

## EXECUTIVE BOARD

*At a meeting of the Executive Board on Thursday, 24 September 2009 in the Marketing Suite, Municipal Building*

Present: Councillors McDermott (Chairman), D. Cargill, Harris, McInerney, Nelson, Polhill, Swain, Wharton and Wright

Apologies for Absence: Councillor Gerrard

Absence declared on Council business: None

Officers present: M. Reaney, G. Cook, B. Dodd, I. Leivesley, A. McNamara, G. Meehan, D. Parr, D. Tregoe, C. Halpin and S. Wallace-Bonner

Also in attendance: Councillor Redhead

### ITEMS DEALT WITH UNDER POWERS AND DUTIES EXERCISABLE BY THE BOARD

#### EXB33 MINUTES

The Minutes of 9<sup>th</sup> September 2009 were taken as read and signed as correct record.

#### EXB34 WORLD EXPO SHANGHAI

The Board received a report of the Chief Executive which set out that the World Expo in Shanghai ran between 1<sup>st</sup> May and 31<sup>st</sup> October 2009 and would attract around 70 million visitors. It was regarded as a once in a generation opportunity to consolidate existing and forge new relationships in the World's emerging markets and was predicted to deliver up to £50m benefits to Liverpool and the North West over the next decade.

It was noted that Liverpool was the only UK city to have a dedicated Pavilion at the event. Its presence was being led by Liverpool Vision in partnership with Liverpool City Council, the Liverpool-Shanghai Partnership and the Northwest Regional Development Agency (NWDA).

It was further noted that a number of themes would

*Action*

be addressed by Liverpool's Pavilion during the Expo. They were:

- Urban regeneration, energy, sustainability and the environment;
- Advanced technology and science;
- Culture, health and sport
- The Knowledge Sector;
- Professional services; and
- Liverpool: the gateway to the North west (Ports, airports and property development).

Pavilion sponsorship opportunities, which started at £6,000 for individuals organisations, included a package of professional business support which was outlined in the report.

The Board was advised that Peel Holdings was to be the lead sponsor of the Liverpool Pavilion at the Expo. Peel was investing more than £100,000 in the deal to be the headline sponsor for the Pavilion during the six-month event and more sponsors were expected to be announced in coming weeks.

It was further noted that the Liverpool City Region authorities had been invited to take a Platinum Sponsorship Package – costing £18,000 – so they could be involved in the event. St. Helens, Wirral, Sefton and Knowsley were all committed to a Platinum Sponsorship Package.

RESOLVED: That Halton Borough Council commit to Platinum Sponsorship Package.

#### EXB35 IMPLICATIONS OF THE ATLANTIC GATEWAY IN HALTON

The Board received a report of the Strategic Director – Environment which aimed to summarise the “Atlantic Gateway Spatio-Economic Framework Options Paper”, published by the North West Development Agency (NWDA) in terms of its implications for Halton.

The Board was advised that the “Atlantic Gateway Spatio-Economic Framework Options Paper” (the Options Paper) was prepared by the consultants Ekosgen on behalf of the NWDA, and was published in August 2009 for a period of stakeholder consultation. The Options Paper sought the views of partners on the options for interventions associated with the implementation of Atlantic Gateway, across a series of themes. The Options Paper was attached

to the report at Appendix 1.

It was noted that the Atlantic Gateway was the spatial area anchored by the cities of Liverpool and Manchester and the corridor between them, including Warrington, Halton and parts of Cheshire. The Atlantic Gateway concept sought to join together the disparate elements of this large sub-region, linking initiatives and interventions, including physical sites and infrastructure, and also social, environmental and most significantly economic policy approaches.

It was further noted that the Options Paper was primarily based upon themes of intervention, creating a high level economic and spatial framework. This methodology looked to establish what the Atlantic Gateway should aim to become rather than assessing the potential contribution of individual development sites in the first instance. However, the Atlantic Gateway would be influenced by Peel Holdings Ocean Gateway investment strategy, which was based on the development of Peel's portfolio sites in the North West and shared some of the same themes, aims and goals.

In policy terms, the Atlantic Gateway sought to build upon the Government initiatives to focus economic development on strong regions and sub-regions, and sought to overcome potential problems with City Region insularity by ensuring that both Manchester and Liverpool look outwards as well as inwards. This meant that there was an opportunity for Halton, over and above its role in the Liverpool City Region, to play an important role in this larger sub-regional area.

