



Cabinet minutes

Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on Tuesday 13 October 2020 in Via MS Teams Video Conference, available to the public at <https://buckinghamshire.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>, commencing at 10.00 am and concluding at 12.25 pm.

Members present

M Tett, A Macpherson, K Wood, B Chapple OBE, J Chilver, A Cranmer, I Darby, T Green, C Harriss, P Hogan, D Martin, N Naylor, M Shaw, W Whyte, G Williams and F Wilson

Apologies

S Bowles

Agenda Item

1 Apologies

Apologies were received from Steve Bowles, Cabinet Member for Town Centre Regeneration.

2 Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED: The minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2020 were AGREED as an accurate record.

3 Declarations of interest

Bill Chapple declared a personal interest in item 8 as his son worked in the Children's Services Department for Buckinghamshire Council. Angela Macpherson declared a personal interest in item 11 as Board Member of Vale of Aylesbury Housing Trust.

4 Hot Topics

The following hot topics were discussed:-

Leader

The Leader gave an update on covid-19. Buckinghamshire has had low infection rates but they have risen quite significantly recently. He sent out a regular newsletter to residents and would be sending a newsletter to them today. The rate was particularly high in Chiltern and South Bucks and Wycombe. He urged residents to make a concerted effort to abide by the rules and to be not be complacent otherwise the rates could continue to increase to those seen in the Midlands and potentially the north of England. He did not want to see any restrictions on resident's personal freedom and the local economy. Buckinghamshire was currently

in Tier 1 at medium risk but the trend was showing that there was a potential to move up into Tier 2.

Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change

- Buckinghamshire has been chosen as a pilot for a Nature Recovery Strategy with four other Authorities; Manchester, Northumberland, Cumbria and Cornwall. Buckinghamshire was the only Council to be chosen in the middle to southern England.
- Pembroke Depot in Aylesbury was flooded due to the heavy rain so operators were one day late in collecting rubbish but they were back to normal this week. He thanked all the officers involved in clearing the depot.
- The questionnaire on climate change had now closed which had been sent to residents and businesses. They had a good response to the questionnaire which would help guide the Strategy, which would be sent out for consultation at the end of this year.
- The Leader thanked the Cabinet Member as there had been significant issues with waste collection in the Chiltern and Wycombe areas which was being rectified. The Cabinet Member reported that 99% of collections were now being undertaken in Buckinghamshire which was 250,000 households.

Cabinet Member for Housing and Homelessness

- The Council had been successful in receiving a Government Grant for the Next Steps Accommodation Programme to help provide accommodation for the homeless during the covid-19 pandemic. This consisted of a £485,000 revenue grant to offset the accommodation costs. They also have £650,000 capital funding which would enable a partner housing association to purchase 15 units for former rough sleepers who were currently in supported housing which would free up further space.
- The Cabinet Member was taking part in the Big Sleep Out on 20 November 2020 and the money raised would be given to Wycombe Homeless Connection.

Cabinet Member for Planning and Enforcement

- He referred to nominations for the new Buckinghamshire Design Awards to champion design excellence which included good architecture, urban design or conservation work. The deadline was 16 October 2020 with nominations sent to designawards@buckinghamshire.gov.uk

5 Question Time

Cllr Stuchbury's question

I'm seeking reassurance from the Cabinet member in regards to processing planning applications particularly within the Buckingham/rural area. A few of the North Bucks area planning committee meetings have been cancelled with the suggestion that there is no business which needs processing. However, there are a number of

applications, some dating back to 2018, and many of them are for major developments within a community with an agreed neighbourhood development plan which was agreed by the latter-day planning authority through public referendum within Buckingham. I, therefore, seek a better understanding of why the committee has only met once this year. Is there some issue which we are not privy to regarding staffing or the ability to process applications or is there a procedural operational change in determining applications which could explain why there are not sufficient planning applications to be determined? I've been thinking of asking the question for some time, but the latest cancellation of the meeting of 30th September this was the catalyst necessitating presenting this question to seek clarity of the above concern.

