

## HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of the OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (PERFORMANCE AND GROWTH) held in Civic Suite, Pathfinder House, St Mary's Street, Huntingdon PE29 3TN on Tuesday, 7 May 2024.

PRESENT: Councillor C M Gleadow – Chair.  
Councillors S J Corney, J E Harvey,  
S A Howell, A R Jennings, R Martin,  
Dr M Pickering and N Wells.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence from the meeting were submitted on behalf of Councillors A Blackwell, S Cawley, I D Gardener and R A Slade.

IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor S Wakeford.

### **81. MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

Councillor S Corney declared an other registerable interest in Minute 23/82 as a trustee of the Ramsey Community Centre.

Councillor S Corney declared a non-registerable interest in Minute 23/82 as a ward member for Bury.

Councillor J Harvey declared a non-registerable interest in Minute 23/82 as her children played cricket at Huntingdon Cricket Club.

Councillor S Howell declared a non-registerable interest in Minute 23/82 as a ward member for Yaxley.

Councillor R Martin declared a non-registerable interest in Minute 23/82 as a ward member for Sawtry.

### **82. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY SPEND ALLOCATION**

Pursuant to Minute No 23/78 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny (Performance and Growth) Panel on 3rd April 2024, Members gave further consideration to the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy Spend Allocation, which had been approved by the Cabinet on 19th April 2024, but which had been called-in by Councillors Cawley, Corney, Gardener, Harvey and Martin. The Panel's deliberations were assisted by a report by the Elections and Democratic Services Manager (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book).

Following a question from Councillor Wells, the Panel heard that the CIL process was being redeveloped, and that this would be

brought back to the Panel at a future date.

Councillor Martin noted that the information contained within the additional Appendix 3 was helpful when considering each application. It was confirmed to the Panel that the purpose of CIL was to unlock growth, applications were welcome to help develop and support communities and that some projects were the result of negotiations at a developer stage.

It was observed by Councillor Corney, that when CIL reports had previously been presented to the Panel, there had been the opportunity to discuss each large project application individually, as well as the main body of the report.

The Panel heard that in order to provide applicants with a timely answer, the team processed applications regularly, in the event of an unsuccessful application, or a change of circumstances, applicants were welcome to reapply and also to use feedback to reshape their bid if necessary. Following a question from Councillor Jennings, it was confirmed that feedback was provided within the reports submitted and that further feedback could be provided if requested by the applicant.

Further to a question by Councillor Gleadow, it was confirmed to the Panel that should an applicant make the team aware of time constraints or a threat to funding for their application, exceptional circumstances could be applied and an emergency discussion and decision could be made.

Councillor Harvey enquired about how growth was assessed in urban and rural areas, following which, the Panel heard that several factors were considered including the size of the settlement and the growth involved versus the size of the ask. In addition, Neighbourhood Plans and impact on surrounding areas were also considered to result in an evidence led approach. Following a further question from Councillor Harvey, the Panel were assured that applications were considered on a case by case basis.

Following the general discussion on the Community Infrastructure Levy Spend Allocation, the Panel then discussed each application in turn as per the Cabinet recommendations.

### **Hilton Pavilion (Appendix A)**

The Panel had no comments to discuss in relation to this application.

### **Sawtry Pavilion (Appendix B)**

Following a question from Councillor Martin, the Panel heard that the Elizabeth II Trust was a national trust that supports and

protects that area and that their involvement would be required for any development of the site.

### **The Guardroom Community Hub, Bury (Appendix C)**

Councillor Martin observed that the application was looking to achieve a lot for the community within the project, and that this would unlock growth in a developing area. It was enquired whether there would be a limit on funding due to the commerciality of the project. The Panel heard that where viability of the project could be demonstrated, and that the proposed infrastructure would support business as well as the viability of the business and community development it would be considered. The Panel heard that in this instance, the Business Plan had not demonstrated the economic output but that they were welcome to reapply in future funding rounds once the project was further developed. The Panel heard that applications need to satisfy the requirement that long-term community investment and benefits would be achieved.

Councillor Martin observed that the Panel had not had the opportunity to discuss individual applications at the previous meeting, by enabling this discussion Overview and Scrutiny would have been able to add their comments on each application for Cabinet to assist in their consideration of the recommendations within the report. It was confirmed to the Panel that determination on the recommendations had been achieved following discussion of the item and using the rationale within the report.

Councillor Corney observed that the parish of Bury had seen substantial growth through new developments, tripling in size, the proposal in question has been part of that development but that the building had only recently been offered to the Parish Council.

Following an enquiry by Councillor Harvey, the Panel heard that funding could be awarded subject to a successful planning application which could be submitted following the CIL application.

### **St Neots Community Fire Station Modernisation and Extension Project (Appendix D)**

The Panel had no comments to discuss in relation to this application.

### **Sports Provision, Abbey College, Ramsey (Appendix E)**

Councillor Corney observed that District Councillors were often unaware of applications coming forward within their ward.

### **Folksworth Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) (Appendix F)**

The Panel had no comments to discuss in relation to this application.

**New Workshop and storage for Warboys New Parish Centre (Appendix G)**

The Panel had no comments to discuss in relation to this application.

**King George V Pavilion Works, Huntingdon (Appendix H)**

Councillor Wells observed that the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy was to increase and improve playing facilities across the district.

**Extension to a footpath in Colne (Appendix I)**

The Panel had no comments to discuss in relation to this application.

**Community Centre Extension, Ramsey (Appendix J)**

*Councillor Corney left the room for the discussion.*

The Panel had no comments to discussion in relation to this application.

*Councillor Corney re-entered the room.*

**MAGPAS internal re-fit and purchase of an aviation tank (Appendix K)**

The Panel had no comments to discuss in relation to this application.

Having fully debated the report, the Panel in conclusion have affirmed that the original decision of Cabinet held on 19th April 2024 may stand with regard to the Community Infrastructure Levy Spend Allocation.

Chair