The Board was advised that the Options Paper built on a series of Foundation Reports assessing the Atlantic Gateway in a number of ways, which were set out in the report. The Options Paper set out a number of areas in which it was anticipated that organising, planning, advocacy and prioritisation at the spatial level of the Atlantic Gateway had some merit. The paper also recognised that in some areas, a more localised, informal approach to capitalising on opportunities may be more appropriate. The key areas identified were outlined in detail in the report.

It was further noted that the Options Paper focussed on a number of underlying principles guiding the Atlantic Gateway, as outlined in the report. The Options Paper stated that it was not the intention for the Atlantic Gateway to subsume current arrangements or to take over the role of the city regions and sub-regional partnerships; rather, there would be a focus on key areas of added value.

The Board was advised that the Options Paper presented the key areas outlined above in terms of the pertinent issues, why the key areas presented an opportunity for the Atlantic Gateway, and the potential options for dealing with the key area within the Gateway remit. In most cases, there were around three options presented, based on varying levels of intervention, ranging from no or little intervention to high level or radical intervention.

The Board was further advised that a summary of the issues and options presented for each of the key areas, along with suggestions of potential implications for Halton, was attached to the report at Appendix 2.

It was noted that being in a central position within the Atlantic Gateway Area, the implementation of the options proposed would have an impact upon Halton. Depending on the degree, type and level of intervention which formed the preferred options, these impacts would range from relatively minor to potentially extremely large. The most significant of these impacts were summarised and set out within the report, with consideration being given to the opportunities afforded by the Atlantic Gateway for Halton, as well as the areas of the Options Paper which could be altered or improved to better reflect Halton's needs and aspirations.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the implications of the implementation of the "Atlantic Gateway" Options in Halton are noted; and
- (2) the Council respond to the Options proposed within the "Atlantic Gateway Spatio-Economic Framework Options Paper" in the manner outlined within this paper.

#### EXB36 RESIDENTS-ONLY PARKING SCHEMES

The Board received a report of the Strategic Director, Environment which reviewed Council policy in relation to residents only parking schemes.

The Board was advised that the increasing number of vehicles on our roads was creating more and more pressure on parking space on the highway. The problems were at their worst adjacent to schools, shops, transport hubs and other key destinations but there was also a growing problem with residential areas, partly due to multiple car ownership in

some households. There was pressure on parking spaces to the areas around Runcorn and Widnes North (Farnworth) rail stations. In Victoria Road (Widnes North rail station) where most residents had off-road parking facilities, the problem had been largely solved by the use of parking restrictions.

It was noted that parking on Halton's roads was free and open to all highway users on an equal basis, provided their vehicles were street legal. It was an uncomfortable truth that nobody had an absolute right to expect to park on the highway directly outside or even near their own home. Owning and running a car was a lifestyle choice that residents made and, therefore it was their responsibility to ensure that they could legally park their vehicle when not in use. The highway was for the passing or repassing of traffic and not for parking.

It was further noted in Halton, there was no charge levied for the use of the limited number of Council owned car parks and thus there was no income from these facilities and they were a financial liability to the Council, due to their ongoing maintenance costs. Most parking provision associated with the town centre and supermarket shopping was in private ownership and again carried no charge, currently. However, there was charging by the owners of car parks at some locations such as the hospital and Runcorn mainline railway station. The Council had commissioned parking studies in Runcorn and Widnes Town centres and in Halton Lea. These studies provided the base data and analysis to enable consideration by the Council, in conjunction with private car park operations, of future car parking policy. Enforcement of on-highway parking restrictions was the responsibility of Cheshire Police.

The Board was advised that Cheshire Police had been consulted to ascertain if they would be prepared to enforce a Residents Only Parking (ROPS) scheme in Halton, if one was introduced. This request had been declined as Police had indicated that the Force's position on residents only parking was that it was solely a local authority issue. Extensive internet research and contact with other local authorities confirmed that this was the Force's view and was consistent with those of other Forces in the Country. The Police were also not prepared to enforce ROPS, even if the funding was provided by the Council to enable officers to work overtime.