Response provided by Warren Whyte, Cabinet Member for Planning and Enforcement.

It was recognised that there are a number of legacy issues within the former Development Management teams, which were now with the new council to resolve. As such, the Planning and Environment Service was one of the first areas of the Council to be reviewed as part of Buckinghamshire Council's Review and Revive Programme. In addition the Council had started implementing immediate actions in Development Management, with a view to bringing about improvements to expedite the determination of applications ahead of the wider service programme.

In total since April 2020 the Council had received 951 applications within the North area, of those 425 fell within the categories defined in the council's constitution that could be called into committee (full, outline or reserved matters). The North Area Committee had only been held once, with 4 committee dates being cancelled. This was because the majority of applications were being determined using delegated powers. The council had determined 964 applications in the North area under delegated powers since April 2020 and 1 application had been determined by the North Area Planning committee. It should be noted that in accordance with national best practice over 96% of applications were usually determined by councils under delegated authority.

He had asked Officers to review the sites listed by Councillor Stuchbury. Out of the 42 listed, 10 of the applications did not fall within the category that could be called into committee. Of those pending the majority were being actively worked on and awaiting further information or subject to negotiation. Very few were subject to call in request by a Member, albeit comments had been made. The Council were actively programming applications to forthcoming committees but this would be dependent on the stage that was reached on negotiations on the application at the time of the closing of agendas.

The service would also carry out an investigation as to the consistency of the number and type of applications reaching each of the five area committees and feed this into an overall view of how the constitution was operating in this area.

Cllr Robin Stuchbury (written response)

In light of the written response and verbal response at the Cabinet meeting on 8 September 2020, has the Cabinet now come to the conclusion of their view on the proposals in the Planning White Paper and the environmental and economic impact this could have for Buckinghamshire, as well as the implications for local democratic accountability in the planning process?

Response to be provided by Warren Whyte, Cabinet Member for Planning and Enforcement.

The Council's draft response to the Planning White Paper has been published and was on the agenda for this Cabinet meeting. He will see from the draft response that whilst there were some interesting ideas in the White Paper, he also had a number of concerns and intended to make a full submission to Government before the close of the consultation period.

Cllr Alan Bacon

The Long Shadow of Deprivation is a very recent report from a government agency, the Social Mobility Commission. This report identifies social mobility in Chiltern as amongst the very worst in the country. Will the portfolio holder please report on how the council will seek to address this situation?

Response provided by Gareth Williams, Cabinet Member for Communities and Public Health.

Whilst the Council welcome the intentions of the report to highlight partnership work needed to reduce inequalities, unfortunately the way the data had been used had led to some misleading conclusions and was contradicted by other, more comprehensive reports issued by the same Commission.

There were four areas in Buckinghamshire. These were Aylesbury Vale with a median 'deprived' wage in 2014-2016 of £15,200, South Bucks at £17,100, Wycombe at £15,500 and, somewhat bizarrely, Chiltern at just £6,900. In the case of Chiltern, with just 52 out of 1440 in the school year chosen (just 3.6%) in the 'most deprived' category it was easy to see how a median could be affected when the entire authority was judged by its 26th most deprived earned income. By comparison, the total 'deprived' number in most areas was 13-14% of the population.

One of the report's main conclusions was that areas with lower pay for disadvantaged sons and less equality of opportunity were typically more deprived areas, have lower house prices, fewer market opportunities in professional occupations, fewer educational opportunities in 'outstanding' schools and were more densely populated. The fact that none of those variables apply to Chiltern area further serves to illustrate this appears to be an anomaly. In actual fact, the unemployment level in Chiltern was just 4.2%, well below the national average. With

regard to schools in the Chiltern area, 49/51 (96%) were good or outstanding (33% were outstanding).

The Social Mobility Commission's latest, more comprehensive, 'State of the National report, using a variety of 14 different data sources a year after the above mentioned report, showed Chiltern as a social mobility hotspot, 56th out of 324 authorities.

