

Community Infrastructure Levy Funding
Comments of Overview & Scrutiny Panel (Performance & Growth)

- 3.1 The Overview & Scrutiny (Performance & Growth) Panel discussed the report at its meeting on 10th June 2025.
- 3.2 Councillor Martin asked if the governance structure had changed regarding the criteria for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) applications, referencing Kimbolton and Stoney Parish Council's previous attempt which was unsuccessful but has now been approved this time around. It was explained that it is not a difference in scoring, instead, feedback is provided to declined applicants and Officers work closely with them to advise how to make their submissions stronger for their next attempt.
- 3.3 The Chair commented that it was positive that the applications were improving and that funds were being allocated as a result of this.
- 3.4 Councillor Chapman raised the issue of Huntingdonshire's CIL still having £35 million available, referring to St Neots Town Council being asked to spend £2.5 million to the Priory Centre project in St Neots which has gone over budget.
- 3.5 Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) was mentioned, wondering if this should be spent to fund infrastructure projects whilst the district is still intact. The Panel heard that there is a review regarding the strategic approach to CIL and LGR where this issue is being discussed.
- 3.6 Further information was requested about the Monkswood police station, particularly the delays experienced. It was confirmed that there is a review of budget and designs which has halted the project.
- 3.7 Councillor Martin expressed his pleasure over projects which are now being completed but asked for more detail around when the funding was granted for ease of reviewing the process. It was heard that this had been included in the report but can be added as it's own column in the table to make this easier.
- 3.8 Councillor Catmur requested clarification as to the scoring mechanism. It was explained that the scoring is indicative at present, and the decisions are made separately from the score. Attention was drawn to the report which highlights what comes into the scoring process and this is currently under review.
- 3.9 The Chair suggested the possibility of more Members getting involved in the review of the scoring process for greater understanding.

- 3.10 Parish Councils were brought up, it being noted that they were grateful for the feedback from the pre-application process but they would like a further understanding of how the rest of the process works. It was confirmed that this had evolved from the Governance process and that the team have worked closely Town and Parish forum where they went through the enquiry process.
- 3.11 Concern was raised referencing 3.3 of the report, spend allocation and CIL being needed to support infrastructure projects in the future. It was noted that there was concern on holding back waiting for Strategic projects like the A141. Insight was sought regarding what CIL will be used for and when. It was advised that all applications are reviewed thoroughly and considered carefully and must ensure funds from CIL are available for key infrastructure needed, referencing strategic allocation.
- 3.12 Dismay was raised by Councillor Chapman that Little Paxton bridge had not been included in the Strategic projects at 3.3 of the report. It was confirmed this was currently with Cambridgeshire County Council who were looking at options beyond bridge changes for the flooding.
- 3.13 Cllr Chapman queries £5 million that had been allocated for use at the Eaton Socon Grid and asked what had happened to that project.
- 3.14 It was raised there was a word missing in appendix 1 under Bury Guardroom, it should read 'To transform the former RAF Guardroom building into a multifunctional SPACE'
- 3.15 It was queried about the location of the project in Appendix 2 and asked if more detail could be added to the address in the future.
- 3.16 Following the discussion, the Panel were informed that their comments would be added to the Cabinet report in order for an informed decision to be made on the report recommendations.