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 Wednesday, 8 October 2025.

PRESENT: Councillor C M Gleadow – Chair.

Councillors A Blackwell, J R Catmur, B S Chapman, I D Gardener, A R Jennings, R Martin, S R McAdam, Dr M Pickering, S L Taylor and C H Tevlin.

APOLOGY(IES): Apologies for absence from the meeting were submitted on behalf of Councillors S J Corney.

34. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 3rd September 2025 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

35. MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillor Gleadow declared an other registerable interest in minute 25/38 by virtue of being the District Councillor for St Ives.

Councillor Gardener declared an other registerable interest in minute 25/38 by virtue of being the County Councillor for Kimbolton and a Member of the Fire Authority.

Councillor McAdam declared an other registerable interest in minute 25/38 by virtue of being a Member of Huntingdon Town Council.

Councillor Sanderson declared an other registerable interest in minute 25/38 by virtue of being a Member of Huntingdon Town Council.

Councillor Blackwell declared an other registerable interest in minute 25/38 by virtue of being a Member of Huntingdon Town Council.

Councillor Tevlin declared an other registerable interest in minute 25/38 by virtue of being a Trustee for the Fenstanton New Village Hall.

36. OVERVIEW & 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.

Councillor Chapman joined the meeting at 19:02.

In response to a question regarding the Transformation report, it was confirmed this had been set for pre-scrutiny in error and would be coming to the Panel in November for scrutiny only.

A question was raised relating to the unscheduled items showing on the Work Programme. The Panel wondered when these would be coming through, mentioning there was only one item for this meeting. The Chair confirmed she was in discussions about this and hopes for future Agendas to be even moving forward.

Concern over Parking Fees 2025/2026 was raised. It was commented that the price increase was meant to happen when the CPE came into effect but has not happened as set out in the budget. It was confirmed this is going to Full Council as part of the Democratic process where it can be discussed further. It was also suggested a discussion with the Portfolio holder directly could be helpful.

Pride in the joint Administration was expressed in that they are looking at alternatives to increasing Parking revenue without relying on choosing to increase the fees as their only option to achieve this.

The Chair commented that a review on Parking as part of the agreement and hopes this will start soon.

Councillor Gardener expressed frustration that he had not been informed of The Local Development Order (LDO) for Brampton Cross. His concern is that the LDO only allows communities one opportunity for comment and the final decision is made at Cabinet rather than the Development Management Committee (DMC). The Panel heard that this would be taken away and an answer sought.

37. OUTSTANDING RESPONSES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The Panel received and noted the responses received in relation to questions arising at previous meetings of the Panel.

38. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY FUNDING

By means of a report by the Funding Project Manager of Strategic Growth (a copy of which was appended in the Minute Book), The Community Infrastructure Levy Funding Report was presented to the Panel.

A question was raised regarding the criteria for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) applications. Clarification was sought as to whether the standards had been adjusted, referencing

Kimbolton and Stoney Parish Council's previous attempt which was unsuccessful but has now been approved this round. It was explained that it was not a difference in scoring, instead, feedback was provided to declined applicants and Officers worked closely with them, advising how to make their submissions stronger for their next attempt.

The Chair commented that it was positive the applications were improving and that funds were being allocated as a result of this.

The issue of Huntingdonshire's CIL still having £35 million available was raised. The Member wondered why St Neots Town Council was being asked to spend £2.5 million to the Priory Centre project in St Neots which had gone over budget when there are still funds available in the Council's CIL. The Panel heard any CIL funds that are received in the Strategic pot are for the entire District, using Alconbury SEND school as an example of a project that benefits residents outside of Alconbury. It was confirmed that St Neots had six applications and have been successful with gaining funds in the past.

After hearing a question about the Eaton Socon Grid update, the Panel were advised this would be taken away and an answer sought.

Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) was mentioned. It was questioned if this should be spent to fund infrastructure projects whilst the District is still intact. The Panel heard that there was a review regarding the strategic approach to CIL and LGR, where this issue was being discussed.

It was noted 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'

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.

Further information was requested about the Monkswood police station, particularly the delays experienced. It was confirmed that there was a review of budget and designs which had halted the project.

Satisfaction was expressed over projects which are now being completed but more detail around when the funding was granted was requested. The Panel heard that this had been included in the report but can be added as its own column in the table.

After a question from the Panel, it was confirmed that the next round of CIL finding will begin 27th October and will close on the 19th December.

Further understanding of the scoring mechanism was requested. It was explained that the scoring is indicative at present, and the decisions were made separately from the score. Attention was drawn to the report which highlights what comes into the scoring process and this was under review.

The Chair suggested the possibility of more Members getting involved in the review of the scoring process for greater understanding.

Parish Councils were raised, 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 had worked closely with the Town and Parish forum where they went through the enquiry process.

A question was raised regarding the Sustainable Framework For Play in Huntingdonshire report which is going to the Overview & Scrutiny (Environment, Communities & Partnerships) Panel in November. Clarity was sought on how this Framework, once adopted, will be taken into consideration with CIL fund allocation in the future. It was confirmed that this will be a relevant evidence base for consideration that Officers will apply when applications are submitted though applications will still be measured against their value, with the fundamental drivers of growth in mind.

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.

The Chair shared this concern and asked if the Panel could be provided with an indication of timelines of future CIL fund allocation. The Panel heard there is a report in progress which will come forward and provide a framework around the strategic allocation.

Dismay was raised that Little Paxton bridge had not been included in the Strategic projects in 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.

Following the discussion, it was

RESOLVED

that the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel be passed to Cabinet for their consideration when making a decision upon the recommendations within the report.

Chair