That said the Council were not being complacent and wanted to see Social Mobility as a hallmark of the place in which residents lived. The Council needed to keep supporting schools to retain their well above average Ofsted ratings, results and pupil progress as well as creating the right conditions for good jobs in the local economy. Furthermore, the Council continued to work with the Buckinghamshire Skills Hub to ensure that all secondary school pupils have access to good careers advice and opportunities. The Under 19's careers education program had been rated the most successful careers and enterprise program for the 2nd year by the Careers and Enterprise Company. The annual Skills Show provided a showcase to careers for young people. This year due to restrictions it would be a series of online events aimed at bringing lessons to life by showing how curriculum subjects could be applied in the workplace and supporting young people through their next choices during these challenging time.

The Council would be working through their Community Boards to make sure they were aware of their local inequalities and could direct funding locally towards projects which best address local needs. The Council were also speaking to the Commission to explore best practice projects and to see if there was more to learn from the small dataset they used.

Cllr Lesley Clarke

Why has the Cabinet Member not incorporated any of the suggestions from local Members, the Chairman and Members of High Wycombe Town Committee and the Chairman of the High Wycombe Community Board Infrastructure Sub Group in putting together the recommendations as those submitted to Cabinet on Handy Cross Park and Ride Car Park?

Response provided by David Martin, Cabinet Member for Logistics.

He, along with officers advising him had taken fully into account all suggestions from local members and stakeholders regarding the Handy Cross Car park. Prior to the public consultation he had a number of telephone conversations with Cllr Clarke and other local members; he also received and replied to various emails from Cllr Clarke and other local members. Thereafter, accompanied by the Service Director, he attended a meeting of the High Wycombe Town Committee, at which Cllr Clarke, with other members, asked numerous questions and made a wide range of representations, all of which were noted and taken into account when preparing his report to Cabinet.

The public consultation on the proposals for Handy Cross park and ride car park commenced on 28/8/20 and ran until 20/9/20. During this time, the Council received a total of 61 responses. Of those, four identified themselves as Councillors, two informing they were members of the High Wycombe Town Committee, and one informing they were a member of the High Wycombe Community Board Infrastructure Group. No formal response to the consultation was received from Cllr Clarke.

He was satisfied that all comments received pre-consultation, and from the consultation itself, had been fully considered; were summarised in Appendix B to his report; and were taken into account in the preparation of his report.

6 Forward Plan (28 Day Notice)

RESOLVED: Cabinet NOTED the forward plan.

7 Select Committee Work Programme

With regard to the Transport, Environment and Climate Change Select Committee it was noted that the contributor for the Transport for Bucks Contract Re-procurement should be amended to Nick Naylor. A Cabinet Member commented that whilst the Select Committee Work Programme was important with the escalating covid-19 figures there would be increasing pressure on NHS and social care staff so the quality and depth of information provided to Select Committees could be impacted. The Leader commented that this could also have an impact on other Council work including budgets and staffing.

RESOLVED: Cabinet NOTED the Select Committee Work Programme.

8 Director of Public Health Annual Report

Cabinet received the Annual Report on the health of the Buckinghamshire population from the Director of Public Health. The Cabinet Member for Communities and Public Health reported that the aim was to support a strategic approach in the new council and partners to address the health of the local population. The report also analysed the health of residents at a more local level both at a community board level and at the level of primary care networks. This would enable the new Community Boards to understand some of the health and wellbeing issues in their local area. The DPH annual report provided further detail on the factors that drive health and should be read in conjunction with the Community Board profiles.

The four main health behaviours – smoking, physical inactivity, unhealthy diet and alcohol misuse account for 40% of all years lived with ill health and disability. These behaviours were major risk factors driving the development of long-term conditions that account for 70% of all NHS and social care spend.

The Director of Public Health reported that this year's report was more of a stocktake looking back at past years and looking to the future. 140 million working days were lost every year due to ill health that cost the Country £22 billion which

was why health was at the core of everything. Buckinghamshire had some of the best health outcomes in the Country; this was due to the high quality environment, good education attainment and higher incomes. Despite this it was important to deal with long term health conditions. There were also variations in Buckinghamshire which was why Community Boards were invaluable in targeting local need. Only a small part of the population lived in the most deprived areas nationally. This has had an impact on the covid-19 pandemic which has hit certain communities more than others.

