford	Central Bedfordshire	11,752
	Cadwell	North Hertfordshire	1,829
	Chesfield	North Hertfordshire	5,127
	Hitchin Bearton	North Hertfordshire	6,271
	Hitchin Highbury	North Hertfordshire	6,244
	Hitchin Oughton	North Hertfordshire	3,552
	Hitchin Priory	North Hertfordshire	3,707
	Hitchin Walsworth	North Hertfordshire	6,051
	Hitchwood, Offa and Hoo	North Hertfordshire	5,854
	Kimpton	North Hertfordshire	1,822

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
Huntingdon CC			75,590
	Alconbury	Huntingdonshire	2,899
	Brampton	Huntingdonshire	5,486
	Buckden	Huntingdonshire	2,628
	Godmanchester & Hemingford Abbots	Huntingdonshire	6,906
	Great Staughton	Huntingdonshire	2,694
	Hemingford Grey & Houghton	Huntingdonshire	4,792
	Holywell-cum-Needingworth	Huntingdonshire	5,500
	Huntingdon East	Huntingdonshire	4,967
	Huntingdon North	Huntingdonshire	6,962
	Kimbolton	Huntingdonshire	2,725
	Sawtry	Huntingdonshire	5,032
	Somersham	Huntingdonshire	2,949
	St. Ives East	Huntingdonshire	4,835
	St. Ives South	Huntingdonshire	5,837
	St. Ives West	Huntingdonshire	2,268
	The Stukeleys	Huntingdonshire	3,427
	Warboys	Huntingdonshire	5,683
Ipswich BC			75,117
	Alexandra	Ipswich	6,429
	Bixley	Ipswich	5,690
	Bridge	Ipswich	5,642
	Gainsborough	Ipswich	5,934
	Gipping	Ipswich	5,618
	Holywells	Ipswich	5,380
	Priory Heath	Ipswich	6,273
	Rushmere	Ipswich	6,177
	Sprites	Ipswich	4,998
	St. John's	Ipswich	6,461
	St. Margaret's	Ipswich	6,263
	Stoke Park	Ipswich	4,987
	Westgate	Ipswich	5,265
Ipswich North and Stowmarket CC			75,860
	Carlford & Fynn Valley	East Suffolk	6,719
	Kesgrave	East Suffolk	11,149
	Rushmere St. Andrew	East Suffolk	3,557
	Castle Hill	Ipswich	5,714

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Whitehouse	Ipswich	5,893
	Whitton	Ipswich	5,781
	Battisford & Ringshall	Mid Suffolk	2,471
	Blakenham	Mid Suffolk	2,653
	Bramford	Mid Suffolk	2,028
	Chilton	Mid Suffolk	4,579
	Claydon & Barham	Mid Suffolk	4,683
	Combs Ford	Mid Suffolk	4,705
	Needham Market	Mid Suffolk	4,908
	Onehouse	Mid Suffolk	2,211
	St. Peter's	Mid Suffolk	2,264
	Stonham	Mid Suffolk	2,366
	Stow Thorney	Mid Suffolk	4,179
Lowestoft CC			73,967
	Beccles & Worlingham	East Suffolk	11,889
	Carlton & Whitton	East Suffolk	7,960
	Carlton Colville	East Suffolk	7,526
	Gunton & St. Margarets	East Suffolk	7,841
	Harbour & Normanston	East Suffolk	11,147
	Kessingland	East Suffolk	3,549
	Kirkley & Pakefield	East Suffolk	10,508
	Lothingland	East Suffolk	2,919
	Oulton Broad	East Suffolk	10,628
Luton North BC			73,266
	Barnfield	Luton	5,603
	Bramingham	Luton	5,399
	Challney	Luton	8,972
	Icknield	Luton	5,792
	Leagrave	Luton	8,140
	Lewsey	Luton	8,507
	Limbury	Luton	5,673
	Northwell	Luton	5,213
	Saints	Luton	9,369
	Stopsley	Luton	5,186
	Sundon Park	Luton	5,412
Luton South and South Bedfordshire CC			70,197
	Caddington	Central Bedfordshire	7,895
	Eaton Bray	Central Bedfordshire	3,377
	Biscot	Luton	9,239

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Crawley	Luton	4,921
	Dallow	Luton	9,056
	Farley	Luton	7,384
	High Town	Luton	4,723
	Round Green	Luton	7,863
	South	Luton	7,783
	Wigmore	Luton	7,956
Maldon CC			70,201
	Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Chelmsford	4,189
	Galleywood	Chelmsford	4,339
	Rettendon and Runwell	Chelmsford	4,869
	South Hanningfield, Stock and Margaretting	Chelmsford	4,602
	South Woodham-Chetwood and Collingwood	Chelmsford	6,209
	South Woodham-Elmwood and Woodville	Chelmsford	6,113
	Althorne	Maldon	3,546
	Burnham-on-Crouch North	Maldon	3,293
	Burnham-on-Crouch South	Maldon	3,299
	Heybridge East	Maldon	3,291
	Heybridge West	Maldon	3,280
	Maldon East	Maldon	1,889
	Maldon North	Maldon	3,339
	Maldon South	Maldon	3,043
	Maldon West	Maldon	3,200
	Mayland	Maldon	3,539
	Purleigh	Maldon	2,866
	Southminster	Maldon	3,484
	Tillingham	Maldon	1,811
Mid Bedfordshire CC			71,748
	Elstow and Stewartby	Bedford	3,877
	Wilshamstead	Bedford	4,079
	Wootton	Bedford	4,995
	Ampthill	Central Bedfordshire	10,674
	Aspley and Woburn	Central Bedfordshire	3,824
	Barton-le-Clay	Central Bedfordshire	4,016
	Cranfield and Marston Moretaine	Central Bedfordshire	11,205

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Flitwick	Central Bedfordshire	10,710
	Houghton Conquest and Haynes	Central Bedfordshire	2,676
	Silsoe and Shillington	Central Bedfordshire	4,359
	Toddington	Central Bedfordshire	7,572
	Westoning, Flitton and Greenfield	Central Bedfordshire	3,761
Mid Norfolk CC			75,389
	All Saints & Wayland	Breckland	5,181
	Attleborough Burgh & Haverscroft	Breckland	3,898
	Attleborough Queens & Besthorpe	Breckland	5,424
	Dereham Neatherd	Breckland	5,720
	Dereham Toftwood	Breckland	4,356
	Dereham Withburga	Breckland	4,206
	Guiltcross	Breckland	2,502
	Harling & Heathlands	Breckland	2,584
	Mattishall	Breckland	4,466
	Saham Toney	Breckland	3,874
	Shipdham-with-Scarning	Breckland	4,287
	The Buckenham & Banham	Breckland	2,585
	Watton	Breckland	5,932
	Central Wymondham	South Norfolk	4,838
	Easton	South Norfolk	1,577
	Hingham & Deopham	South Norfolk	2,555
	North Wymondham	South Norfolk	4,456
	South Wymondham	South Norfolk	4,193
	Wicklewood	South Norfolk	2,755
North Bedfordshire CC			76,319
	Bromham and Biddenham	Bedford	5,942
	Clapham	Bedford	3,296
	Eastcotts	Bedford	3,353
	Great Barford	Bedford	6,268
	Harrold	Bedford	3,209
	Kempston Rural	Bedford	5,876
	Oakley	Bedford	3,000
	Riseley	Bedford	2,782
	Sharnbrook	Bedford	3,164
	Wyboston	Bedford	3,077

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Biggleswade North	Central Bedfordshire	7,577
	Biggleswade South	Central Bedfordshire	8,612
	Northill	Central Bedfordshire	3,589
	Potton	Central Bedfordshire	6,579
	Sandy	Central Bedfordshire	9,995
North East Cambridgeshire CC			70,806
	Bassenhally	Fenland	4,115
	Benwick, Coates & Eastrea	Fenland	3,574
	Birch	Fenland	2,190
	Clarkson	Fenland	1,205
	Doddington & Wimblington	Fenland	3,682
	Elm & Christchurch	Fenland	3,764
	Kirkgate	Fenland	1,585
	Lattersey	Fenland	2,132
	Manea	Fenland	2,088
	March East	Fenland	5,554
	March North	Fenland	5,354
	March West	Fenland	5,591
	Medworth	Fenland	1,358
	Octavia Hill	Fenland	3,031
	Parson Drove & Wisbech St. Mary	Fenland	4,123
	Peckover	Fenland	1,632
	Roman Bank	Fenland	5,267
	Slade Lode	Fenland	1,854
	St. Andrews	Fenland	2,037
	Staithe	Fenland	1,716
	Stonald	Fenland	2,245
	The Mills	Fenland	2,150
	Waterlees Village	Fenland	2,858
	Wenneye	Fenland	1,701
North East Hertfordshire CC			76,849
	Braughing	East Hertfordshire	2,207
	Buntingford	East Hertfordshire	5,829
	Hertford Rural North	East Hertfordshire	1,849
	Hertford Rural South	East Hertfordshire	2,087
	Little Hadham	East Hertfordshire	1,970
	Mundens and Cottered	East Hertfordshire	2,017
	Puckeridge	East Hertfordshire	2,193
	Thundridge & Standon	East Hertfordshire	2,495

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Walkern	East Hertfordshire	2,151
	Watton-at-Stone	East Hertfordshire	2,032
	Arbury	North Hertfordshire	2,211
	Baldock East	North Hertfordshire	2,311
	Baldock Town	North Hertfordshire	5,727
	Ermine	North Hertfordshire	2,103
	Letchworth East	North Hertfordshire	4,370
	Letchworth Grange	North Hertfordshire	5,505
	Letchworth South East	North Hertfordshire	5,343
	Letchworth South West	North Hertfordshire	5,945
	Letchworth Wilbury	North Hertfordshire	3,946
	Royston Heath	North Hertfordshire	4,430
	Royston Meridian	North Hertfordshire	4,139
	Royston Palace	North Hertfordshire	4,300
	Weston and Sandon	North Hertfordshire	1,689
North Norfolk CC			76,648
	Bacton	North Norfolk	2,064
	Beeston Regis & The Runtons	North Norfolk	2,207
	Briston	North Norfolk	2,026
	Coastal	North Norfolk	1,992
	Cromer Town	North Norfolk	3,988
	Erpingham	North Norfolk	2,220
	Gresham	North Norfolk	2,009
	Happisburgh	North Norfolk	2,183
	Holt	North Norfolk	3,608
	Hoveton & Tunstead	North Norfolk	4,308
	Lancaster North	North Norfolk	1,846
	Lancaster South	North Norfolk	4,263
	Mundesley	North Norfolk	2,252
	North Walsham East	North Norfolk	3,745
	North Walsham Market Cross	North Norfolk	2,148
	North Walsham West	North Norfolk	4,302
	Poppyland	North Norfolk	2,139
	Priory	North Norfolk	1,909
	Roughton	North Norfolk	2,306
	Sheringham North	North Norfolk	2,038
	Sheringham South	North Norfolk	4,152
	St. Benet's	North Norfolk	2,027

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Stibbard	North Norfolk	2,266
	Stody	North Norfolk	1,948
	Suffield Park	North Norfolk	2,215
	The Raynhams	North Norfolk	2,142
	Trunch	North Norfolk	2,185
	Walsingham	North Norfolk	2,048
	Wells with Holkham	North Norfolk	1,976
	Worstead	North Norfolk	2,136
North Suffolk CC			76,747
	Bungay & Wainford	East Suffolk	6,881
	Framlingham	East Suffolk	6,760
	Halesworth & Blything	East Suffolk	6,605
	Kelsale & Yoxford	East Suffolk	3,257
	Bacton	Mid Suffolk	2,293
	Debenham	Mid Suffolk	2,474
	Elmswell & Woolpit	Mid Suffolk	4,958
	Eye	Mid Suffolk	2,250
	Fressingfield	Mid Suffolk	2,355
	Gislingham	Mid Suffolk	2,582
	Haughley, Stowupland & Wetherden	Mid Suffolk	4,424
	Hoxne & Worlingworth	Mid Suffolk	2,292
	Mendlesham	Mid Suffolk	2,425
	Palgrave	Mid Suffolk	2,264
	Rattlesden	Mid Suffolk	2,469
	Rickinghall	Mid Suffolk	2,362
	Stradbroke & Laxfield	Mid Suffolk	2,495
	Thurston	Mid Suffolk	4,622
	Walsham-le-Willows	Mid Suffolk	2,572
	Bardwell	West Suffolk	2,125
	Barningham	West Suffolk	2,237
	Ixworth	West Suffolk	1,720
	Pakenham & Troston	West Suffolk	2,047
	Stanton	West Suffolk	2,278
North West Cambridgeshire CC			73,556
	Ramsey	Huntingdonshire	7,876
	Stilton, Folksworth & Washingley	Huntingdonshire	5,224
	Yaxley	Huntingdonshire	8,279
	Barnack	Peterborough	2,713

