

## **Cabinet**

**10 APRIL 2018**

**PRESENT:** Councillor N Blake (Leader); Councillors A Macpherson (Deputy Leader), J Blake, S Bowles, H Mordue, C Paternoster, Sir Beville Stanier Bt and J Ward

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Councillors P Cooper, C Poll and M Winn

### **1. MINUTES**

RESOLVED –

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 6 March, 2018, be approved as a correct record.

### **2. COMMUNITY SAFETY UPDATE AND ANNUAL PLAN 2018-19**

Members received a report considered also by the Environment and Living Scrutiny Committee on 28 March, 2018, and summarised in the Minutes of that meeting. The report had been updated to include the latest updates made by the Community Safety Partnership. The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee attended the meeting to elaborate upon his Committee's deliberations. The Chairman expanded upon the principal issues raised by the Committee (as also set out in the Committee Minutes), and was assured that where possible these would be taken into account in the implementation of the Action Plan for 2018/2019. Cabinet thanked the Committee for its input to this process and it was,

RESOLVED –

That the Annual Plan for 2018/2019 be approved.

### **3. MRF CONTRACT FOR MIXED RECYCLING**

Members received a report also submitted to the Environment and Living Scrutiny Committee on 28 March, 2018, and summarised in the Minutes of that meeting, setting out the proposed contractual arrangements for future materials recycling. The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee attended the meeting and elaborated upon the deliberations of the Scrutiny Committee.

In summary a procurement exercise had been undertaken jointly with Cherwell District Council. The tenders had been evaluated, the details of which had been set out in the confidential section of the Cabinet agenda. The procurement exercise had been carried out against the background of a fluctuating global materials recycling market. The new contract had been tendered on a fixed fee for processing and an income share basis. The Environment and Living Scrutiny Committee was supportive of the proposed arrangements.

RESOLVED –

That the contractual arrangements for mixed recycling as outlined in the Cabinet report, be approved.

#### 4. CENTRAL AREA GROWTH BOARD

The National Infrastructure Commission's (NIC) interim report on the Cambridge-MK - Oxford growth corridor identified that one factor holding the area back from achieving its full potential as the UK's "silicon valley" was the lack of joined-up planning for housing, jobs and infrastructure across traditional local authority boundaries. It had been felt that current governance mechanisms were not sufficient to deliver the step change in strategic leadership and collaboration needed, and that a fundamental shift in the scale at which local authorities collaborated was required.

The NIC had encouraged authorities within the central section of the arc to strengthen structures for collaborative governance and collective decision making and had referenced the need to establish a Growth Board. The final report of the NIC had contained several recommendations concerning which AVDC had responded. A copy of the response was appended to the Cabinet report on options for the corridor, (referred to elsewhere in these Minutes).

Within the Cambridge-MK-Oxford corridor, formalised stronger regional working arrangements had been established at either end through the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and the Oxfordshire Growth Board. Establishing a Growth Board for the central area would enable AVDC and its partner authorities to meet the challenge of councils working together closely in the future.

AVDC had been actively engaging since last summer on closer regional working with the 17 local authorities within the South East Midlands and Buckinghamshire Thames Valley LEP footprints that were locally defined as being within the Cambridge-MK-Oxford corridor. All the authorities across this geography had agreed to form the Central Area Growth Board (CAGB), with the exception of Buckinghamshire County Council. The partners had agreed in principle that the Board would co-ordinate cross boundary working within the central area.

The CAGB would be constituted as a Joint Committee under Sections 101(5) and 102 of the Local Government Act 1972 and Section 9EB of the Local Government Act 2000 and pursuant, where applicable to the Local Authorities (Arrangements for the Discharge of Functions) (England) Regulations 2012.

The establishment of a Growth Board in the centre of the Cambridge-MK-Oxford corridor would also allow the central area to be an active participant in the cross corridor working arrangements currently being established. The CAGB would provide strategic leadership to enable the area to plan for and realise an economic transformation across the central area and would act as a single co-ordinating voice for the region in discussions with Central Government. The Growth Board's key function would be to focus on growth related matters with four key outcomes:-

- Accelerate the delivery of planned growth across the area, where this was enabled by investment in infrastructure and services.
- Provide the strategic leadership that would enable existing mechanisms and processes to plan for and realise an economic transformation across the area.
- Secure long term benefits and opportunities for local communities.
- Attract increased private sector investment.

It would also seek to:-

- Establish common planning areas to produce an integrated and holistic approach to strategic planning for employment, housing and infrastructure that built upon Local Plans.
- Accelerate and increase the delivery of planned growth across the area, where this was enabled by investment in infrastructure and services.
- Work together to influence the route planning options in order to realise the opportunity for the area including an “expressway” (road and rail) and other associated linkages that might be delivered.
- Approve and monitor the implementation of a central area programme of works, including those flowing from any Place deals, Strategic Economic Plans and Transport Strategies and other relevant infrastructure programmes.
- Contribute to and be an active member of the Cambridge-MK-Oxford Corridor cross corridor governance arrangements.

The proposed terms of Reference set out the governance structure and the roles and responsibilities of Board members. A full list of those members and terms of reference had been appended to the Cabinet report.

No powers were being ceded from member authorities to the Growth Board. If members of the Growth Board agreed to vest powers into it, this would be agreed by individual councils via their normal decision making processes. Hence AVDC would only cede powers to the Growth Board if it and all other member authorities chose to. MK Council would be the accountable body for the CAGB and would provide the Section 151 officer role to the Board.