Looking to the future there was an increasingly ageing population. However, whilst young people were smoking and drinking less there was an increase in obesity and mental health problems. The economic impact of covid-19 was also a health factor; in the last recession in 2008 a 1% rise in unemployment led to 2% rise in long term conditions. It was important to build back better.

During discussion the following points were made:-

- One in 10 children live in poverty and reassurance was given that this was the Government's definition of poverty and it was a relative rather than absolute poverty; as areas benchmark against other parts of the Country. They used the percentage below the median income that the family was at to measure poverty; Buckinghamshire's rate was half the national average.
- There were concerns about the increased rate of covid-19 within the BAME communities around the susceptibility of getting covid-19 and also their fatality rate. The Council had run workshop sessions with Members to raise awareness of those vulnerabilities in the community including protecting the community as a whole. The Director of Public Health reported that they were working with the NHS and partners to specifically look at BAME communities and health inequalities which included improving data collection to monitor the impact, better communications campaigns which were culturally sensitive and culturally competent prevention campaigns to address long term health conditions that increase the risk of getting covid-19 such as diabetes, heart disease and high blood pressure. NHS health checks were targeting those communities to identify any concerns and also any contact made with care services. The Council was also looking at their experience during covid-19 pandemic using behaviour insight to identify ways to help these communities. Trusted local leaders were key in spreading important messages.
- Community Boards were the local delivery mechanism to drive local programmes. Post covid-19 pandemic the Team would work closely with Community Boards using pump priming money from the public health budget to help provide for local health needs and work on local health and wellbeing plans and covid-19 recovery plans. This would involve working with the voluntary and community sector, primary care networks and Community Board Co-ordinators.
- A question was raised about mental health, depression and suicide rates and the impact of covid-19 on anxiety levels due to social isolation, growing

unemployment and lack of support network and how the Council was supporting staff in this area. Confidential support was offered to Council staff and uptake of this was monitored to see if services needed to be increased with the Mental Health Assistance Programme. The Team were also looking at online resources. At the beginning of the crisis they worked with the Mental Health Trust linking in with the voluntary sector to expand services such as bereavement. A Work Programme has been developed across the partnership which was being taken forward looking at vulnerable groups, particularly those who have been adversely affected and further funding has been allocated for mental health projects including suicide prevention.

- A Member referred to the table on page 84 of the agenda and expressed surprise at respiratory issues being the third biggest cause of deaths and wondered whether this was connected to climate change. The Director of Public Health reported that climate change would result in intense storms, flooding, air pollution, food insecurity and the spread of new infectious diseases. The impact of covid-19 globally would be dwarfed by the impact of climate change.
- Reference was made to the importance of GPs undertaking preventative work. The Director of Public Health referred to a previous discussion at the Health and Wellbeing Board and if you did just one thing it would be to prevent cardiovascular disease and just one thing inside that was smoking which would take out cancers, respiratory and cardiovascular disease.
- A point was made that it was important to have health issues raised in all policies which was particularly relevant now the Council had become unitary and to think holistically about health impacts across all areas eg housing.

Cabinet welcomed the report.

RESOLVED

Cabinet NOTED the Director of Public Health Annual Report and ENDORSED the recommendations below and the draft action plan.

Recommendations within the Director of Public Health Annual Report for Buckinghamshire Council

- a) The council to consider adopting a 'health in all polices' approach whereby relevant policies and decisions consider how residents health could be improved and poor health prevented as part of business as usual, e.g. when planning new developments or considering transport policies.
- b) The council to consider opportunities to develop its role as an anchor organisation.
- c) The council to continue to roll out training to front line staff to encourage residents to make simple changes that could improve their health, wellbeing and independence and ensure staff can

signpost people to community assets that can support this.