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Fletton & Stanground	Peterborough	6,329
	Fletton & Woodston	Peterborough	6,633
	Glington & Castor	Peterborough	5,297
	Hampton Vale	Peterborough	4,346
	Hargate & Hempsted	Peterborough	4,773
	Orton Longueville	Peterborough	6,528
	Orton Waterville	Peterborough	6,801
	Stanground South	Peterborough	6,273
	Wittering	Peterborough	2,484
North West Norfolk CC			75,200
	Bircham with Rudhams	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,240
	Brancaster	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,061
	Burnham Market & Docking	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,108
	Clenchwarton	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,270
	Dersingham	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	5,085
	Fairstead	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	3,696
	Gayton & Grimston	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	4,756
	Gaywood Chase	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	1,826
	Gaywood Clock	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	1,845
	Gaywood North Bank	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	6,331
	Heacham	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	4,489
	Hunstanton	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	3,719
	Massingham with Castle Acre	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,417
	North Lynn	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	3,141
	Snettisham	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,244
	South & West Lynn	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	3,024

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Springwood	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,066
	St. Margaret's with St. Nicholas	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	3,145
	Terrington	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	4,621
	The Woottons	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	5,526
	Walsoken, West Walton & Walpole	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	4,664
	West Winch	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	3,926
Norwich North BC			74,086
	Hellesdon North West	Broadland	4,615
	Hellesdon South East	Broadland	4,121
	Old Catton and Sprowston West	Broadland	6,611
	Sprowston Central	Broadland	4,243
	Sprowston East	Broadland	6,971
	Thorpe St. Andrew North West	Broadland	5,950
	Thorpe St. Andrew South East	Broadland	5,477
	Catton Grove	Norwich	7,177
	Crome	Norwich	7,851
	Mile Cross	Norwich	7,034
	Sewell	Norwich	7,216
	Thorpe Hamlet	Norwich	6,820
Norwich South BC			73,515
	Bowthorpe	Norwich	6,463
	Eaton	Norwich	7,715
	Lakenham	Norwich	7,379
	Mancroft	Norwich	6,907
	Nelson	Norwich	8,115
	Town Close	Norwich	7,810
	University	Norwich	9,108
	Wensum	Norwich	7,962
	New Costessey	South Norfolk	5,022
	Old Costessey	South Norfolk	7,034
Peterborough CC			72,273
	Bretton	Peterborough	5,698

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Central	Peterborough	6,290
	Dogsthorpe	Peterborough	5,557
	East	Peterborough	5,377
	Eye, Thorney & Newborough	Peterborough	7,222
	Gunthorpe	Peterborough	6,257
	North	Peterborough	5,524
	Park	Peterborough	5,692
	Paston & Walton	Peterborough	6,440
	Ravensthorpe	Peterborough	6,442
	Werrington	Peterborough	7,736
	West	Peterborough	4,038
Rayleigh and Wickford CC			76,422
	Wickford Castledon	Basildon	6,439
	Wickford North	Basildon	10,472
	Wickford Park	Basildon	7,446
	Downhall & Rawreth	Rochford	5,157
	Hawkwell East	Rochford	4,848
	Hawkwell West	Rochford	5,154
	Hockley	Rochford	5,177
	Hockley & Ashingdon	Rochford	5,290
	Hullbridge	Rochford	5,500
	Lodge	Rochford	5,295
	Sweyne Park & Grange	Rochford	5,059
	Trinity	Rochford	5,495
	Wheatley	Rochford	5,090
Rochford and Southend East CC			69,841
	Foulness & The Wakerings	Rochford	5,557
	Roche North & Rural	Rochford	5,132
	Roche South	Rochford	4,538
	Eastwood Park	Southend-on-Sea	7,639
	Kursaal	Southend-on-Sea	7,606
	Shoeburyness	Southend-on-Sea	8,743
	Southchurch	Southend-on-Sea	7,571
	St. Laurence	Southend-on-Sea	8,033
	Thorpe	Southend-on-Sea	7,493
	West Shoebury	Southend-on-Sea	7,529
Saffron Walden CC			71,575
	High Ongar, Willingale and The Rodings	Epping Forest	1,895

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Moreton and Fyfield	Epping Forest	1,744
	Ashdon	Uttlesford	1,625
	Broad Oak & the Hallingburys	Uttlesford	3,236
	Clavering	Uttlesford	1,864
	Debden & Wimbish	Uttlesford	1,743
	Elsenham & Henham	Uttlesford	3,616
	Felsted & Stebbing	Uttlesford	3,459
	Fritch Green & Little Dunmow	Uttlesford	1,893
	Great Dunmow North	Uttlesford	3,657
	Great Dunmow South & Barnston	Uttlesford	4,985
	Hatfield Heath	Uttlesford	1,821
	High Easter & the Rodings	Uttlesford	1,973
	Littlebury, Chesterford & Wenden Lofts	Uttlesford	3,473
	Newport	Uttlesford	3,062
	Saffron Walden Audley	Uttlesford	3,488
	Saffron Walden Castle	Uttlesford	3,448
	Saffron Walden Shire	Uttlesford	5,343
	Stansted North	Uttlesford	3,524
	Stansted South & Birchanger	Uttlesford	3,305
	Stort Valley	Uttlesford	1,622
	Takeley	Uttlesford	4,936
	Thaxted & the Eastons	Uttlesford	4,054
	The Sampfords	Uttlesford	1,809
South Basildon and East Thurrock CC			76,260
	Langdon Hills	Basildon	6,949
	Nethermayne	Basildon	9,766
	Pitsea North West	Basildon	9,140
	Pitsea South East	Basildon	8,953
	Corringham and Fobbing	Thurrock	4,496
	East Tilbury	Thurrock	5,061
	Orsett	Thurrock	4,983
	Stanford East and Corringham Town	Thurrock	6,535
	Stanford-le-Hope West	Thurrock	5,428
	The Homesteads	Thurrock	6,580
	Tilbury Riverside and Thurrock Park	Thurrock	4,329
	Tilbury St. Chads	Thurrock	4,040

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
South Cambridgeshire CC			75,484
	Cherry Hinton	Cambridge	5,966
	Queen Edith's	Cambridge	6,429
	Balsham	South Cambridgeshire	2,972
	Barrington	South Cambridgeshire	2,618
	Bassingbourn	South Cambridgeshire	2,992
	Duxford	South Cambridgeshire	2,767
	Fen Ditton & Fulbourn	South Cambridgeshire	7,685
	Foxton	South Cambridgeshire	2,729
	Gamlingay	South Cambridgeshire	2,969
	Hardwick	South Cambridgeshire	2,474
	Harston & Comberton	South Cambridgeshire	7,661
	Linton	South Cambridgeshire	5,676
	Melbourn	South Cambridgeshire	6,274
	Sawston	South Cambridgeshire	5,331
	Shelford	South Cambridgeshire	5,595
	The Mordens	South Cambridgeshire	2,705
	Whittlesford	South Cambridgeshire	2,641
South Norfolk CC			76,479
	Beck Vale, Dickleburgh & Scole	South Norfolk	5,257
	Bressingham & Burston	South Norfolk	2,756
	Brooke	South Norfolk	2,695
	Bunwell	South Norfolk	2,507
	Cringleford	South Norfolk	3,754
	Diss & Roydon	South Norfolk	8,181
	Ditchingham & Earsham	South Norfolk	5,265

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Forncett	South Norfolk	2,750
	Harleston	South Norfolk	4,774
	Hempnall	South Norfolk	2,631
	Hethersett	South Norfolk	6,459
	Loddon & Chedgrave	South Norfolk	4,634
	Mulbarton & Stoke Holy Cross	South Norfolk	7,321
	Newton Flotman	South Norfolk	2,516
	Poringland, Framinghams & Trowse	South Norfolk	6,118
	Rockland	South Norfolk	2,782
	Stratton	South Norfolk	3,417
	Thurlton	South Norfolk	2,662
South Suffolk CC			71,070
	Assington	Babergh	2,188
	Box Vale	Babergh	2,258
	Brantham	Babergh	2,066
	Brett Vale	Babergh	2,540
	Bures St. Mary & Nayland	Babergh	2,265
	Capel St. Mary	Babergh	2,419
	Chadacre	Babergh	4,869
	Copdock & Washbrook	Babergh	2,605
	East Bergholt	Babergh	2,315
	Ganges	Babergh	1,920
	Great Cornard	Babergh	7,017
	Hadleigh North	Babergh	2,055
	Hadleigh South	Babergh	4,470
	Lavenham	Babergh	4,176
	Long Melford	Babergh	4,665
	North West Cosford	Babergh	2,203
	Orwell	Babergh	2,073
	South East Cosford	Babergh	2,114
	Sproughton & Pinewood	Babergh	4,263
	Stour	Babergh	2,375
	Sudbury North East	Babergh	1,972
	Sudbury North West	Babergh	4,093
	Sudbury South East	Babergh	1,927
	Sudbury South West	Babergh	2,222

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
South West Norfolk CC			73,926
	Ashill	Breckland	2,219
	Bedingfeld	Breckland	2,412
	Forest	Breckland	2,196
	Hermitage	Breckland	2,251
	Launditch	Breckland	2,066
	Nar Valley	Breckland	2,252
	Necton	Breckland	2,199
	Swaffham	Breckland	6,358
	Thetford Boudica	Breckland	3,121
	Thetford Burrell	Breckland	3,453
	Thetford Castle	Breckland	3,486
	Thetford Priory	Breckland	3,950
	Airfield	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	4,148
	Denver	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,020
	Downham Old Town	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,189
	East Downham	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,056
	Emneth & Outwell	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	3,959
	Feltwell	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	4,081
	Methwold	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,029
	North Downham	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,120
	South Downham	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,034
	Tilney, Mershe Lande & Wiggshall	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	4,003
	Upwell & Delph	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	4,969
	Watlington	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,190
	Wissey	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,165
Southend West BC			69,817
	Belfairs	Southend-on-Sea	7,565
	Blenheim Park	Southend-on-Sea	8,201

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Chalkwell	Southend-on-Sea	7,214
	Leigh	Southend-on-Sea	7,628
	Milton	Southend-on-Sea	7,822
	Prittlewell	Southend-on-Sea	7,787
	St. Luke's	Southend-on-Sea	8,046
	Victoria	Southend-on-Sea	8,103
	Westborough	Southend-on-Sea	7,451
St Albans CC			70,881
	Ashley	St Albans	5,783
	Batchwood	St Albans	5,351
	Clarence	St Albans	5,192
	Colney Heath	St Albans	4,542
	Cunningham	St Albans	4,704
	London Colney	St Albans	6,938
	Marshalswick North	St Albans	4,955
	Marshalswick South	St Albans	5,483
	Park Street	St Albans	5,673
	Sopwell	St Albans	5,207
	St. Peters	St Albans	6,144
	St. Stephen	St Albans	5,380
	Verulam	St Albans	5,529
St Neots CC			74,699
	Fenstanton	Huntingdonshire	2,970
	Great Paxton	Huntingdonshire	2,571
	St. Neots East	Huntingdonshire	2,261
	St. Neots Eatons	Huntingdonshire	8,354
	St. Neots Eynesbury	Huntingdonshire	8,658
	St. Neots Priory Park & Little Paxton	Huntingdonshire	7,801
	Bar Hill	South Cambridgeshire	2,789
	Caldecote	South Cambridgeshire	2,732
	Cambourne	South Cambridgeshire	7,029
	Caxton & Papworth	South Cambridgeshire	4,761
	Girton	South Cambridgeshire	4,052
	Histon & Impington	South Cambridgeshire	8,212

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Longstanton	South Cambridgeshire	4,272
	Over & Willingham	South Cambridgeshire	5,537
	Swavesey	South Cambridgeshire	2,700
Stevenage CC			70,370
	Datchworth & Aston	East Hertfordshire	1,973
	Codicote	North Hertfordshire	2,150
	Knebworth	North Hertfordshire	4,176
	Bandley Hill	Stevenage	4,905
	Bedwell	Stevenage	5,147
	Chells	Stevenage	4,761
	Longmeadow	Stevenage	4,326
	Manor	Stevenage	4,929
	Martins Wood	Stevenage	4,461
	Old Town	Stevenage	6,148
	Pin Green	Stevenage	4,581
	Roebuck	Stevenage	4,857
	Shephall	Stevenage	4,345
	St. Nicholas	Stevenage	5,141
	Symonds Green	Stevenage	4,349
	Woodfield	Stevenage	4,121
Suffolk Coastal CC			73,270
	Aldeburgh & Leiston	East Suffolk	9,511
	Deben	East Suffolk	3,661
	Eastern Felixstowe	East Suffolk	10,168
	Martlesham & Purdis Farm	East Suffolk	6,215
	Melton	East Suffolk	3,489
	Orwell & Villages	East Suffolk	7,713
	Rendlesham & Orford	East Suffolk	3,887
	Saxmundham	East Suffolk	3,344
	Southwold	East Suffolk	3,212
	Western Felixstowe	East Suffolk	8,392
	Wickham Market	East Suffolk	3,864
	Woodbridge	East Suffolk	6,358
	Wrentham, Wangford & Westleton	East Suffolk	3,456
Three Rivers CC			71,552
	Kings Langley	Dacorum	4,052