It was noted that using powers introduced by the Road Traffic Act 2004, it would be possible for Halton to take

on responsibility for enforcing on street parking restrictions instead of the Police, including any ROPS. These Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) powers would mean that the majority of parking offences, including parking on yellow lines and mis-using disabled persons' parking bays, would no longer be criminal offences. A total of 247 local authorities had taken on CPE powers to March 2009, freeing some Police resources to tackle more serious crime.

The case for introducing CPE in Halton was in the process of being considered and would include an assessment of the financial implications as well as any enforcement benefits. However, should Halton subsequently decide to adopt CPE powers it would be able to keep the income from any parking tickets issued under the initiative. This income would then have to be used to cover all operational costs including funding parking attendants (called Civil Enforcement Officers) who would replace Police staff for enforcement, and also the management and administration systems associated with collecting fines and pursuing defaulters. The operational costs would be dependent on the areas covered and the times of operation. If the income from any parking charges issued did not cover operational costs, any shortfall would have to be met from other Council resources. It followed that there was a direct relationship between the number of parking tickets issued and the level of parking enforcement that could be resourced.

The Board was advised that, as indicated above, there was no charging regime in place either on street or in the limited number of off street car parks, which were operated by the Council. Therefore the Council had no parking income against which it could offset the cost of a ROPS within a CPE regime. Without wishing to prejudice the outcome of the Council's feasibility study into CPE, its ability to fund a ROPS would be limited.

It was noted that there had been intermittent requests over the years for ROPS to be introduced in individual streets in the Borough, usually triggered by residents being unable to park immediately outside their homes. However, even taking into consideration the town centres and other areas subject to high levels of often transitory demand for parking space, it was clear that the area around Runcorn mainline rail station was one of the most under pressure, with Holloway being the main focus of attention. This was due to the on-street parking by rail users, who wished to avoid paying daily charges at the station's car parks and the practical difficulties facing householders in constructing off

road parking, due to the height of their front gardens relative to the carriageway of Holloway.

The Board was advised that the situation had been much worse over the past few months as construction of a new multi-storey car park at the station required the temporary closure of the main car park. A large proportion of the usual parking demand was displaced onto the surrounding streets and following the opening of the multi-storey car park, drivers were now reluctant to pay for parking. Instead they were continuing to park on surrounding roads, wherever possible, with some leaving cars outside resident's homes for days on end.

Many of Holloway's residents see the introduction of ROPS as a simple solution provided that the restrictions were enforced robustly. However, based on the reported experiences of other local authorities, such schemes had a number of associated problems and impacts, which were set out in the report and it was felt inappropriate to introduce a scheme at the present time.

RESOLVED: That residents only parking schemes should not be introduced at the present time.

#### EXB37 RIGHTS OF WAY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The Board received a report of the Strategic Director, Environment, which sought approval to the adoption of Halton's first Rights of Way Improvement Plan, following a 12 week consultation with other local authorities, user groups and outside agencies.

The Board was advised that Section 60 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 introduced a requirement on all local authorities in England and Wales to prepare a Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP).

ROWIPs were not about rights of way in isolation, they were intended to deliver an integrated network of routes in and between town and country. The areas the Rights of Way Improvement Plan must assess were set out in the report.

It was also noted that the plan must contain a Statement of Actions that the Highway Authority intended to carry out in order to improve its network, with particular regard to issues identified within the assessment. The Rights of Way network was undoubtedly a major means of accessing the countryside and key services, but on its own

did not show the full picture. There were many other routes and sites that were used by the general public for informal countryside access and every day journeys that were not legally recorded as definitive public rights of way. With this in mind, the Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Halton considered the whole network of access routes, public open spaces and sites, as well as definitive rights of way and highways. It also assessed the whole spectrum of users and journey purposes, from disabled needs to routes to open access land.

It was noted that once the ROWIP was published, the Council was required to make a new assessment and review it within 10 years. Thereafter, they would review the plan at not more than 10 year intervals.

The ROWIP was a strategic document and would form a distinct strand of Halton's next Local Transport Plan (LTP), which was being prepared on a joint basis with Merseytravel and the five Merseyside districts. This was Halton's first full 10 year Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

The draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan had been used as the basis for a 12 week consultation with a wide range of users and stakeholders to enable their views to be taken into consideration in the preparation of the final document. The Board was advised that only 14 formal written responses were received, these responses along with discussions with other consultees, were found to be positive, in addition, 17 questionnaires on the ROWIP were also returned. On the whole, the document was well received and strongly supported. Summaries of the results of the questionnaire survey and written responses were set out in the Appendices to the report.