- d) The Buckinghamshire Council public health and prevention team should support Community Boards to consider the health needs of their population and what simple practical steps they could take to improve health in their local area.
- e) To continue to promote the health of the council workforce with good workplace health policies.

Recommendations for Community Boards

- f) Community Boards should work with local communities, public health and wider partners to identify the health and wellbeing issues in their local area and take effective action to address them. Community boards should use their pump-priming wellbeing fund to help improve health and wellbeing in their area.

Recommendations for the NHS and primary care networks

The NHS should:

- a) Increase their focus on preventing ill health and tackling inequalities and ensure this is built into every care pathway.
- b) Consider how to build a health in all policies approach and opportunities to act as an anchor organisation.
- c) Consider how the NHS can best support effective place-based working and community-centred approaches.
- d) Ensure front line staff are trained to support people to make simple changes to improve their health and wellbeing and to signpost people to community assets that support this.
- e) Continue to promote and protect the health of their workforce through effective workplace policies.

Primary care networks:

- a) Should work with their local communities, Buckinghamshire Council public health, Community Boards and other partners to understand and improve the health in their local area.
- b) Ensure front line staff are trained to support people to make simple changes to improve their health and wellbeing and signpost people to community assets that can support their health.
- c) Continue to promote and protect the health of their workforce.

9 Youth Justice Strategic Plan

Cabinet received a report on the Youth Justice Strategic Plan which was produced every year to set out how youth justice services in the local area were to be provided and funded. The Cabinet Member for Children's Services commented that last year the priorities had been to address disproportionality, prevent exploitation of young people and embedding an evidence based model of practice. During the covid-19 pandemic the Service used alternative methods to contact young people and they had managed to contact every young person apart from one who had been unavailable before the pandemic started. Funding was always a challenge but the budget remained stable.

The priorities for next year were to reduce first time entrance into the Service, reduce reoffending and the use of custody. There had been excellent collaboration between key partners and the Cabinet Member thanked the police and staff for all their hard work.

During discussion the following points were made:-

- One of the past priorities had been to address disproportionality however the figures for custodian sentences in Buckinghamshire were high compared to the South East. The Corporate Director for Children's Services reported that part of their work over the past two years was to look at local demographics and for some groups of young people they were at greater risk of reoffending. Whilst the numbers were generally low there were some young people with complex needs and a number of options were being explored to address these.
- A Member asked for a gender breakdown of those young people who used the service and asked if they were mostly male. He also commented that in the report it did give a breakdown of those working in the Service who were mostly female. The Corporate Director for Children's Services reported that they looked for staff who could relate to young people regardless of their gender. In some years there have been an increase in male young offenders but there were no stereotypes.

RESOLVED: Cabinet AGREED the 2020/21 Youth Justice Strategic Plan.

10 Handy Cross Park and Ride Car Park - Introduce Charges

Cabinet received a report on the Handy Cross Development which commenced in May 2014 with the intention of introducing charges in the 396 space park and ride car park. The Cabinet Member for Logistics reported that the site was just off junction 4 of the M40 at the top of Marlow Hill which was a good position for High Wycombe Town Centre. The report only related to the Council owned car park not to the other facilities on that site.

As the car park was being maintained at the expense of Council tax payers the plan

was to introduce parking charges in the same manner as the other 84 council owned car parks. Currently on the site there was a park and ride facility which provided free parking and free bus travel to the town centre except for Saturday with a charge of £2.50. This arrangement, which was funded from CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy), was in place until 31/3/21. Decisions around bus fares continuing to be free would be subject to future CIL applications. The car park was designed by the then Wycombe District Council.

Subject to Cabinet approval and the amendment order being made, customers would pay for parking upon their return and pay only for the time they have used. Payments could be made at the machine with credit / debit card using both chip and pin and contactless payment functions. This negated the need for civil enforcement officers. The recommended tariffs were drawn up as a result of the public consultation and to ensure a fair and consistent approach for all users. The tariff structure took into account charges in the town centre.