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Abbots Langley & Bedmond	Three Rivers	4,973
	Carpenders Park	Three Rivers	5,056
	Chorleywood North & Sarratt	Three Rivers	5,841
	Chorleywood South & Maple Cross	Three Rivers	5,793
	Dickinsons	Three Rivers	5,103
	Durrants	Three Rivers	5,041
	Gade Valley	Three Rivers	5,058
	Leavesden	Three Rivers	5,708
	Moor Park & Eastbury	Three Rivers	4,613
	Oxhey Hall & Hayling	Three Rivers	4,972
	Penn & Mill End	Three Rivers	5,129
	Rickmansworth Town	Three Rivers	5,553
	South Oxhey	Three Rivers	4,660
Thurrock BC			72,023
	Aveley and Uplands	Thurrock	7,056
	Belhus	Thurrock	6,847
	Chadwell St. Mary	Thurrock	7,045
	Chafford and North Stifford	Thurrock	5,264
	Grays Riverside	Thurrock	6,557
	Grays Thurrock	Thurrock	6,032
	Little Thurrock Blackshots	Thurrock	5,029
	Little Thurrock Rectory	Thurrock	4,309
	Ockendon	Thurrock	7,483
	South Chafford	Thurrock	4,559
	Stifford Clays	Thurrock	5,049
	West Thurrock and South Stifford	Thurrock	6,793
Watford BC			70,576
	Bushey North	Hertsmere	5,612
	Callowland	Watford	4,868
	Central	Watford	5,160
	Holywell	Watford	5,829
	Leggatts	Watford	5,377
	Meriden	Watford	5,431
	Nascot	Watford	6,315
	Oxhey	Watford	5,141
	Park	Watford	6,129
	Stanborough	Watford	5,470
	Tudor	Watford	4,942

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Vicarage	Watford	4,764
	Woodside	Watford	5,538
Welwyn Hatfield CC			74,535
	Brookmans Park & Little Heath	Welwyn Hatfield	5,102
	Haldens	Welwyn Hatfield	4,852
	Handside	Welwyn Hatfield	5,359
	Hatfield Central	Welwyn Hatfield	4,767
	Hatfield East	Welwyn Hatfield	5,063
	Hatfield South West	Welwyn Hatfield	5,248
	Hatfield Villages	Welwyn Hatfield	5,471
	Hollybush	Welwyn Hatfield	4,748
	Howlands	Welwyn Hatfield	5,208
	Panshanger	Welwyn Hatfield	4,388
	Peartree	Welwyn Hatfield	4,768
	Sherrards	Welwyn Hatfield	4,434
	Welham Green & Hatfield South	Welwyn Hatfield	5,125
	Welwyn East	Welwyn Hatfield	5,069
	Welwyn West	Welwyn Hatfield	4,933
Witham CC			74,050
	Coggeshall	Braintree	4,602
	Kelvedon & Feering	Braintree	4,361
	Silver End & Cressing	Braintree	4,714
	Witham Central	Braintree	4,459
	Witham North	Braintree	5,088
	Witham South	Braintree	4,556
	Witham West	Braintree	4,889
	Marks Tey & Layer	Colchester	7,967
	Mersea & Pyefleet	Colchester	8,122
	Stanway	Colchester	6,915
	Tiptree	Colchester	7,283
	Great Totham	Maldon	3,019
	Tollesbury	Maldon	1,630
	Tolleshunt D'arcy	Maldon	3,442
	Wickham Bishops and Woodham	Maldon	3,003

Glossary


Assessor	Statutorily appointed technical adviser to the BCE, being either the Registrar General for England and Wales or the Director General of Ordnance Survey.	Public hearing	Formal opportunity in a given area for people to make oral representations, chaired by an Assistant Commissioner. In each region of England there may be no fewer than two and no more than five hearings, and each may last a maximum of two days.
Assistant Commissioner	Independent person appointed at the request of the BCE to assist it with the discharge of its functions.	Representations	The views provided by an individual, group or organisation to the BCE on its initial or revised proposals (or on the representations of others), either for or against, including counter-proposals and petitions.
Borough constituency (abbreviated to BC)	Parliamentary constituency containing a predominantly urban area.	Review date	The 'effective date' at which electorate and local government boundary data is fixed so that we can then work with it on a stable basis. Defined by the 2020 Act for the 2023 Review as 2 March 2020 for the electorate numbers, and 1 December 2020 for local government boundaries.
County constituency (abbreviated to CC)	Parliamentary constituency containing more than a small rural element.	Revised proposals	The initial proposals as subsequently revised.
Designation	Classification as either a borough constituency or as a county constituency.	Rules	The statutory criteria for Parliamentary constituencies under Schedule 2 to the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 (as amended by Acts up to and including the 2020 Act).
Electorate	The number of registered Parliamentary electors in a given area.	UK electoral quota	The average number of electors in a constituency, found by dividing the total electorate of the UK (less that of the five specific 'protected' constituencies) by 645.
(Statutory/ Permitted) Electorate range	The statutory rule that requires the electorate of every recommended constituency to be – for the 2023 Review – between 69,724 and 77,062.	Unitary authority	An area where there is only one tier of local council (above any parish or town council). Contrasted with those 'shire district' areas that have two tiers (i.e. both a non-metropolitan county council and a district/ borough/city council).
Final recommendations	The recommendations submitted in a formal final report to Parliament at the end of a review. They may – or may not – have been revised since the initial proposals in any given area.		
Initial proposals	First formal proposals published by the BCE during the review for public consultation.		
Periodical report	Report to Parliament following a general review of Parliamentary constituencies.		
Places of deposit	In each constituency the Commission will make available hard copies of its initial proposals (including report and maps). The places of deposit where the public may inspect the proposals are usually the offices of the relevant local authority, although other public places such as libraries may be used. The Commission will publish a full list of places of deposit on its website.		




This page is intentionally left blank



- Wards:
- 1 Bar Hill
 - 2 Caldecote
 - 3 Cambourne
 - 4 Caxton & Papworth
 - 5 Fenstanton
 - 6 Girton
 - 7 Great Paxton
 - 8 Histon & Impington
 - 9 Longstanton
 - 10 Over & Willingham
 - 11 St. Neots East
 - 12 St. Neots Eatons
 - 13 St. Neots Eynesbury
 - 14 St. Neots Priory Park & Little Paxton
 - 15 Swavesey



- Constituency
- Local Authorities
- Wards




© Crown copyright and database rights 2021 OS 100018289. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form. Third party rights to enforce the terms of this licence shall be reserved to OS.

This page is intentionally left blank



Wards:

- 1 Alconbury
- 2 Brampton
- 3 Buckden
- 4 Godmanchester & Hemingford Abbots
- 5 Great Staughton
- 6 Hemingford Grey & Houghton
- 7 Holywell-cum-Needlingworth
- 8 Huntingdon East
- 9 Huntingdon North
- 10 Kimbolton
- 11 Sawtry
- 12 Somersham
- 13 St. Ives East
- 14 St. Ives South
- 15 St. Ives West
- 16 The Stukeleys
- 17 Warboys



- Constituency
- Local Authorities
- Wards


0 1 2 km

© Crown copyright and database rights 2021 OS 100018289. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-license, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form. Third party rights to enforce the terms of this licence shall be reserved to OS.

This page is intentionally left blank




- Wards:
- 1 Barnack
 - 2 Fletton & Stanground
 - 3 Fletton & Woodston
 - 4 Glinton & Castor
 - 5 Hampton Vale
 - 6 Hargate & Hempsted
 - 7 Orton Longueville
 - 8 Orton Waterville
 - 9 Ramsey
 - 10 Stanground South
 - 11 Stilton, Folksworth & Washingley
 - 12 Wittering
 - 13 Yaxley



Legend:

- Constituency
- Local Authorities
- Wards



© Crown copyright and database rights 2021 OS 100018289. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-license, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form. Third party rights to enforce the terms of this licence shall be reserved to OS.

This page is intentionally left blank

Public
Key Decision - Yes

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Title/Subject Matter: Corporate Plan Refresh 2021/22

Meeting/Date: Overview and Scrutiny (Performance and Growth) Panel,
7 July 2021

Executive Portfolio: Councillor Ryan Fuller, Executive Leader

Report by: Business Intelligence and Performance Manager

Ward(s) affected: All

RECOMMENDATION

The Overview and Scrutiny Panel is invited to consider and comment on the refresh of the Corporate Plan for 2021/22, as detailed in the report to Cabinet attached.

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Title/Subject Matter: Corporate Plan Refresh 2021/22

Meeting/Date: Cabinet, 15 July 2021
Council, 21 July 2021

Executive Portfolio: Councillor Ryan Fuller, Executive Leader

Report by: Business Intelligence and Performance Manager

Ward(s) affected: All Wards

Executive Summary:

The purpose of this report is to update Cabinet on the refresh of the Corporate Plan for 2021/22 and present the proposed actions and performance indicators to Council for approval.

The Council's Corporate Plan was adopted in 2018, comprising of a four-year plan outlining the Vision, Strategic Priorities and Objectives for Huntingdonshire District Council. The Plan sets out what the Council aims to achieve in addition to core statutory services.

A 'light touch' review of the Plan has taken place which has allowed us to identify whether the 2020/21 key actions and performance indicators are still fit for purpose (i.e. which have been achieved and can be removed) and that those selected reflect the Council's current direction. The development of our Covid Recovery Programme and more activities being run as projects means several of the actions previously listed, and many new activities, are now covered by separate reporting mechanisms. They are therefore not included in the Corporate Plan to avoid duplication and any confusion which could arise from different reporting formats and timescales.

Recommendation:

The Cabinet is

RECOMMENDED

to endorse the proposed list of key actions and performance indicators at Appendix A for inclusion in the Corporate Plan for 2021/22.

The Council is

RECOMMENDED

to approve the revised key actions and performance indicators for inclusion in the Corporate Plan for 2021/22.

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 This report seeks endorsement of the proposed key actions and performance indicators (PIs) for the Corporate Plan for 2021/22.

2. WHY IS THIS REPORT NECESSARY/BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Council needs a clear vision with strategic priorities, setting out its objectives and how these will be achieved. The Council's Corporate Plan was reviewed in 2018 and comprises of a four-year plan outlining the Vision, Strategic Priorities and Objectives for Huntingdonshire District Council.
- 2.2 The purpose of the refresh is not about creating a new Corporate Plan but providing an opportunity to reflect on any changes needed to the key actions and PIs for 2021/22. This review provided an opportunity to consider whether any actions or measures have been achieved and should therefore be removed and whether any further changes to actions and PIs were needed. It was also an opportunity to consider whether the actions and measures continue to be the right ones. The review took account of whether any changes due to new challenges or ambitions were necessary.
- 2.3 The impacts of Covid-19 on our services and residents are now being addressed through our Covid Recovery Programme. As such, most of the 'recovery actions' previously included in the Corporate Plan have been removed but will be managed and reported on through that Programme. Similarly, more planned actions are now being run as projects and these will also be reported on separately as part of our programme of corporate projects.

3. OPTIONS CONSIDERED/ANALYSIS

- 3.1 Quarterly performance reporting throughout the year has highlighted areas where a small number of actions and PIs could be improved. We have taken into account feedback throughout the year from Heads of Service, Officers who provide data and both Overview & Scrutiny and Cabinet Members.
- 3.2 All actions and PIs supporting the three Strategic Priorities (People, Place and Providing Value for Money Services) were examined; proposed changes considered included removal of, or amendments to, actions or PIs as well as the addition of some new actions or PIs. The list of proposed key actions and PIs for 2021/22 is attached at Appendix A.
- 3.3 This review has followed the development of Service Plans which allows us to more closely align the actions or PIs proposed for inclusion in the Corporate Plan with those being used to manage services. Where the same actions and PIs have been used, services will be clearly focussed on delivering the same outcomes and measuring these in the same way. The Corporate Plan provides the highest level in the "golden thread" running from the Plan through Service Plans to individual objectives set in Staff Appraisals.
- 3.4 Services will continue to monitor progress on their Service Plan aims and Members will continue to receive reports on progress made against key activities and PIs in the Corporate Plan on a quarterly basis. Members will continue to receive reports on the progress of corporate projects each quarter and there will be separate reporting on Covid Recovery Programme actions.
- 3.5 Subject to any amendments, the proposed list of key actions and PIs at Appendix A will be submitted for approval by Council on 21 July 2021.

4. COMMENTS OF OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY

- 4.1 The Overview and Scrutiny (Performance & Growth) Panel is due to receive this report on the Corporate Plan Refresh at its meeting on 7 July 2021. Comments from the Panel will be submitted to Cabinet with this report.

5. KEY IMPACTS/RISKS

- 5.1 The key impact is that everyone in the Council will be clear about the actions and PIs to be used to measure progress made in delivering the Council's Vision and Strategic Priorities.

- Officers will be clear about what is important and their role as identified through individual objectives
- Financial Planning will be more clearly linked to corporate planning
- Service Plans will be more clearly linked to corporate planning
- Members will know what information they will get and when
- Portfolio Holders will be able to hold Officers to account
- Overview and Scrutiny will have the information they need to hold Portfolio Holders to account

6. WHAT ACTIONS WILL BE TAKEN/TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 6.1 Following Cabinet, the proposed key actions and PIs will be submitted for approval by Council. Once approved, an updated version of the Corporate Plan will be made available to all employees through the Intranet and will be published on the Council's website. Progress in delivering our key actions and results for PIs in the Corporate Plan will be reported to Overview and Scrutiny and Cabinet every quarter, along with details of financial performance and progress in delivering corporate projects.

