

COMMENTS FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (PERFORMANCE AND GROWTH)

PROSPECTUS' FOR GROWTH – HUNTINGDON, ST IVES AND RAMSEY

- 4.1 The Panel received the Prospectus for Growth (PFG) – Huntingdon, St Ives and Ramsey at its meeting on 5th February 2020.
- 4.2 Members welcomed the PFGs and thought they are a good starting point for the economic development of the Towns.
- 4.3 Concerns were raised regarding the funding of the PFGs. In particular a comment was made, in relation to the St Neots experience, that costs could rise. Members were informed that the Towns would have to bid for money up to a limit of £500k but it is intended the funding is seed funding and Towns are expected to raise their own additional funding.
- 4.4 Councillor Wakeford was concerned about the reference to the removal of the ring road without any further explanation. It was explained that the consultants have been tasked with producing a document with suggestions on how to improve the Towns economically and have done so; however, some of the suggestions have not been assessed on whether they are feasible. The Panel was also reminded that the PFGs are draft and that it is up to the Town Teams on what initiatives to take forward.
- 4.5 A comment was made that there are no Action Plans included with the PFGs; however, it was noted that they are draft aspirational documents and should not seek to control matters that would be for planning policy. It will be up to Town Teams to take forward the ideas they want.
- 4.6 Members enquired about the pedestrianisation of Godmanchester Bridge. The PFG for Huntingdon does not mention it as the Town Team has not considered the idea. It was suggested that the Combined Authority should be encouraged to take a view on the Godmanchester Bridge.
- 4.7 The structure of Town Teams and the governance arrangements in place was raised; however, it was explained that governance would be the subject of future discussions.