If Cabinet agreed the recommendations the new parking restrictions and tariff structure would be displayed for 28 days and would be introduced from Monday 16 November 2020. The Cabinet Member for Logistics reported that he had taken into account comments made at the High Wycombe Town Committee.

During discussion the following points were made:-

- Whilst some of the comments had been taken into account at the High Wycombe Town Committee not all comments had been taken forward. A Member referred to the need to increase infrastructure for electric cars. There were three electric points with six connectors which were 3kw which was the equivalent of a 13 amp plug; this equated to 10 miles for every hour they were connected. The leisure centre had 7kw and were free to use by customers. The Council should be providing a similar service. The Cabinet Member responded by saying that the electric car points had been commissioned by the then Wycombe District Council but that he would look into whether these should be replaced.
- Once Wycombe Wanderers resume playing the town centre could be having crowds of up to 10,000 people and parking needed to be provided away from the stadium at the park and ride facility. Wycombe Wanderers had not responded but should have been contacted by the Council as an important stakeholder. Football fans should not be asked to pay for parking and bus fares as this may cause them to park elsewhere in Sands which would cause disruption for local residents. The Cabinet Member reported that he would be speaking to the club about appropriate parking arrangements on match days.
- A Member referred to the 10 hour banding for the car park which she commented was unusual as it was normally 12 hours. The Cabinet Member responded to say that the 10hr tariff was proposed at £3.00 to enable schools' staff and pupils and business staff to be able to park for a school day or shift at relatively low cost compared to parking in the Town centre, The

longer stay tariffs provided flexibility to support the wider community.

- Reference was made to the publicity of these changes and also how the Council was working with bus operators and Chiltern Rail to link in with commuter trains to encourage park and ride. The Cabinet Member responded that they were in discussion with bus and train operators to align services.
- Members noted that Wycombe District Council had previously intended to introduce charges and that there would be a six month review to look at the impact of these charges on other areas. The Cabinet Member also reported that Wycombe District Council had set up a Task and Finish Group to look at the original proposals to introduce charges at the car park with 16 recommendations; none of which covered recent representations.

RESOLVED

Cabinet AGREED to the introduction of parking restrictions and a tariff structure at Handy Cross Park and Ride car park in High Wycombe as set out in the paragraph below and AUTHORISED the making of the orders which are necessary to give effect to this decision:

1. Tariff structure:

Up to 30 minutes - £0.00

Up to 4 hours - £1.20

Up to 10 hours - £3.00

Up to 24 hours - £4.00

Up to 48 hours - £8.00

Up to 72 hours - £12.00

Up to 96 hours - £16.00

Maximum stay of 96 hrs

2. Parking Permits priced at £60 per calendar month, purchasable in monthly increments up to a maximum of 12 months for £720.
3. Car park open and chargeable 24hrs per day, seven days a week and 365 days of the year with the exceptions of Christmas Day, official Boxing Day and Easter Sunday, when the car park will be open; but charges will not apply.
4. Car park fees and charges to apply for electric vehicle users to enable electric vehicle bays to be effectively managed and availability of space maximised.
5. Disabled Badge holders park for free; in line with the majority of council owned/managed car parks in Buckinghamshire.

11 Planning White Paper Response

Cabinet received a report which set out an intended response from the Council to the Government's recent consultation paper entitled 'Planning for the Future'. The Leader reported that this was the biggest change to planning since 1947 and he

encouraged Members, Parish and Town Councils and residents to look at the proposed changes as this would impact on all local areas and would have a profound impact on Buckinghamshire and its natural attributes.

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Enforcement referred also to the importance of this public consultation. He commented that the current system was not perfect however with regard to the Government proposals there was a mixture of helpful ideas (digitalisation of planning and making the local plan process slicker) but also areas of concern. He summarised the main points as follows:-

- Reduces local democratic accountability
- Reduce the engagement of local plans
- Inflated housing targets
- Affordable housing proposals must be properly funded
- Developers should fund the full cost of development
- Greater penalties for planning enforcement

The Cabinet Member reported that the reason that it was being discussed at an early point at Cabinet was to allow other organisations to understand the Council's approach so that they could feed their comments back either individually or through the Council. The White Paper was split into 3 areas with 24 specific proposals; planning and development, beauty and sustainability and infrastructure.