7. LINK TO THE CORPORATE PLAN, STRATEGIC PRIORITIES AND / OR CORPORATE OBJECTIVES

- 7.1 No changes are proposed to the Corporate Plan Vision or Strategic Priorities. The actions and PIs proposed will be used to measure progress in 2021/22.

8. CONSULTATION

- 8.1 The Council's Senior Leadership Team and their teams have been involved in the refresh of the Corporate Plan, in consultation with relevant Portfolio Holders. The views of Overview and Scrutiny Members are to be submitted to Cabinet with this report following their meeting on 7 July 2021.

9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 Not applicable for this report.

10. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The Council's 2021/22 Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy to 2024/25 was approved by Council in February 2021. The proposed 2021/22 Corporate Plan actions and PIs have been informed by the approved service budgets and savings and growth proposals. It is anticipated that there will be no additional resource implications as a result of adopting these actions and PIs.

11. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 No equality implications have been identified as a result of the refresh of the Corporate Plan.

12. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISIONS

- 12.1 The Corporate Plan provides a clear direction for what we are doing, why we are doing it and what impact it is having. The refreshed Corporate Plan will continue to guide the work of services responsible for delivery of the Council's ambitions, with actions and PIs to be used to monitor progress in 2021/22.

10. LIST OF APPENDICES INCLUDED

Appendix A – draft Corporate Plan featuring key actions and performance indicators proposed for 2021/22.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

CONTACT OFFICER

Daniel Buckridge, Business Intelligence and Performance Manager

☎ (01480) 388065 (currently voicemail only)

Email: daniel.buckridge@huntingdonshire.gov.uk

Corporate Plan 2018 – 2022

Huntingdonshire is already one of the best places to live in the country. We have good strategic transport links, a diverse workforce, below average unemployment, prosperous towns, active and engaged communities, a wide range of leisure options, a well-cared-for local economy and many, many other benefits.

We want to create an environment within which Huntingdonshire and its people can thrive. We want to protect and enhance the natural beauty of the area, ensuring that new development creates sustainable places where people want to live.

The Council is one part of a complex structure of public sector service providers and, in the context of public sector reforms and new ways of working, the need for collaborative partnership working is ever-increasing. We know we cannot deliver our vision alone and no single organisation has all the answers. We are taking the lead on work with partners such as the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, to help bring in investment and attract people to live and work here.

We remain committed to addressing the area's 'grand challenges' (Good Start, Good Health, Good Work, Good Place), which are now linked to our Corporate Plan, as well as a range of 'wicked issues' which present risks to the area, its people and the Council's ability to deliver its vision. We will continue to be reactive to emerging issues as we address wider economic and environmental challenges and we will involve and support our residents and businesses in adapting to these challenges.

These include the national and local implications of Covid-19, with the pandemic and lockdown restrictions having significant impacts on our people, our businesses and some of our medium-term objectives. While it is still too early to fully understand the lasting effects on the area, both our emergency response and our recovery activities are aimed at minimising negative impacts and taking opportunities to "build back better". Our [Covid Recovery Programme](#) covers the specific activities and projects being delivered in direct response to the pandemic.

The Council's Corporate Plan sets out a programme of activity to deliver growth and investment in the local economy whilst at the same time delivering quality services to residents. However, in the current climate we need to remain prepared to reallocate resources to react to new circumstances and to support evolving recovery plans.

Where we can properly plan for the future prosperity of our residents, find sensible solutions to tackle the things that matter to our residents and more proactively engage with the communities of Huntingdonshire; we will do so. We will do all these things because we are an ambitious **place** with huge potential and we always strive for the best outcomes for our **people**.

The Corporate Plan shows you our objectives, the work programmes we have put in place, the actions we will take and how we will measure our performance.

Vision: We want to support a safe and healthy environment, deliver economic growth, provide value for money services and create opportunities for the people of Huntingdonshire

People (Good Start/Good Health):

We want to make our district a better place to live, to improve health and well-being and support people to be the best they can be

People – Support people to improve their health and well-being

Our Work Programme

- Enabling people to live independently through the provision of adaptations and accessible housing
- Providing great, accessible green spaces, countryside, leisure and cultural facilities and opportunities for recreation and health
- Ensuring new developments have sufficient public green open spaces including play provision
- Facilitating and providing opportunities for positive activities that support residents' health and wellbeing needs
- Supporting, enabling and facilitating individuals to improve their health and well-being through self-care
- Working with partners to improve health and reduce health inequalities
- Prioritising accessible, high quality, well maintained open space, walking and cycling facilities on new housing developments
- Meeting the housing and support needs of our population

Key Actions for 2021/22

- Work in partnership to provide greater leisure and health opportunities to enable more people to be more active, more often
- Provide financial assistance to people on low incomes to pay their rent and Council Tax
- Ensure that the principles of earlier interventions aimed at preventing homelessness are embedded within public sector organisations and other stakeholder partners
- Adopt a new Homelessness Strategy and a new Lettings Policy
- Identify and implement solutions to eradicate the need to place homeless families in B&Bs

Performance Indicators for 2021/22**We will measure our success in the following ways:**

- Number of homelessness preventions achieved (cumulative year to date)
- Average number of days to process new claims for Housing Benefit and Council Tax Support (cumulative year to date)
- Average number of days to process changes of circumstances for Housing Benefit and Council Tax Support (cumulative year to date)

More people taking part in sport and physical activity:

- Number of individual One Card holders using One Leisure Facilities services over the last 12 months (rolling 12 months)
- Number of individual One Leisure Active Lifestyles service users (cumulative year to date)

Providing more opportunities for people to be more active:

- Number of sessions delivered by One Leisure Active Lifestyles (cumulative year to date)

People participating more often:

- Number of One Leisure Facilities admissions – swimming, Impressions, fitness classes, sports hall, pitches and Burgess Hall (excluding school admissions) (cumulative year to date)
- People participating more often: One Leisure Active Lifestyles total attendances (cumulative year to date)

People – Develop a flexible and skilled local workforce

Our Work Programme

- Ensuring the full range of sufficient skills are available to support the Enterprise Zone
- Creating stronger links between businesses, education and training
- Working with businesses to establish current and future skills needs

People – Develop stronger and more resilient communities to enable people to help themselves

Our Work Programme

- Supporting community development and enabling the voluntary and community sector to develop
- Working with communities to build resilience
- Increasing and supporting the development of levels of volunteering

Key Actions for 2021/22

- Support community planning including working with parishes to complete Neighbourhood Plans
- Develop our asset-based approach to working with partners to improve opportunities for residents in the Oxmoor area, taking actions to increase community resilience and reduce demands and pressures on partner organisations
- Work with Recognised Organisations and other community organisations to increase volunteering

Place (Good Place/Good Work):

**We want to make Huntingdonshire a better place
to work and invest and we want to deliver
new and appropriate housing**

Place – Create, protect and enhance our safe and clean built and green environment

Our Work Programme

- Ensuring that our streets and open spaces are clean and safe

Our Work Programme

- Working closely with partners to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour
- Collaborating with partners, providers and stakeholders in an enterprising fashion to enhance community resilience and build sustainable opportunities for people

Key Actions for 2021/22

- Adopt a plan and deliver increases in nature – protecting and increasing biodiversity within our parks and open spaces
- Deliver programme of waste minimisation activities to encourage people to reduce, re-use and recycle

Performance Indicators for 2021/22

We will measure our success in the following ways:

- Percentage of sampled areas which are clean or predominantly clean of litter, detritus, graffiti or flyposting (cumulative year to date)
- Number of missed bins per 1,000 households (cumulative year to date)
- Percentage of household waste recycled/reused/composted (cumulative year to date)
- Number of complaints about food premises (cumulative year to date)
- Percentage of licensed taxi/hackney carriage/private hire vehicles that meet 'Euro 6' low vehicle emission standards (latest position at end of each quarter)
- Total number of appeals allowed as a percentage of total number of planning appeals decided (cumulative year to date)
- Number of cost awards against the Council where the application was refused at Development Management Committee contrary to the officer recommendation (cumulative year to date)

Place – Accelerate business growth and investment

Our Work Programme

- Supporting new and growing businesses and promoting business success
- Supporting the delivery of the Alconbury Enterprise Zone
- Supporting economic growth in market towns and rural areas
- Promoting inward investment

Key Actions for 2021/22

- Develop a Regeneration Plan

Key Actions for 2021/22

- Work with partners across the Cambridgeshire economy to deliver the ambitions of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review / Local Industrial Strategy

Place – Support development of infrastructure to enable growth**Our Work Programme**

- Facilitating the delivery of infrastructure to support housing growth
- Influencing the development of the Highways and Transport Infrastructure Strategy

Key Actions for 2021/22

- Continue to work with partners and influence the Combined Authority (CA) and secure support and resources to facilitate delivery of new housing, drive economic growth and provide any critical infrastructure
- Support the implementation of 'Prospectuses for Growth' for St Ives, Huntingdon and Ramsey and the St Neots Masterplan
- Continue to provide active input into and work with partners on key transport developments, including the A428, East-West Rail and A14 improvements
- Work with partners to develop Oxford-Cambridge Arc (Ox-Cam) growth corridor proposals and maximise the opportunities this can offer locally

Performance Indicators for 2021/22**We will measure our success in the following ways:**

- The amount of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding committed for infrastructure development (cumulative year to date)

Place – Improve the supply of new and affordable housing, jobs and community facilities to meet current and future need**Our Work Programme**

- Planning and delivering the provision of decent market and affordable housing for current and future needs
- Ensuring an adequate supply of housing to meet objectively assessed needs
- Ensuring there are the right community and leisure facilities to support new housing developments

Key Actions for 2021/22

- Maintain a five year housing land supply (5YHLS) and ensure that the Housing Delivery Test in the National Planning Policy Framework is met
- Devise and implement strategies to use Council assets to support the delivery of affordable homes

Performance Indicators for 2021/22

We will measure our success in the following ways:

- Percentage of planning applications processed on target – major (within 13 weeks or agreed extended period) (cumulative year to date)
- Percentage of planning applications processed on target – minor (within 8 weeks or agreed extended period) (cumulative year to date)
- Percentage of planning applications processed on target – household extensions (within 8 weeks or agreed extended period) (cumulative year to date)
- Number of new affordable homes delivered (cumulative year to date)
- Net growth in number of homes with a Council Tax banding (cumulative year to date)

Becoming a more Efficient and Effective Council

Our Work Programme

- Implementing our Transformation Programme
- Where possible, migrating customers to online services as the service of choice
- Maximising income opportunities, where appropriate
- Increasing the use of Information Technology to maximise efficiencies
- Identifying new opportunities for income generation
- Having an engaged and motivated workforce
- Ensuring our Medium-Term Financial Strategy is focused on strategic priorities
- Continuing to reshape the way the Council works to realise our savings target and improve performance

Key Actions for 2021/22

- Actively manage Council owned non-operational assets and, where possible, ensure such assets are generating a commercial return for the Council

Key Actions for 2021/22

- Develop the Council's approach to data and business intelligence to support efforts to improve organisational efficiency including the development of unit cost and value metrics to measure service performance
- Develop the Council's approach and methodologies for business change, service design, user research and designing digital services to enable effective change management within the organisation
- Develop a Workforce Strategy including options for best use of apprenticeship levy

Performance Indicators for 2021/22

We will measure our success in the following ways:

- Total amount of energy used in Council buildings (cumulative year to date)
- Percentage of Business Rates collected in year (cumulative year to date)
- Percentage of Council Tax collected in year (cumulative year to date)
- Number of magistrates court appeals against licensing decisions which have been upheld against the Council (cumulative year to date)
- Percentage satisfaction with ICT support services from feedback received (cumulative year to date)
- Percentage of invoices from suppliers paid within 30 days (cumulative year to date)
- Staff sickness days lost per full time equivalent (FTE) (cumulative year to date)
- Income generated from Commercial and Operational Estate Rental Income (cumulative year to date)

Becoming a more Customer Focused Organisation

Our Work Programme

- Ensuring technology is used effectively to maximise our interaction with customers
- Involving customers in significant changes to services
- Gaining a better understanding of our customer needs and ensuring all customer engagement is meaningful

Key Actions for 2021/22

- Develop our understanding of customer and resident needs and demands
- Expand how we offer online and out of hours access to our services via the customer portal and other solutions
- Introduce a new electronic pre-application planning advice service

Performance Indicators for 2021/22

We will measure our success in the following ways:

- Percentage of calls to Call Centre answered (cumulative year to date)
- Customer Services customer satisfaction rate (cumulative year to date)
- Percentage of Stage 1 complaints resolved within time (cumulative year to date)
- Percentage of Stage 2 complaints resolved within time (cumulative year to date)
- Percentage reduction in avoidable contacts (cumulative year to date)
- Percentage of households with customer accounts generated (latest result)
- Percentage of all council services that have an end to end digital process (latest position at end of each quarter)

Councillor Ryan Fuller, Executive Leader –

“I will never stop championing what a great place Huntingdonshire is and I want to see us continue to thrive.