The Board was further advised that the draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan was also considered by the Urban Renewal Policy and Performance Board at its meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> June 2009, when it resolved that the draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan be forwarded to the Executive Board for consideration.

Under the Strategic Environment Assessment Directive and Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, there was requirement to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) on certain plans and programmes, such as the ROWIP. The results of these assessments were set out in the report.



RESOLVED: That the adoption of the Rights of Way Improvement Plan, subject to any minor amendments and the inclusion of photographs that may be required prior to its publication, being delegated to the Strategic Director, Environment, in consultation with the Executive Board Member for Planning, transportation, Regeneration and Renewal be approved.

*(NB: Councillor Nelson declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following item due to being a Chair of Governors of The Grange and left the meeting during consideration of the item).*

EXB38 SECONDARY RE-ORGANISATION - RUNCORN - KEY DECISION

The Board received a report of the Strategic Director, Children and Young People, which provided a response to the statutory consultation to close The Grange Nursery, Infant and Junior School, change the age range of The Grange Comprehensive School and enlarge the school from 1050 to 1445 pupils. An outline of the decision-making process was also included in the report. In addition, it provided a summary of the response to the pre-statutory consultation to expand The Heath Specialist Technology College and provided an outline of the next stage in the procedure.

It was noted that at the Executive Board meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2009 it was agreed that statutory consultation could be undertaken to discontinue The Grange Nursery, Infant and Junior Schools; expand the age range of The Grange Comprehensive and enlarge the school to establish an "All Through School".

The Board was advised that the statutory proposal was published on the 25<sup>th</sup> June 2009. Letters were sent to all parents and provided for staff and governors. These letters contained a copy of the statutory proposals and included a feedback form and contact details. They were also provided the date, time and venue of consultation meetings. In addition, the public meeting was advertised in the local press and posters were displayed at the four schools, plus other secondary schools, Children's Centres, Community Centres, Direct Links and the libraries. The consultation details were also included in the circular which was distributed to all schools and Children's Services settings. A copy of the statutory notice was appended to the report.

It was noted that a Governors meeting was held on the consultation on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2009 and the staff meeting and

public consultation meeting at The Grange Comprehensive School on the 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2009. The staff meeting was well attended and a copy of the presentation used was placed on the website, along with the questions raised. Those people wishing to respond to the consultation were advised to put their views in writing. A total of 20 responses had been received in response to the consultation. The responses had all been from staff, parents and governors. There had been no objections to the proposals. All those who had responded had supported the proposal.

It was further noted that at the same meeting of the Executive Board on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2009 that pre-statutory consultation could be taken on the proposal to expand The Heath Specialist Technology College. The consultation commenced on the proposal on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2009 similar to that of the Grange. The proposed expansion was discussed at the Governors meeting where it was supported. There were a total of three responses received to the consultation, these responses were all in support of the proposal to expand the College.

The Board was advised that the decision-maker (Executive Board) must decide on the proposal within two months of the end of the representation period otherwise the decision must be referred to the Adjudicator for a decision. If referred to the Adjudicator the proposals and any representations must be forwarded to the Adjudicator within one week of the end of the two month representation period along with any representations received and not withdrawn. The report set out what choices the decision-maker could take and it was noted that conditional approval could only be granted in a limited number of circumstances.

It was noted that the statutory consultation be undertaken in Autumn 2009 with the proposal to expand The Heath Specialist Technology College. Following completion of the statutory consultation a further report would be provided to the Executive Board for consideration.

#### **REASON(S) FOR DECISION**

To provide more choice and diversity and retain pupils within the Borough.

#### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

N/A

## **IMPLEMENTATION DATE**

A decision will be required by Executive Board prior to 24th September 2009.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) Proposals having been published in pursuance of the powers set out in sections 15(1) and 19(1) of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 and having had regard to the statutory guidance and to responses to the consultation it is RESOLVED that the following related proposals be approved:-
  - (a) with effect from 31<sup>st</sup> August 2010, The Grange Nursery School, The Grange Infants School and The Grange Junior School be discontinued;
  - (b) with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2010 the age range of The Grange Comprehensive School be changed from 11 -16 years to 3 – 16 years; and
  - (c) with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2010 The Grange Comprehensive School be enlarged from 1050 pupils to 1445 pupils and become known as The Grange School; and
- (2) statutory consultation be undertaken to expand The Heath Specialist Technology College from 1050 (210 per year group) in 2009 to 1200 in 2011 (240 per year group) to 1350 (270) in 2013.