Cabinet asked that the following comments be taken into account in the draft response:-

- The quality of architecture was a key requirement.
- Consideration needed to be given to reforming the Planning Inspectorate to avoid delays.
- Infrastructure funding was not front-loaded and infrastructure should be provided before expansion.
- Further consideration should be given to health needs with future developments.
- Simplification of local plans were a concern and it was important that local communities were not disenfranchised.
- Reference was made to thresholds so that the 10 threshold was reduced not increased to 40-50 for affordable housing. This would be an issue for rural areas.
- There was a problem with developers land banking and controlling delivery – if planning permission was granted then developers should be given a time frame to build houses.
- Concerns were raised about housing targets which would be non-negotiable. The target would be calculated by an algorithm. The Council could be given a high target which they could not meet because of issues outside of its control e.g. the area of outstanding natural beauty and developers not building houses. The Cabinet Member reported that he had responded robustly to Government in the past two weeks on housing targets which had been

welcomed by stakeholders.

Members noted that the White Paper would have a significant impact on the Buckinghamshire Local Plan but if the Government firmed up its proposals in the next six to twelve months then the Council would be in a good position to work with the new system. It was important that communities had enough time to put their views forward on their new local plans but the Cabinet Member for Planning and Enforcement was concerned that the timeframe suggested in the White Paper was not robust enough for this at the moment.

The deadline for the response to Government was 29 October 2020.

RESOLVED

Cabinet AGREED the draft response to the Government consultation as set out in Appendix A of the report, with delegated responsibility for submission of the final response, incorporating the further changes above made at the Cabinet meeting, to the Corporate Director Planning Growth and Sustainability in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Enforcement.

12 Aylesbury Garden Town - Housing Infrastructure Fund, contract signing

Cabinet received a report on the Aylesbury Garden Town Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) contract signing. The Council had provisionally been awarded £172,323,426 by Homes England to enable the building of nearly 10,000 new homes in Aylesbury through the delivery of specific key infrastructure projects including roads and schools, subject to entering into the contract. The majority of the funding was to provide infrastructure ahead of the Section 106 monies or income receipt.

The Leader reported that the Council had bid successfully for Government funding for the Housing Infrastructure Fund to provide essential infrastructure to enable the delivery of housing in Aylesbury but would also impact on other areas of the County e.g. Princes Risborough. Homes England were the agency working on behalf of Government and they needed to secure legal release of this money. The report set out the legal conditions which included financial implications and risks. This funding would help fund link roads around Aylesbury plus new schooling, electricity generation and other key infrastructure. A new Board would oversee the Project chaired by the Leader.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change welcomed the proposal and commented that whilst some residents may not like extra road building it would have a good impact on the environment by alleviating roads in the town centre and also help surrounding villages who had a number of power cuts because of electricity generation.

RESOLVED:

- 1) Cabinet AGREED to delegate authority to approve the Housing Infrastructure**

Fund

(HIF) Aylesbury Garden Town (AGT) contract to the Corporate Director for Planning Growth and Sustainability (PG&S), and the Section 151 officer (jointly), in consultation with the Leader.

- 2) Cabinet NOTED the key risks to the Council in agreeing to the contract with Homes England.**
- 3) Cabinet AGREED to the establishment of a new HIF Investment Board (a Member led Board to oversee the HIF Programme), including Aylesbury Garden Town HIF, Princes Risborough HIF, Abbey Barn Lane HIF and A355 Beaconsfield Relief Road HIF. Membership will consist of the Leader, the Cabinet Member for Resources, the Cabinet Member for Transport, the Cabinet Member for Town Centre Regeneration, and the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills. Its role will be to monitor progress, recommend changes in funding allocations between projects and consider the re-allocation of the HIF recycling pot.**