The Council’s vision is ambitious but achievable. As a provider of vital services, we will strive for the best and will always be there for our most vulnerable residents.”

This page is intentionally left blank

Public
Key Decision - Yes

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Title/Subject Matter: 3C Legal, ICT and Building Control Shared Services Annual Reports 2020/21

Meeting/Date: Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Performance and Growth) – 7th July 2020

Executive Portfolio: Executive Councillor for Corporate Services, Councillor David Keane

Report by: Corporate Director (People) - Oliver Morley

Wards affected: All

RECOMMENDATION

The Overview and Scrutiny Panel is invited to comment on the Shared Services Annual Report 2020/21 attached to the Cabinet report in the Annex hereto.

This page is intentionally left blank

Public
Key Decision - No

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Title/Subject Matter: 3C Legal, ICT and Building Control Shared Services Annual Reports 2020/21

Meeting/Date: Cabinet – 15th July 2021

Executive Portfolio: Executive Councillor for Corporate Services, Councillor David Keane

Report by: Corporate Director (People) - Oliver Morley

Ward(s) affected: All

Executive Summary:

The attached Annual Report refers to the progress that has been made over the last year by the 3C ICT, Legal and Building Control shared services against the 2020/21 Business Plans in terms of their financial and service performance. It also covers customer satisfaction and work to deliver on development projects.

Shared Services are overseen by a Management Board (containing the lead directors from each authority). The governance structure also features a Chief Executives' Board and an overarching group comprising the Executive Councillors with overall responsibility for shared services from each of the Councils.

The Annual Report requires the approval of all three partners. It is therefore recommended that the Cabinet delegate authority to the Shared Service Management Board to agree final amendments to the Annual Report in line with comments received from all partner committees.

Recommendation(s):

The Cabinet is

RECOMMENDED

- 1) To endorse the 3C Shared Services Annual Report attached at Appendix A; and
- 2) To delegate authority to the Shared Service Management Board to agree any final amendments to the Annual Report in line with comments received from all three individual partner Councils.

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To receive the Annual Report of the services currently delivered in partnership with Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridge City Council and Huntingdonshire District Council commenced sharing Legal, Building Control and ICT Services in October 2015 (known as 3C Shared Services). The shared services are based upon a “lead authority model” where an agreed lead Council is responsible for the operational delivery of the service. The formal partnership agreement between the authorities contains a requirement that an Annual Report is prepared on the services’ activities and performance. The 3C Shared Services Annual Report, at Appendix A, sets out the context for the operation of each of the shared services with a summary of performance against the approved business plan.

2.2 The achievement of the following outcomes is regarded as the primary objective of sharing services:

- Protection of services which support the delivery of the wider policy objectives of each Council;
- The creation of services that are genuinely shared between the relevant councils with those councils sharing the risks and benefits whilst having in place a robust model to control the operation and direction of the service;
- Savings through reduced managements costs and economies of scale;
- Increased resilience and retention of staff;
- Minimise the bureaucracy involved in operating the shared service;
- Opportunities to generate additional income, where appropriate;
- Procurement and purchasing efficiencies, and
- Sharing of specialist roles which individually, are not viable in the long-term.

2.3 The Council aims to be a good partner to facilitate effective strategic relationships and collaboration and to drive service integration where this improves shared outcomes. There is a continued commitment, as part of this, to the effective delivery of shared services and to ensure that governance arrangements are effective and service levels are agreed and effectively monitored. This includes a documented understanding of the quality standards, performance levels or benefits from the integrated services.

2.4 This report provides the Cabinet with the opportunity to consider the extent to which the agreed outcomes have been delivered and the performance of the range of services that are being administered on a shared basis.

2.5 The original Shared Services Agreement for the 3C services was in place from 2015 and until 30th September 2020. The renewal process as defined

in that Agreement was followed, with the result that a new Agreement was completed to last until 30th September 2025.

3. OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 3.1 The Annual Reports are provided to Cabinet for information. Cabinet is invited to consider and note the content of these reports but may request further information or clarification if helpful in that deliberation.

4. COMMENTS OF OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY

- 4.1 The comments of the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel will be included in this section prior to its consideration by the Cabinet.

5. WHAT ACTIONS WILL BE TAKEN/TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 5.1 The Head of each shared service is responsible for the overall operation of that service. Any feedback on the Annual Report will be fed into them to inform the delivery of the service and how it operates.
- 5.2 The recommendation set out is to delegate authority to the Shared Service Management Board to agree final amendments to the Annual Report in line with comments received from all three individual partner Councils.

6. LINK TO THE CORPORATE PLAN, STRATEGIC PRIORITIES AND/OR CORPORATE OBJECTIVES

- 6.1 The recommendations relate to the corporate objective 'to become more business-like and efficient in the way we deliver services'.

7. CONSULTATION

- 7.1 Significant consultation with staff and Staff Council took place during the establishment of the Shared Services.

8. IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 There are no significant implications.

9. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISIONS

- 9.1 To enable the Cabinet to consider how the shared services have delivered against the approved business plans for the year ended March 2021. The Annual Report at Appendix A provides service specific details on the operation and performance of the shared services.

9.3 The Cabinet is **RECOMMENDED**

- 1) To note the 3C Shared Services Annual Report attached at Appendix A; and

- 2) To delegate authority to the Shared Service Management Board to agree any final amendments to the Annual Report in line with comments received from all three individual partner Councils.

10. LIST OF APPENDICES INCLUDED

Appendix A – 3C Shared Services Annual Report 2020/21.

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

CONTACT OFFICER

Name/Job Title: Oliver Morley
Tel No: Corporate Director (People)
Email: Oliver.Morley@Huntingdonshire.gov.uk



2020/21 Annual Report

3C Shared Services is a strategic partnership between Cambridge City Council, Huntingdonshire District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

VERSION 0.1

Author: 3C Shared Services Management Board

Contents

Section 1 - General Information

Section 2 - 3C Legal Shared Service Annual Report 2020/21

Section 3 – 3C ICT Shared Service Annual Report 2020/21

Section 4 – Building Control Shared Service Annual Report 2020/21

Section 1 - General Information

- 1.1 Cambridge City Council, Huntingdonshire District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council commenced sharing Legal, ICT and Building Control services in October 2015. The formal Agreement between the authorities contains a requirement that an Annual Report is prepared on the services' activities and performance.
- 1.2 The Shared Services Agreement establishes a governance structure comprising a Management Board (containing the lead directors from each authority), a Chief Executives' Board and 3C Joint Shared Services Group (comprising of the leaders of each of the Councils). In addition, Senior Managers ensure the services have appropriate plans in place that are aligned to deliver against the priorities of the three partner authorities.
- 1.3 The Shared Services Agreement was renewed in 2020 and lasts until 30th September 2025. In addition to the Principles of Collaboration, following detailed discussions with the Member Joint Group, the Agreement now formally establishes a comprehensive set of Objectives of sharing:
- To operate in partnership and support the objectives of the 3 Councils.
 - To inform the strategic direction of the authorities through the provision of guidance and advice.
 - To act as a catalyst of business change that promotes the transformation agenda of the 3 councils.
 - To provide further enhancement of services which support the delivery of the wider policy objectives of each Council.
 - To simplify and work harmoniously between services and authorities to deliver a more seamless, planned and predictable end-to-end service, which effectively delivers outcomes to residents.
 - To ensure ongoing delivery of services that are genuinely shared, where appropriate, between the relevant councils with those councils sharing the risks and benefits whilst having in place a robust model to control the operation and direction of the service.
 - To help identify and support the realisation of savings within the organisations where current ways of working do not maximise the opportunities for efficiency and effectiveness, within your areas of influence.
 - To deliver savings through, but not limited to, drivers of costs, reduced overhead costs and economies of scale.
 - To enable increased resilience through the recruitment and retention of high calibre staff by delivering greater succession planning and reduce reliance on the external recruitment market.
 - To minimise the bureaucracy involved in operating and interacting with the shared services.

- To pursue opportunities for working with new partners where the opportunity to generate additional income or deliver significant operational or strategic benefits to the authorities exists.
- To pursue procurement and purchasing efficiencies between partners and where appropriate beyond the organisations.
- To share specialist roles which individually, are not viable in the long-term.
- To deliver a customer focussed service, which has the understanding and meeting of customer needs at its heart.
- To operate in a transparent way on an individual council basis in relation to financial and operational performance and reporting.
- To work towards harmonised arrangements in these respects during the life of the Agreement.
- To adopt as a minimum a quantitative performance management culture – one that takes into account the perspectives of residents, staff, shared services, the 3 councils and elected Members.

The Annual Report contains specific details on the operation of the services and assessments of their performance against their objectives, on their financial performance and customer satisfaction and on the achievement of development projects.

Section 2 - 3C Legal Shared Service Annual Report 2020/21

2.1 General Information

- 2.1.1 At the end of 2019/20 The Practice was able to make a one-off saving of £119K (representing 10% of the budget) as a permanent reduction.
- 2.1.2 In the summer of 2020 internal audit carried out a review of the Practice and its performance against the original business case objectives, including governance arrangements, financial monitoring, spend on external legal advice, KPIs and training and professional development, as well as progress against this business plan.
- 2.1.3 The identified recommendations of the report have enabled improvement work to commence:
- a) The implementation of an improved way to commission external legal advice, including a simplified and consistent way to record the charges within the financial management system. This will ensure we commission and spend on external legal advice in a more consistent and efficient way.
 - b) The introduction of consumption charging for each partner council. The benefit of this model is that it allows each partner to identify workstreams and potential need to streamline client processes, as well as to consider viability of schemes including legal costs based on historical data and considering cost recovery.
- 2.1.4 Overall, the Practice was also able to function efficiently and effectively during the challenges faced from the Covid-19 pandemic, due to the ability to work remotely and in a more flexible way. A text and “WhatsApp” group has been established to improve internal communication across the service and where possible use of this will be refined in the coming year. This additional communication process has been successful during recent network outages and ensured the Practice remained operational.

The forecast for 2021/22

- 2.1.5 The Practice is currently scoping out a review of the current service offering which will seek to further ensure that it is providing an effective, efficient and valuable service to all partners, aiming to commence this work in the coming months. The first stage is to understand the current and future demands from across the partnership (including continuation of the implementation of the recommendations within the audit report) to review the existing operating model.

Key Performance Indicators

- 2.1.6 The year to date has seen a continuation of the improvement in the level of hours recorded by fee earners.

- 2.1.7 The Practice continues to outperform against the KPI target of 90%, with this year seeing a 99% return on target hours, an increase from 92.5% last year. This is particularly encouraging given the challenges of dealing with the pandemic and against an increase in the target hours set this year.
- 2.1.8 The roll-out of Council Anywhere has certainly contributed greatly to providing the service with the necessary tools to deliver the service under a fully remote working platform and operation.
- 2.3.4 In relation to litigation success the figures demonstrate that the Practice has maintained a very steady success rate (94%) in excess of the KPI target (80%), whilst also handling an increased number of cases.
- 2.1.9 Additionally, The Practice has made positive progress in developing the role of the intelligent client and focusing on client needs, across the partner authorities. By working more closely with clients to understand their needs, the Practice will use their knowledge and expertise to source the most appropriate and cost-effective solution, on a case by case basis.

2.2 **Financial Performance**

2.2.1 The Outturn for 2020/21 is as follows:

Table 1 is showing what was the forecast budget for the year against the actual performance of the practice with a final column (variance) showing what this represents in terms of financial variance for the year.

Outturn 2020-2021				
Descriptions	Budget	Actual	Variance	Note
Expenditure	1,443,150	1,290,100	-153,050	Favourable
External Income	-242,058	-182,937	59,121	Unfavourable
Net	1,201,092	1,107,163	-93,929	Favourable
*External Income budget is based on 2019-2020 actual income				

Table 2 shows the percentage split of hours consumed across the three partner authorities with the actual cost to each authority also shown

Council	Hours Consumed	Actual £
CCC	8996 (48.21%)	£400,697
HDC	3048 (18.01%)	£148,202

SCDC	5844 (33.78%)	£279,864
------	---------------	----------

Table 3 shows the original forecast contribution by each partner authority which was based on the previous year's consumption. This budget has been adjusted throughout the year based on the consumption forecast. The actual figure shown in column 2 reflects the hours consumed taken together with the operating costs of the practice with the variance shown by taking account of budgeted contribution against actual contribution.

Contribution 2020-2021				
Partners	Budget	Actual	Variance	Note
Cambridge CC	-718,050	-601,625	116,424	Underspend
Huntingdonshire DC	-238,200	-197,268	40,931	Underspend
South Cambridgeshire DC	-486,900	-308,270	178,631	Underspend
Total Contribution	-1,443,150	-1,107,163	335,986	

Table 4

Ringfenced Income 2020-2021				
Partners	Budget	Actual	Variance	Note
Cambridge CC	-116,359	-21,493	94,865	Underachieved
Huntingdonshire DC	-58,372	-33,997	24,375	Underachieved
South Cambridgeshire DC	-67,328	-127,446	-60,119	Overachieved
Total Contribution	-242,058	-182,936	59,121	
*City - Underachieved income due to COVID19 and ringfenced income adjustment to SCDC				
*HDC - Underachieved income due to COVID19				
*SCDC - Overachieved income due to ringfenced income adjustment from City				

2.2.2 The outturn for 2020/21 is £1,107,163 against a budget of £1,443,150. This is an underspend of £335,986 however this has been achieved by taking into account the external income which has been applied towards contribution by

individual partners. In doing so it should be stressed that the income applied has been ringfenced to individual partner authorities.