In the visioning document “Helping the Cambridge, Milton Keynes and Oxford Corridor Reach Its Potential”, published at the time of the autumn budget, Government had announced its ambition to work with the central area on housing and growth deals throughout 2018. Whilst any potential housing and growth deals would not necessarily cover the whole geography of the central area, the Growth Board would have an important role to play in co-ordinating these at the sub-regional level.

Collaborating and proactively planning for growth through the forum of a Growth Board would allow regional partners to shape the future growth of their areas, rather than have growth thrust upon them. By joining the CAGB, AVDC would be committing itself to an on-going annual contribution of £5K to support the Board’s work. Further contributions might be sought for specific pieces of work. In the years in which AVDC was the host authority (those during which it chaired the Growth Board), committee management services would be provided by this Council.

RESOLVED –

That Council be recommended to:-

- (1) Approve the arrangements for the new Central Area Growth Board Joint Committee as set out in the Cabinet report.
- (2) Agree (subject to (4) below) the new governance structure and become a full member of the Central Area Growth Board and adopt the Terms of Reference as appended to the Cabinet report.

- (3) Commit to a contribution of £5K per annum of on-going revenue to support the work of the Board.
- (4) Adopt the proposals for the Joint Committee and delegate any amendments to the Terms of Reference that might be necessary to the Chief Executive after consultation with the Leader of the Council.

## **5. NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE COMMISSION: CAMBRIDGE-MK-OXFORD CORRIDOR**

The National Infrastructure Commission (NIC) report “Partnering For Prosperity”, published in November, 2017, viewed east west infrastructure as a once in a generation opportunity to unlock land for new settlements and alleviate some of the constraints in the arc in terms of housing affordability, as well as congestion, and to better link the thriving economies of Oxford and Cambridge. The decision on the “missing link” - the expressway corridor - (Option A,B or C) between the M40 and M1 was key.

Highways England, who had been commissioned by the Department of Transport to deliver the expressway project, had sought views from stakeholders on the preferred corridor route and the least preferred. Members’ seminars had been held to seek views but no overall consensus had been reached on the preferred corridor route. The Cabinet report, which could be viewed on the Council’s website at <http://democracy.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/documents/g2473/Public%20reports%20pack%2010th-Apr-2018%2018.30%20Cabinet.pdf?T=10> set out the key considerations raised during the seminars, which focused on the lack of information available to be able to make a fully informed choice about the corridor route at this time. Concern had been expressed that the decision about this important aspect was being made in isolation of decisions for locations and scale of new settlements across the corridor and areas for economic growth. Comments had also been made about the absence of evidence from connectivity studies or other detailed analysis.

Three non Cabinet Members attended the meeting to comment specifically on the expressway options and their views were taken into account during Cabinet’s discussions, as were the views expressed individually in writing by a number of other Members in response to an invitation to comment on this issue.

Whilst Cabinet concurred with the proposed response referred to in paragraph 4.14 of the Cabinet report, it was felt that a number of additional points should be made (as set out below in the resolution to this Minute). Cabinet wished the Council’s response to make clear that the routes were not designed to meet existing growth but to meet the needs of significant future growth. It was also felt that the Council’s response should refer to the need for community engagement, that the preferred route should demonstrate community benefit and the need for any mitigation measures.

A response was required by 12 April, 2018 and in accordance with the urgency provisions contained within the Constitution, the Chairman of the Environment and Living Scrutiny Committee had been consulted and had agreed that this item should not be subject to call-in in view of the timescale.

RESOLVED –

- (1) That the principal points summarised from the Member seminars and set out in paragraph 4.14 of the Cabinet report be included within this Authority's response together with the following additional points:-
  - There is a hybrid version of the corridor that needs to be properly explored, including the potential of a new junction from the M40, which could combine aspects of routes A and B.
  - Acknowledge that Corridor C is probably the “least preferred” as it does not contribute as well as the other corridors could against all of the current measured factors indicated, although improvements to the A421 should be considered as part of the connectivity study.
  - The need for an overall coordinated approach at Government level, with timely announcements to ensure that councils across the corridor area can proceed to adopt their current Local Plans, but also effectively plan for and commit to early reviews of their Plans, and also working with adjacent authorities to work up the spatial plans referred to by the NIC to facilitate delivery of long term growth.
- (2) That the Director with responsibility for planning, after consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Growth Strategy, be authorised to draft and submit the Council's response to Highways England.
- (3) That AVDC's written response to the NIC's report “Partnering For Prosperity: A New Deal for the Cambridge-MK-Oxford Arc” be approved along the lines of the document attached as Appendix 3 to the Cabinet report and the discussions at this meeting, and that the Director with responsibility for Planning, after consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Growth Strategy, be authorised to submit the response to Government.

## **6. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED –

That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the Paragraph indicated in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act:-

Tender evaluation details for the MRF contract for mixed recycling (Paragraph 3)

The public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information because the report contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of organisations, including the authority holding that information, and the disclosure of commercially sensitive information would prejudice negotiations for contracts and land disposals or transactions.

## **7. MRF CONTRACT FOR MIXED RECYCLING**

Cabinet received commercially sensitive information relating to the evaluation of tenders for the renewal of the materials recycling contract.