15 Winslow Centre Development

Cabinet received a report on a proposed scheme of a mixture of housing and community/ sports facilities for the Winslow Centre Development

The Cabinet Member for Property and Assets reported that the Winslow Site covered 15 acres to the north of the town and was the site of a former secondary school which closed in 1989. Cabinet previously agreed to the demolition of these buildings which was now taking place with the exception of the library which remained open for the time being. This report requested progression to the next stage which included design, feasibility and consultation and the preparation of the planning application. The site was divided into three plots; Plot 1 would provide a new library and place for community activities, Plot 2 extra care and sheltered accommodation and Plot 3 residential development. The existing sports facilities on the site which included rugby, football and tennis would eventually be relocated to a new sports hub owned by the Council to the north of the town. The Scheme was financially viable and would deliver significant benefits to residents. There had been regular engagement with a range of stakeholders including local members, Town Council, local community and sports clubs.

The Local Member was invited to address Cabinet, on an exception basis. He made the following comments:-

- The Project had been described as One Public Estate but there were no other organisations involved.
- Some of the proposals were contrary to the Winslow Neighbourhood Plan. The site was proposed for development in the Plan but not as proposed in the Cabinet report. The site was allocated with a medical centre, extra care housing and green space. The key element was the medical centre with the extra growth in Winslow but the report inferred that the Clinical

Commissioning Group (CCG) had withdrawn. Any further work should be conditional upon re-engagement with the CCG and NHS property with a view to delivering a new medical centre as a core element of the proposal.

- There was no reference in the Neighbourhood Plan for residential development in Plot 3. 38 residential units were proposed in addition to the care homes. This had not been mentioned in discussions with the Parish Council.
- The Neighbourhood Plan called for 30% affordable homes; the allowance in the report was only 25% which would have a negative impact on the net capital receipt.
- The library provided an excellent service with 60 volunteers. The report referred to service transformation but it would be difficult to improve the service already provided in the old building. They were concerned about a reduced sized library as the new building also needed to contain community facilities and office space.
- The redevelopment of the site should not begin until the sports facilities were re-located however, this was provided for in the plans. The cost of the improved sports facilities should be taken out of the capital receipt.

Following discussion of the exempt report the Cabinet Member for Property and Assets reported that the Council would welcome any re-engagement with the CCG and NHS. The CCG had withdrawn from discussions earlier in the year, together with Thames Valley Police. The channels of communication had been kept open for re-engagement. He provided a commitment to enhanced sports facilities in the new sports hub and to pay due regard to the Winslow Neighbourhood Plan. There would be full consultation with the Town Council and local community.

RESOLVED

1. **Cabinet APPROVED the release of £800k from the Winslow capital project budgets to complete the initial concept design stage for the Winslow Centre Development (a One Public Estate funded feasibility project).**
2. **Cabinet AUTHORISED the Director of Property and Assets in consultation with the agreed Cabinet Member, the S151/Head of Finance delegated authority to take the project through to the end of RIBA Stage 3. This will see completion of the initial concept design stage including:**
 1. **Seeking pre-planning advice, public consultation and submission of the relevant planning application(s); including the development of a planning strategy and a full local member and stakeholder consultation plan;**
 2. **Continuing negotiations with specialist housing providers and public sector partners to inform the business case decision to be brought back to Cabinet;**
 3. **Appointment of Professional Teams and commissioning of further required surveys;**

4. The exploration of a property company for the management, rent and or sale of housing units (residential and independent living);
 5. Arranging the provision of a temporary library facility to prepare for the existing library decant whilst it is re-provisioned in a new facility.
3. Cabinet WELCOMED reengagement with the Clinical Commissioning Group so that they could be involved in the provision of a new, fit for purpose community facility; provided commitment to enhanced sports facilities and confirmed that the project would have due regard to the Neighbourhood Plan.

16 Exclusion of the public (if required)

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 involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

Paragraph 3 Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

Item 17 - Winslow Centre Development

18 Date of next meeting

Tuesday 10 November 2020 at 10.00am