2.2.3 Table 2 above shows each Councils contribution together with hours consumed and the actual value of those hours as against that overall budget.

2.2.4 Performance against the income target of £242,058 for 2020/21 has seen income of £182,937 delivered. The deficit is as a result of a fall in external income due to a decrease in mainly planning and court fees relating to the impact of Covid-19. This has contributed to the overall deficit/surplus £

2.3 Service Performance

2.3.1 Staff productivity in terms of chargeable hours recorded comfortably exceeded the KPI of 90%. Taken against an individual target per fee earner (adjusted for those staff not working full time) of 1200 hours per annum, 17,888 hours were recorded in total across the Practice. If the equivalent of 1,200 hours per annum had been realised 15,859 hours would have been recorded. The Practice was therefore operating at 99% of total target level.

2.3.2 The success rate in litigation was 94% against a target of 80%. The figures are extremely encouraging and work currently underway with the client (developing the intelligent client role) will seek to build on this. HDC has a comparatively high number of cases in relation to debt recovery and parking prosecutions. Work is well underway to seek to enable the client to process more routine paperwork /activity on these matters which is a more effective mechanism for interfacing with court/public (HDC has just switched to processing claims via Money Claims On Line which will assist in reducing consumption moving forward).

2.4 Customer Feedback

2.4.1 Improved performance is also reflected in the customer satisfaction levels, with a 93% satisfaction reported for the year. Below a sample of the positive comments:

*"**** is always efficient, clear and keeps me in the loop. "*

"The matter was handled really well. It was a non standard lease but the solicitor drafted the new clauses and progressed the lease renewal efficiently"

*"This case was difficult to prosecute due to the age of the claimant and the pandemic crisis but **** achieved the outcome that the authority supported"*

*"I valued ****'s support and how responsive she was during the contract preparations. "*

2.5 Looking Forward

- 2.5.1 The roll out of Council Anywhere is providing an improved working platform for the Practice which is crucial to enable its progression and increase its ability to attract and retain staff. Efficient and flexible working arrangements are an attractive prospect for staff and aids in promoting the Practice as an excellent environment in which to work. Better access to IKEN and improved ICT systems will enhance flexible working and help to improve the success of future recruitment strategies, enabling the Practice to effectively secure and retain permanent employees.
- 2.5.2 The Business Continuity Plan for the Practice has been developed in light of the current Covid-19 pandemic and to reflect advances in flexible working arrangements for the Practice with associated strengthening of resilience.
- 2.5.3 Work will continue to ensure that the commissioning of external legal advice is cost-effective, consistent and efficient, with the implementation of robust methods of assessment and a triage process as well as the recording of spend through the financial management system, working with all three partner council's financial teams.
- 2.5.4 Following on from the audit review and in line with good practice, the Practice is currently scoping out a review of the current service offering, which will seek to further ensure that it is providing an effective, efficient and valuable service to all partners. The first stage is to understand the current and future demands from across the partnership to assess if the existing operating model is fit for purpose and future ready; this work will commence in the coming months. Proposed options of any future target operating model will be presented to the Shared Services Management Board and relevant Councillors for review and decision in due course.
- 2.5.5 It is vital that the great work of the past 12 months in developing the effective and cohesive relationship between client and lawyer continues, including continued development of efficient working practices to ensure best value for both parties. The use of consumption data for engagement with clients has provided a positive tool to focus attention on process/procedure. It allows any bottlenecks to be identified and has encouraged clients to work with the Practice to streamline processes and procedures to make best use of legal resource. The feedback from the clients has been extremely encouraging and the journey together to make best use of resources is one which will continue to be refined.

Section 3 - 3C ICT Shared Service Annual Report 2020/21

3.1 General Information

- 3.1.1 This year has been dominated by our need to support and managing the risks associated with the council's response to Covid19. Without exception, all ICT projects and workstreams during the year have been impacted in some way by Covid 19. Whether that was risk of delays in supply chains for goods and services, suppliers and partners not being able to be on council premises or our own staff having to work remotely, the impact was widespread and persistent. Alongside this, because all three councils went through rapid transformation of working practices, 3C ICT also had to respond quickly to new and additional demands and then continually adjust throughout the year to ensure staff / members were able to work effectively remotely and provide service to residents and members of the public.
- 3.1.2 This started in March 2020 when within a very short period of time after government announcements, staff were being asked to work from home, but needed to operate and access systems, services and support as if they were in the office. Within weeks, the vast majority of the office-based workforce were using their Council Anywhere devices to support home working. Consequently, there were heavy demands on multiple teams within ICT to support and guide users in the use of the technology and tools – Connecting remotely, how to use teams, diagnosing home broadband issues, requests for equipment to be shipped to home addresses, etc.
- 3.1.3 A combination of the design of the CA solution and the timing of the Council Anywhere roll out project made the switch to remote working possible in such a short period of time. Overall, staff feedback indicates a very positive experience and take up of the new technology that was delivered – numbers increased from a few hundred active users in Feb 2020 to over 1000 at the end of Q1. By the end of Q4 we have seen 2000 active users of Teams.
- 3.1.4 During the year, the councils have also taken the decision to increase the number of laptops and mobile phones issued to staff in order to support new methods of working. There has been a significant increase in the numbers of devices. In summary, 10% increase in laptops on the estate since March 2020, and 15% since the start of CA roll out. Alongside this the mobile device estate has also increased by 75%. This has added additional demand to teams within ICT with regards to supporting, managing, and maintaining equipment. A review of services will consider what recommendations to make to address any gaps with service delivery because of this increase.
- 3.1.5 While 2019/2020 FY was the year of major infrastructure projects, key projects continued to be delivered over the past 12 months, including delivery of some major applications supporting Housing, Waste and Shared planning service areas. In addition the wider ICT services also benefited from projects that provided increased data centre capacity, introduced a new mobile device management platform and some large scale infrastructure projects covering data centre resilience, firewall upgrades, Teams based telephony and the move of half of the data centre to a new location. The impact of Covid on projects

when it hit in March 2020 was not able to be fully anticipated but the associated risks and issues have been well managed throughout and a series of projects have and programmes of work have continued to be successfully delivered.

- 3.1.6 Financial targets for the year have once again been broadly been achieved in line with the business case objectives. Reductions and cost avoidance have been a key consideration during procurement processes across routine expenditure, systems, and software renewals as well as new services and projects. Underspends in some areas have been as a result of reduced demands, consolidating agreements, negotiations and supplier management processes. Examples include consolidating Microsoft licenses to make more efficient use of the enterprise agreement, discounts on mobile data excess charges, negotiation of contract reductions for City R&B contract renewal and removing parts of the MFD/printer fleet due to drop in demand and repositioning of devices.
- 3.1.7 The ICT Service Desk and the incident / request management process, which is often seen as the 'shop front' to 3C ICT has had to undergo significant change over the last 12 months to cater for different demands from staff. From a Covid point of view, operating procedures have had to adapt because of new working practices. Staff no longer have face to face access to support teams or the service desk. Therefore, 3C ICT have had to not only facilitate the service desk working remotely, but also change the way in which support is provided. This has been done through extra resource, greater use of; remote access tools, telephone advice, centralised management tools and additional health and safety measures if having to provide face to face service – in line with current Covid guidelines.
- 3.1.8 Following the initial spike in requests for service during Q1 and 2 due to Covid, we have seen a drop in the number of incidents and faults being reported by users in relation to their devices and applications. We observed this back in Feb and March 2020, but we are much more confident now that this is as a direct result of the introduction of Council Anywhere and the underpinning infrastructure. This means staff can have more confidence in the stability and reliability of the equipment they use and are now raising more requests for improvements and changes rather than faults.
- 3.1.9 The reductions in the numbers of faults logged with the service desk in comparison to 18/19 and 19/20, have been maintained throughout this year even though there were 2 major incidents that had short term impact on performance (Nov – Data centre outages, Feb/Mar – Lenovo laptop start up issues). This is a good position to build on in the coming year with the continuing trend of reduced numbers and lower impact of Priority 1 (P1) incidents. It has further evidenced that improvements in technology and well-designed solutions can deliver the required outcomes.

3.2 Staffing and Recruitment

- 3.2.1 This year has also been quite challenging for recruitment. Notwithstanding the logistics of running recruitment and onboarding in a remote manner we've seen the job market for ICT professionals change. It has taken several attempts to recruit a number of posts within ICT. Issues such as location, salary, uncertainty

about public sector funding have been cited as reasons of withdrawing applications or declining offers. The benefit of flexible working/remote working is no longer a distinguishing factor. We are now working much closer with HR partners to understand and mitigate these issues as well as trying to 'market' ourselves differently.

- 3.2.2 The departure of the Head of ICT and Digital in Jan 2021 allowed ICT and the shared services directors to consider a number of options on what kind of senior ICT management structure would best serve the councils in the short to medium term. The interim arrangement of having two deputy head of service roles supporting the head of service role has landed well so far. If the feedback received continues to be positive this will be included in the wider service review covering roles, responsibilities, functions and structure across the whole department.
- 3.2.3 In 20/21 the digital team continued with their recruitment of additional developers that were approved as part of the exercise of balancing the digital team budgets across the 3 councils. The recruitment process has been a little more difficult to run and manage under the current Covid restrictions, but eventually it has yielded results. The team scaled up steadily throughout the year rather than a big bang approach and the feedback so far is that the new capacity is being used, helped by the prioritisation of work from respective council digital boards/steering groups. The 'flex resource' has also been recruited and now gives the IC's additional options for delivery of digital work requests that are urgent / short notice and cannot wait for a future sprint to become available.
- 3.2.4 This year has also seen the digital team fill their key role of Digital Operation Manager. Issues such as monitoring and managing the day to day demands, the 'technical debt' of previous developments, implementing processes, procedures and technology for monitoring and reporting on public facing services are just a few areas that this role has started to progress and deliver.

3.3 Financial Performance

- 3.3.1 Financial management and reporting has also continued to improve throughout the year. And although overall the current outturn evidences that 3C ICT are delivering the savings as expected and in line with business plans, there is a risk that some reductions and savings achieved this year are not able to be tracked because they are not currently included in the baseline business case. Instead they are being swept up in recharges along with ad hoc ICT council spends.
- 3.3.2 The quarterly meetings with the council finance leads have been extremely useful and as a consequence we are close to agreeing a method of adjusting and quantifying the amounts to be included in the baseline business case – taking in to account growth and genuine recurring costs that should have been included in the original business case. In future years this will impact the total budget allocated by each council and may appear as an increase, but by being a more accurate reflection on costs, the ICT service can be better managed.
- 3.3.3 Provisional outturn position for 2020/2021:-

	BUDGET	FORECAST	VARIANCE
CCC	2,991,556	2,935,626	-55,930
HDC	2,084,951	2,073,801	-11,150
SCDC	1,375,465	1,355,735	-19,730
	6,451,972	6,365,162	-86,810

3.3.4 The overall financial outturn still demonstrates a saving over the budget based on re-profiled business case approved in February 2018. The council are paying less for their ICT service against that agreed baseline in spite of a very challenging year due to Covid and increases in demands.

3.4 Service Performance, Customer Feedback and Service Delivery

3.4.1 KPI 1 Customer Satisfaction with 3C ICT as measured by receipt of both unsolicited (compliments, complaints and comments) and solicited feedback (feedback requests for all resolved calls and quarterly surveys), average remained just under target for the first 3 quarters of the year, mostly due to service outages during Aug (security certificate issue) and Nov (Data Centre networking issues). However, a rally with customer feedback during Q4 allowed the overall performance to be recovered and meet the annual target of 95%. KPI's 4 (3C ICT Resolution) and 5 (Request starters-moves-changes) performance has missed out on meeting performance by a couple of % with Amber overall for the year, but KPI3 Service Desk Resolution (measured by jobs resolved directly by the service desk at point of contact) has remained above target throughout the year. This fit well with the change of support model with the vast majority of staff having few options to come back in to the office for support and therefore relying more on the service desk. This was only possible due to the additional 'covid fund' funded additional service desk resource that had been brought in to assist.

3.4.2 Following the implementation of changes to the incident management process last year, problem management processes which look at root causes of incidents was introduced. This has had a positive impact by reducing the number of repeat incidents. Examples include RDS service issues, understanding performance issues certain applications, data centre resource capacity issues. This has contributed directly to the overall reduction in high priority (P1) incidents throughout the year.

3.4.3 The year hasn't been without its difficulties and challenges though. All three councils rely on the services and systems to be available. With Covid working practices, not only do staff need to access systems and services in different ways and for longer periods of the day, residents, businesses and members of the public have had a greater reliance on services. Especially access to Covid support and guidance.