### **EXB39 HEALTH & COMMUNITY CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2008-09 AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2009-10**

The Board received a report of the Strategic Director, Health and Community which informed the Board of the 2008/9 capital programme outturn and the 2009/10 capital programme.

A report was presented to the Board on 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2009 setting out the forecast outturn for the Health and Community capital programme for 2008/9 and the reasons for monies being carried forward to 2009/10, together with a proposed programme of schemes for 2009/10. Due to the delay in announcing the housing grant allocations from the Government Office, the report highlighted that assumptions had been made about the level of resources likely to be

available in 2009/10.

The Board was advised that the allocation for the housing programme had been announced as £2.911m, an increase of £2.289m over the 2008/9 allocation. After several years of declining grant in Halton, this level of funding considerably exceeded what was expected and was due to the introduction of a revised funding distribution formula which more closely reflected the priorities in the recently revised Regional Housing Strategy.

Given that the housing programme had been supported by corporate capital growth in recent years when the housing grant was reducing, and the current pressures on the Council in terms of capital, it was proposed that the approved carry forward of £0.736m be vired to support the corporate capital programme.

It was noted that there would be a requirement for some resources to be set aside to fund Halton's share of ICT and Software costs for the development and introduction of a sub-regional Choice Based Lettings Scheme, but the amount involved would not be clear until much later in the financial year. A provisional sum of £50,000 had therefore been included in the programme.

This still left £1.329m of the new housing allocation unallocated. There were a number of potential calls on this fund, but the main priority was in the Housing and Supporting People Strategies was to secure the development of additional extra care housing schemes for the growing population of older people in the Borough.

The Board was advised that a further priority was the Registered Social Landlord (RSL) Partnership Agreement. This partnership between HBC and the RSLs began in July 2008. In 2008/9 the Council identified £467k to be used to fund, on a 50:50 basis, home adaptations within RSL properties.

In 2009/10 the Council had allocated £450k to the Partnership Agreement. To date £410k had been paid, committed to schemes agreed and it was anticipated that the RSLs could carry out further adaptations to a value £400k requiring additional partnership funding of £200k, from the Council, to be match funded by £200k from the RSL.

The report set out the actual funding available for the Health and Community capital programme for 2009/10 after

the adjustment detailed within the report.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the recommendation in 3.3 of the report be approved; and
- (2) the Board recommend the Council to approve the capital programme for 1009/10, as set out in Appendix 1.

#### EXB40 EXTRA CARE HOUSING - DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS AND RESOURCING

The Board received a report of the Strategic Director, Health and Community which informed the Board of progress to date in delivering new schemes as part of the Extra Care Commissioning Strategy and which sought delegated authority in the use of housing capital resources to support the development of future schemes as necessary.

It noted that in February 2008 "Lifetime Homes, Lifetime Neighbours: A National Strategy for Housing in an Ageing Society" set out the Government's vision for housing within an ageing society, describing a range of housing provision that would be necessary to accommodate future growth, including extra care housing. Nationally, by 2026 older people would account for 48% of the forecast household growth resulting 2.4m extra older person households than currently.

In Halton, the impact over the next ten years was a dramatic rise in the over 60s (27%) and over 75 (19%), This, combined with older people's desire to live independently for longer, meant that Halton had a significant shortfall in current and projected extra care provision.

In comparing Halton with a sample of local authorities in the North West, Halton had a similar number of units in proportion to the older population as Blackpool, but a significantly lower number than Warrington, Blackburn and St. Helens.

There was currently only one 40 unit extra care scheme in the Borough and the Commissioning Strategy for Extra Care – May 2008, produced on behalf of the Council identified an immediate need for 137 additional units of extra care housing and a further 59 units by 2017, a total need of 196 units.

The Board was advised that in recent years Halton had faced some difficulty identifying sites suitable for this type of scheme but as a result, a piece of work recently undertaken. A number of sites had been identified which represented possibility for development, as set out in the report.