3.4.4 A series of linked technical issues during Oct and Nov affected the data centre which meant availability fell below what 3C ICT aspired to. The entire 3C ICT team were acutely aware of the impact this had on not only council staff, but the quality of service being provided to residents, businesses and members of the public. Fixes were implemented as soon as the root cause (software bug) was identified, and since then stability has been restored. This has highlighted the reliance we have on a small number of global suppliers when using what is regarded as industry standard technology. This problem also surfaces when considering responding to cyber security alerts and risks – See Cyber security section below.

3.5. Cyber Security

3.5.1 2020 to 2021 has seen the trend of increasing cyber security demand continue. At the beginning of the year, the incident that hit Redcar and Cleveland Council had an impact on all councils around the country. Reviews, data returns, assessments, audits had to be picked up and fed back to the 'centre'/MCLG. This in itself took a lot of time and effort from managers and technical staff. However as we moved through the year, major international/global cyber security incidents also took time and effort. Three supply chain attacks in 6 months on major vendors, who are regarded as industry standard and leaders in their field have shown this trend is on the increase – SolarWinds, Mimecast, Microsoft. Previously we've seen 1 a year where the impact has been very limited, but these three have resulted in 100's a hours of work across multiple teams. A review of what skills and resources we need to allow to try and stay on top of this growing risk area is now underway and will most likely lead to options being presented and budget bids for resources/tools/services to help keep the councils and safe and secure place to work and conduct business with.

3.5.2 Appendix A provides a summary of the current cyber security risk assessment based on NCSC good practice.

3.6. Project Performance

3.6.1 Covid 19 response - Even though the Council Anywhere project completed roll out last year we are of the view that the benefits were not able to be fully realised or recognised until the impact of Covid hit the councils. Until that point the project had delivered the infrastructure improvements and replaced old laptops, but the value of enabling the work force to work remotely immediately and to allow continuity of service has only really been felt over the past 12 months. In addition, the ability to add telephony functionality to teams has allowed the council to continue to work from home and handle phone calls as if they were in the office. This was unplanned technical configuration work, but the phased roll out has meant by the middle of the year almost 1/3 of staff were already using Teams Telephony and valuable lessons were being learnt and able to be fed in to the formal telephony replacement programme.

3.6.2 Infrastructure and Data Centre - The project to disconnect the infrastructure from the legacy CPSN core network (which marked the closure of the EastNet Programme of Work) was achieved ahead of the hard cut off date. As well as the migration of the City Unify telephony and contact centre on to EastNet. This

included a test of the fall back service which had never been proven until that point.

- 3.6.3 Infrastructure projects also accounted for 2 of the biggest pieces of work over the past year. First off was the installation of the generator at PFH which greatly enhanced the resilience of the data centre services in the event of power supply issues in Huntingdon. Secondly the move of the Data Centre from Cambridge to Peterborough. Both projects required significant risk management relating to the availability and continuity of all on premise hosted services but these were managed successfully with no unscheduled downtime. These projects also provided the opportunity to run all hosted services from each half of the data centre infrastructure which provided assurance to each council that the integrity of data and services is protected in the event of a catastrophic failure at one site. There is one more test to perform during 2021 to 2021 which is running all services from the new site in Peterborough. This will be scheduled with agreement from the IC's and Directors in due course once peak activity relating to annual billing and elections is complete.
- 3.6.4 InTune - Migration of all mobile devices on to the new InTune management platform allowing the councils to make more of the investment in the Microsoft Enterprise agreement as well as supporting the roll out of Teams / O365 access to mobile devices. Also delivers better management, monitoring and security capability.
- 3.6.5 SCDC Telephony migration to Teams - Telephony service migration for SCDC was also another major project achievement during the year. This project not only migrated services for the entire council without any interruption to customer facing services, but significant unnecessary / unmanaged costs were identified with the legacy service. This is being fed into the wider Telephony and contact centre programme of work for the 3 councils taking place during 2021 to 2022.
- 3.6.6 Single print environment - This has delivered a truly integrated and seamless print service across all 3 councils allowing any member of staff to be able to print to / collect prints from any MFD device on any of the council sites. At the same time the number of MFD devices have also been reduced (by almost half) to allow further efficiencies and savings to be realised.
- 3.6.7 Waste Services - Follow on go live phases of the Yotta Alloy project have continued throughout the year with major go live milestones achieved – one for City and two for HDC.
- 3.6.8 Tascomi - For the majority of the year 3C ICT were delivering the technical elements of the programme of work, supporting service areas with their data migration processes and technical transition from separate legacy systems into a single cross partner solution. However, following the departure of the programme manager in Dec 2020, 3C ICT were asked to act as 'caretaker' programme manager to ensure risks that had emerged and put the overall programme at risk were adequately managed and that a basic implementation could go ahead on time so that legacy services could be decommissioned and avoid costly renewals. The programme of work has now been re-assessed and

split up into several follow up stages and is able to be handed over in a more manageable state to the service areas to pick up again.

3.6.9 PSN - The project for the PSN renewals for all 3 councils was completed with certificates of assurance being issued at different points during the year. However, the City pen testing had to be delayed and rescheduled due to Covid restrictions that affected all on site testing. This was done in consultation with and full disclosure to the national accreditors so as not to risk any kind of certificate lapse or exception reporting for City. Ultimately all 3 councils achieved PSN assurance, and for the coming year we've taken the first steps to consolidate the submissions with the aim of simplifying the process with the Cabinet Office. Pen testing and auditing for this has already started so that this year all 3 councils will align PSN submissions in to one document set for approval.

3.6.10 Project Processes - One of the objectives set last year was to implement changes to further develop the project and work request commissioning process. Previous feedback from within ICT, IC's and requestors pointed to issues relating to the transparency of scheduling and prioritisation decisions. Working closely with the IC's and key stakeholders a process review was undertaken and an updated assessment and scoring process was implemented and made visible to staff via SharePoint. This has been an enormous help in ensuring drivers and priorities are agreed collectively and all relevant parties are kept updated with decisions made. However due to volume of requests for projects and work requests, demand has far exceeded capacity. A backlog of 120+ items over and above what has been agreed with the IC's has built up. The interim Strategic Portfolio Manager is putting proposals together to be presented to IC's senior stakeholders on how to effectively and efficiently manage and report on the portfolio of work across the 3 councils. Initial findings show that the 130+ project requests combined with just 6 basic project monitoring points makes the overall portfolio of work unmanageable in it's current form.

3.6.11 3C ICT remain committed to working closely with the councils individually and collectively to manage those priorities and providing options on delivery of work highlighting risks and constraints that need addressing and presenting options and recommendations about changes to the overall approach.

3.7 Summary

3.7.1 Of the KPI's being reported 3 are above target and green, and 3 are just below (within a few %) at Amber within tolerance.

3.7.2 Savings and reductions over the pre-shared service position and in line with business case objectives have been delivered

3.7.3 Infrastructure improvements to address risks have been delivered and major milestones in technical DR testing achieved.

3.7.4 New digital services and improvements to existing services have been delivered working closely with IC's on meeting priorities that have changed regularly. Business grants and website updates are of note here.

- 3.7.5 Adapted to a completely new operating model to support staff over an extended period of time who have transformed and, in some cases, re-invented the way they work at individual, team and service area level.
- 3.7.6 Delivered projects under difficult conditions where resources, timescales and requirements have had to change, but maintaining quality and costs. However a review of the overall approach to projects is required because demand is far greater than capacity to deliver.
- 3.7.7 Managing the ever changing and ever-present local cyber security risks against the backdrop of International/Global incidents. In particular supply chain attacks have been a major problem in the 6 months of the year that we have to keep on top of.

3.8 For the future

- 3.8.1 Cyber security risks - Growth in the cyber security capacity and capability within ICT is needed as demonstrated by the unplanned for work during the year. Strategic and operational options and decisions required on what kind of approach we want to take.
- 3.8.2 Increased estate – Growth in devices across the estate has had an impact on the sustainability of 3C ICT support and management systems. Options and impact of different delivery models will be provided so that business cases can be developed to support additional funding for specific teams.
- 3.8.3 Infrastructure review and move to hosted/cloud – The output from the independent data centre technical review is currently in draft and will be presented to the Councils shortly. This will also include cost models for migrating to fully hosted services. This will give the Councils options to consider on how quickly or whether moving to externally hosted solutions provides the right balance of risk/cost/benefit.
- 3.8.4 Budget/baseline business case costs – Following a year of financial analysis associated with providing and developing ICT services, it's clear that there are many costs and charges respective finance teams would like to see included in the main business case charges. The introduction of these changes will require careful management so that the aims, objectives, savings and reductions outlined in the original business case agreement are not lost or ignored.
- 3.8.5 tFlex resource for digital team – With more requests for integration of data and systems to support the digital growth agenda as well as the expected growth in interest in developing mobile applications, the flex resource within the digital team should be called upon more often this year. We understand that service area's are finding it difficult to plan sufficiently far ahead to secure time in sprints, and rather than pushing work to the back of the queue, this will provide the IC's and Service Area's with more options to obtain digital team resource at short notice if funding is available outside of the annual bid process.
- 3.8.6 Benefits realisation and review of project delivery approach – This year CA has evidenced the benefits and value from the project to implement and roll out the new technology, but this is not done as a matter of routine by project/programme sponsors. The councils should consider if and how this

needs to be covered within the project and programme management processes as it can fundamentally change project briefs and business cases. The way in which ICT projects and work requests are commissioned, managed and delivered are also undergoing change now that scoring and prioritisation by the IC's is embedded. During Q1 we expect to consult on and issue guidance on key roles, responsibilities and accountabilities and process for ICT managing projects as well as controlling and reporting on the backlog.

- 3.8.7 Telephony and Contact Centre – The core telephony plus contact centre replacement will be a major technology transformation programme of work this year. It links to a number of major work streams that support multiple council priorities. This work has the potential to impact and transform every service area in each council and will need strong sponsorship, support, significant technical and non technical resources to be delivered successfully and provide the expected benefits.
- 3.8.8 Supplier management – Whilst this has improved a lot this year (as shown with City R&B renewal) and the Microsoft license consolidation work) it has also show this area still needs a lot more time and effort if it's to continue to deliver financial and service benefits across more services. Complexities due to the 3 council partnership arrangements and 3C ICT legal status are now emerging that were not fully appreciated previously. 3C ICT will continue to invest as much time as practical to ensure best value is derived from the priority and critical contracts as agreed with the IC's and councils.

Appendix A – Cyber Security Risk Management Summary

AREAS FOR MONITORING AND MANAGING CYBER SECURITY RISKS.				
	NCSC 10 Steps Theme	Rating ¹	RAG (0-3 red, 4-6 amber, 7-10 green)	Direction of travel since last Q. review
	Risk Management	6	AMBER	↔
	Secure Configuration	7	GREEN	↔
	Network Security	7	GREEN	↔
	Managing user privileges	7	GREEN	↔
	Incident management	5	AMBER	↔
	User education and awareness	6	AMBER	↑
	Malware prevention	8	GREEN	↔
	Monitoring	6	AMBER	↔
	Removable media controls	8	GREEN	↔
	Mobile Working	7	GREEN	↔

The Improvements in the User Education and Awareness section this quarter is centred around the updated version of the IT Security Policy / Acceptable Use policy that is currently going through the Information Governance Groups at each council. “versions of the policy are currently being considered and awaiting sign off. One is an ‘abridged/cut down’ version which is a summary and provides all the main points in a short document, the second version is the detailed/full version which links from the summary version. Once this is signed off and a method of recording staff reading and understanding the policy, we will move from amber to green.

The steps required to bring the remaining themes to Green are as follows:-

Risk Management - Once we receive the final version of the audit relating to this process (due by the end of May 2021) and we complete any high/critical recommendations we can move this from amber to green. The aim is then to maintain Green by sharing the quarterly summary more widely than the Shared Service board, to also include, but not limited to each Councils Information Governance groups, and other senior managers within each council.

¹ Rating based on recognised good practice where zero is no controls in place or yet to be initiated, 5 is defined and managed and 10 is fully optimised and mature controls.

Incident Management - Work continues on the development of the Incident management section which involves internal sign off of the technical incident response plan. This should be complete by the end of May, and once we carry out some table top exercises to test the plan we can also move this from amber to green. To maintain Green there are a series of tests and exercises published by the NCSC we can run aimed at different stakeholder groups and levels.

User education and Awareness – This area is now being supported by the IG groups at each councils and once the joint update of the acceptable use policy is complete and the process of monitoring sign up is agreed, this can move from Amber to Green. To maintain green a review and update of annual refresher training is planned to be started this financial year with new and updated content to be published.

Monitoring – The activity required to move this theme from Amber to Green involves completing the implementation of additional monitoring and audit tools. This area is subject to regular reviews and change because of the continual changing threats that are emerging. Therefore maintaining green will be dependent on wider cyber security threat and risk trends and the development of a continual service improvement plan. This year will be the first time we have approached cyber security management this way and may benefit from a follow up audit review in 12months time.