Due to this year's unexpectedly large capital settlement, there was currently £1.329m uncommitted in the housing capital programme. This offered an opportunity to directly support the development of extra care housing, and the Board was asked to agree that the bulk of this sum of uncommitted capital be reserved for this purpose, and to acknowledge that due to the long lead in time for such developments, much of the expenditure would not be committed until 2010/11.

RESOLVED: That the Board:

- (1) agrees to reserve the uncommitted capital in the 2009/10 housing programme to support the development of extra care housing by Registered Social Landlords;
- (2) acknowledges that due to the development timescales involved, much of the expenditure would not be committed during 2009/10 and any uncommitted capital be carried forward to 2010/11; and
- (3) grants delegated authority to the Strategic Director, Health and Community, in consultation with the Operational Director, Financial Services and the Executive Board Member for Community, to determine appropriate levels of financial support on a scheme by scheme basis.

#### EXB41 HOMELESSNESS STRATEGY - KEY DECISION

The Board received a report of the Strategic Director, Health and Community which sought the Board's approval to ratify a new Homelessness Strategy for the Borough.

The Board was advised that the Homelessness Act 2002 required each local authority to review the extent and nature of homelessness in their area and to produce a strategy and action plan to prevent and tackle the problem. Halton's first Homelessness Strategy was published in 2003 which included measures to prevent homelessness and to develop and improve services for households who become

homeless.

The new Homelessness Strategy built upon the progress made from the previous Homelessness Strategy and focused more heavily on prevention and early intervention strategies.

The report set out the key findings of the Review and the key recommendations that came from this.

The Board was advised that a formal consultation exercise was carried out in March 2009, to seek views on the draft documents referred to above. The Council received six formal responses of which three were from external sources, one from an Elected Member and two from internal officers.

However, it should also be noted that the blue print for developing the draft Homelessness Strategy was presented to the Borough's Homelessness Forum. The Homelessness Forum also had the opportunity to consider and comment on the findings and draft strategy on several occasions ahead of the wider consultation exercise.

The Board was advised that a key component that the respondents were supportive of was the preventative emphasis in the new strategy, its general strategic direction and the objectives and recommendations. The Review and Strategy was presented to the Urban Renewal Policy and Performance Board on the 17<sup>th</sup> June 2009 and endorsed its content.

It was noted that the draft Documents had now been revised taking into account all the appropriate comments. Where possible the recommendations had been rationalised in order to clarify and prioritise strategic thinking to aid delivery of resulting actions.

#### **REASON(S) FOR DECISION**

To adopt a new fit for purpose Homelessness Strategy for the Borough covering the next five years.

#### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

The Action Plan prioritises a number of developmental activities. The actions highlighted are considered to be the ones which would optimise the potential to improve outcomes for homeless households and those at risk of homelessness.

## **IMPLEMENTATION DATE**

With immediate effect.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Board agrees the adoption of the new Strategy.

### **EXB42 SCHEDULE 12A OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AND THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

The Board considered:

- (1) whether Members of the press and public should be excluded from the meeting of the Board during consideration of the following item of business in accordance with Sub-Section 4 of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 because it was likely that, in view of the nature of the business to be considered, exempt information would be disclosed, being information defined in Section 100 (1) and paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972; and
- (2) whether the disclosure of information was in the public interest, whether any relevant exemptions were applicable and whether, when applying the public interest test and exemptions, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed that in disclosing the information.

RESOLVED: That as, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, members of the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business in accordance with Sub-Section 4 of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 because it is likely that, in view of the nature of the business, exempt information will be disclosed, being information defined in Section 100 (1) and paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

### **EXB43 ACCOMMODATION**

The Board received a report of the Strategic Director, Corporate and Policy which sought approval to a number of accommodation proposals aimed at ensuring that Catalyst House is vacated by 1 April 2011, to facilitate the construction of the Mersey Gateway.



RESOLVED: That

- (1) the approach outlined in this report to vacate Catalyst House by 1 April 2011 be approved; and
- (2) the Council's approval be sought to vary the Capital Programme to allow the prudential borrowing of £3m to fund the commencement of the refurbishment of the Municipal Buildings.

MINUTES ISSUED: 6<sup>th</sup> October 2009

CALL IN: 13<sup>th</sup> October 2009

Any matter decided by the Executive Board may be called in no later than 13<sup>th</sup> October 2009.

*Meeting ended at 2.50 p.m.*