Cyber Security briefing: -

The Cyber security risk management process has been subject to an audit by BDO and the early feedback (final report is still going through approval process before being submitted to the council) is that the process being used and follows does provide assurance that the right areas of cyber security risk management are being covered. We have also been working with MHCLG and their cyber security working group who are trying to develop a risk management dashboard. This approach (above) is more detailed than the early releases we have been asked to review, but we'll continue to monitor their developments in case it provides additional benefits.

Cyber security incidents of note

This quarter we have seen a number of global cyber security incidents that have affected us locally within the council.

The Fire Eye tools 'theft' that was mentioned last quarter that impacted the Solar Winds network monitoring tool that we use still continues to incur work for the technical teams as more information and data is released about the impact. The teams completed a rebuild of the environment in December and January, but have to continue applying out of cycle updates and patches as the supplier disclose more details about potential risks and vulnerabilities. This has taken several weeks work from 2 infrastructure engineers during this time.

At the end of Jan Mimecast disclosed details relating to compromise of security certificates that would undermine the security of some of their products. One of which we use as part of our email security layer. This required several days of work – often out of hours by the infrastructure team to run tests, apply updated certificates and checking logs to ensure our system had not been impacted by this breach.

At the beginning of March another major global cyber security incident involving Microsoft exchange services was disclosed. This related to a previously unknown

vulnerability that was being actively exploited worldwide in the 10's of thousands. Even though our systems were configured in such a way that we weren't immediately vulnerable to the exploit, the issue was so severe that all users of Microsoft Exchange were strongly advised to apply updates and check their systems for signs of compromise. There was a significant amount of advice and information coming out regarding this issue and updated advice continues to be sent out. To date this has required 2 engineers almost full time over almost 3 weeks to keep on top of this.

The trend over the past 2 or 3 quarters is that global supply chain attacks such as this are becoming more frequent. Instead of seeing 1 or 2 a year we are seeing several each quarter. This additional demand will be considered as part of our service review and may lead to a request for additional funding for cyber security resources.

Section 4 - Building Control Shared Service Annual Report 2020/21

4.1 General Information

4.1.1 3C Building Control was set up in October 2015 with the following objectives:

- Protection of services which support the delivery of the wider policy objectives of each Council.
- Creation of services that are genuinely shared between the relevant councils with those councils sharing the risks and benefits whilst having in place a robust model to control the operation and direction of the service.
- Savings through reduced managements costs and economies of scale.
- Increased resilience and retention of staff.
- Minimise the bureaucracy involved in operating the shared service.
- Opportunities to generate additional income, where appropriate.

4.1.2 When creating the shared service, the priorities were to improve capacity by expanding the skilled team with management arrangements that enabled resources to be deployed effectively and efficiently, the adoption of best practices and processes and to improve recruitment and retention in local authority building control services.

4.1.3 This Annual Report reflects progress against the Business Plan for 2020/21. The Plan contained detailed service information and was approved at partner committees in March 2020. Given the commercial nature of the service, only limited information has been included in this public report.

4.2 General Progress

4.2.1 The service review growth strategy is now complete and the new structure is in place as of 1 April 2021. Although the impact of Covid-19 caused some delay in implementation it provided a real opportunity in respect of transforming the service position in respect of future ICT and accommodation.

4.2.2 Recruitment has therefore been deliberately limited due to the service review and Covid-19, recruitment during the year consisted of one apprentice assistant and a fixed term administrative support assistant. One senior surveyor has moved to promotion at another Council and one technical support officer has recently decided to retire.

4.2.3 The Street Naming and Numbering function has now transferred to 3C Building Control from 3C ICT for all three partner Councils, along with demolitions. This ensures consistency across the partners and allows for resilience and greater efficiencies in the technical support function.

4.2.4 The team continues to improve its processes. Most applications are submitted electronically, and the service incorporates digital processes. The planned

programme of scanning of live historical files during 2020/21 has been delayed due to Covid-19 and will now take place in the new financial year.

4.2.5 In terms of the recognition received by staff during the year, the team were finalists again in the iESE Public Sector Transformation Awards in March 2021 for the efficiency and effectiveness category, winning either bronze, silver or gold. The order will be announced in September 2021. One member of the team is also a finalist in the European WICE (Women in Construction and Engineering) awards for her success in mentoring newly appointed team members within 3C Building Control, judging will be on 22 April 2021.

4.3 Financial Performance

4.3.1 The outturn position for 2020/21 is recorded in the table below:

£	Budget	Actual	Variance/Outturn
3C Building Control	1,910,120	1,740,221	-169,899 Underspend

4.3.2 It is a requirement that each Council contributes to the non-fee earning account for all statutory works for which the service is unable to charge.

4.3.3 The service is forecasting an increase in the deferred income.

4.4 Service Performance

4.4.1 Building Control had eight Key Performance Indicators for 2020/21 ranging from acknowledging and determining applications to customer satisfaction levels. These KPIs form part of the quality management system adopted by the service. The performance indicators for 2020/21 indicate the service continues to provide a quality service to its customers and exceeds performance targets.

4.5 Customer Feedback

4.5.1 For 2020/21 the Building Control Partnership has been collating data on the percentage of customers who overall have rated the service as good and above. The service forwards customer satisfaction surveys to all customers, including those who submit regularisations. This is captured via an online survey forms utilising Microsoft teams and returns are generally positive. An interim target of 75% has been exceeded with an actual rate of over 87% satisfaction which is an increase from last financial year.

4.6 Key Projects

4.6.1 3C Building Control has four projects identified in 2020/21 Business Plan.

- 4.6.2 The first two projects consist of a full review of the ICT infrastructure to maximise effectiveness of the team and enable agile working. This is interlinked with the second project, change management and implementing a digital service. The service is now progressing these with an ideology of a fully digitalised service and use of automation to improve the customer experience. A project initiation document will be submitted into CCC corporate programme office.
- 4.6.3 Various workstreams have been identified in the final two projects to extend discretionary services to customers and to regrow market share and develop commercial opportunities. These include providing energy, sustainability and climate change advice, clerk of works service and peer reviews in other Councils. These are all in train.
- 4.6.4 The team are currently reviewing requirements for office accommodation in the mid term and a project initiation document will be submitted to CCC corporate programme office. This will be a proof of concept on accommodation in the guise of a digital welfare workspace.

Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2020/21

Performance and Growth

In Progress

Topic	Membership & Scope	Lead Officer	Progress
Transport Strategy	Councillor S J Criswell Councillor I D Gardener Councillor P L R Gaskin Councillor M S Grice	Corporate Director Place	Study has not commenced.
Asset Management Strategy	Councillor I D Gardener Councillor D A Giles	Jackie Goldby/Justin Andrews	1st February 2021 – Members met with the Interim Commercial Estates Manager and provided input and feedback into the Strategy. Next Step The Strategy will be presented to Overview and Scrutiny in Autumn 2021.

Completed

Topic	Membership & Scope	Lead Officer	Progress
Housing Strategy to 2025	Councillor A Roberts Councillor S Wakeford Councillor D Wells Councillor Mrs S R Wilson <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment and make suggestions on the emerging Housing Strategy. 	David Edwards/Liz Bisset	6th August 2020 – A meeting took place with Members; the Interim Corporate Director (Place), David Edwards and Liz Bisset. The vision for the strategy was outlined and Members had an opportunity to comment and make suggestions. 7th October 2020 – The Housing Strategy was presented to Overview and Scrutiny.

			22nd October 2020 – The Cabinet approved the Housing Strategy and the accompanying one year action plan.
--	--	--	---

Customers and Partnerships

In Progress

Topic	Membership & Scope	Lead Officer	Progress
Digital Strategy	Councillor D M Tysoe Councillor R J West	Tony Evans	Next Step The Digital Strategy will follow the completion of the Core Service Strategy.
Climate Change Strategy	Councillor T D Alban Councillor Mrs S R Wilson One Vacancy	Neil Sloper	18th October 2020 – The Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) attended the Centre for Public Scrutiny and Local Government Association Scrutinising Climate Action Webinar on 18th September. Next Step The remit for strategy development has not been established.
Flooding Review	Councillor Mrs S J Conboy Councillor S J Corney Councillor I D Gardener Councillor D M Tysoe Councillor R J West Compile and review evidence (quantitative and qualitative) relating to the December 2020 flooding events, to: 1) Understand what happened. 2) Review the response. 3) Consider future prevention/mitigation.	Corporate Director Place	28th January 2021 – The Task and Finish Group met and began the review. 25th February 2021 – Quinton Carroll, Hilary Ellis, Sue Grace and Emyr Price of Cambridgeshire County Council attended the meeting and answered Members' questions. 11th March 2021 – Paul Burrows and Phillippa Hulme of the Environment Agency attended the meeting and answered Members' questions. Next Step

			A final report is being presented to the Panel at it's next meeting.
Strategic Review of Markets	<p>Councillor B S Banks Councillor S J Corney Councillor Ms A Dickinson Councillor Mrs A Diaz (also the Executive Councillor for Operations and Environment, Councillor Mrs M L Beuttell)</p> <p>To conduct a Strategic Review of HDC Markets and produce a Vision statement and a Strategy.</p>	George McDowell	<p>5th November 2020 – The Panel received a report and suggested scoping document for the Strategic Review of Markets. Members agreed to endorse the approach and aims as set out in the scoping document and appointed five O&S Members to join the Executive Councillor for Operations and Environment in conducting the Strategic Review.</p> <p>18th February 2021 – The review commenced and Members discussed the survey.</p> <p>23rd March 2021 – Members reviewed the survey and provided feedback.</p> <p>22nd June 2021 – Members reviewed the results of the survey and provided feedback.</p> <p>Next Step The next meeting will take place on 20th July 2021.</p>
Waste Strategy	<p>Councillor Ms A Dickinson Councillor D A Giles Councillor Mrs S Smith Councillor Mrs S R Wilson</p>	Neil Sloper	<p>Study has not commenced.</p> <p>Update (provided on 24th November 2020) – The delivery of HDC's Waste Strategy is linked to two other strategies.</p>

			<p>The first is DEFRA's Resources and Waste Strategy. This strategy determines any changes to waste collection practices and the options available for the collection of household waste. This has been delayed until spring 2021.</p> <p>The second is the RECAP (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership) Waste Strategy, which is the parent strategy to HDC's Waste Strategy. The partnership has conducted modelling work with DEFRA to look at the impacts and alternatives of different approaches to waste and recycling collection models but is unable to continue the work until DEFRA's strategy is clear.</p> <p>The delay in the delivery of DEFRA's Strategy has had a knock-on effect for the expected date of RECAP's Strategy, meaning that the delivery of HDC's Strategy has been delayed until January 2022.</p>
Lifelong Health – Part Two	<p>Councillor S J Criswell Councillor Mrs A Dickinson Councillor K P Gulson Councillor Mrs S Smith Councillor Mrs J Tavener Councillor Mrs S R Wilson</p>	Oliver Morley	<p>12th September 2019 – The Panel received the final report of Part One and agreed to continue the study under the guise of 'Part Two'.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify ways of developing better health outcomes for residents. • Identify the benefits of a whole system approach for the Council. 		<p>14th October 2019 – The Task and Finish Group met with Liz Robin, Public Health.</p> <p>10th December 2019 – Following the presentation of the Part One report to Cabinet and the meeting with the Director of Public Health, the Task and Finish Group met to refocus the scope of the study. The study will now focus primarily on collaboration with Parish & Town Councils and community groups in order to improve residents’ physical activity and well-being.</p> <p>13th January 2020 – The Task and Finish Group received a presentation from Active Lifestyles and assessed the interaction the service has with Parish & Town Councils and community groups.</p> <p>28th January 2020 – Alyce Barber, Community Development Officer, attended and informed Members of her work with projects that helps build social contact, builds support networks and addresses mental health issues. Members will also discuss the evidence that links an individual’s mental health with physical health.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>12th February 2020 – The Task and Finish Group received and discussed a number of case studies.</p> <p>26th November 2020 – The Group met and conducted an evidence review. Members recognised that the health issues discussed were around before the pandemic, however they have been affected by it. Despite this, it was decided that any health plan for the District should look beyond the pandemic and be a post Covid-19 plan. The Group decided that the recommendations should be focused on the following themes: access to healthy food, mental well-being and physical health.</p> <p>Next Step – A final report is in the process of being drafted.</p>
--	--	--	--

Completed

Topic	Membership & Scope	Lead Officer	Progress
Healthy Open Spaces and Play Strategy	Councillor Mrs A Dickinson Councillor K P Gulson Councillor Mrs S Smith Councillor Mrs J Tavener Councillor Mrs S R Wilson	Helen Lack	11th March 2020 – A meeting took place with Working Group Members, the relevant Executive Councillors, Helen Lack and Sarah Wheale-Smith of PleydellSmithyman so that Members could give their views on the draft Strategy.

			<p>29th July 2020 – A second meeting took place with Working Group Members, Helen Lack and Sarah Wheale-Smith of PleydellSmithyman. Members were shown the executive summary and a full draft of the Strategy.</p> <p>8th October 2020 – The Healthy Open Spaces Strategy was presented to Overview and Scrutiny.</p> <p>22nd October 2020 – The Cabinet endorsed the Healthy Open Spaces Strategy and 10 year action plan.</p>
--	--	--	--