

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **Extract of Executive Board, Executive Board Sub Committee and Executive (Transmodal Implementation) Sub Board Minutes Relevant to the Urban Renewal Policy and Performance Board**

#### **EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING HELD ON 6 MARCH 2008**

##### **EXB101 Housing Growth Points**

The Board considered a report of the Strategic Director – Environment advising of progress made in respect of the Council's Expression of Interest for Halton for Growth Point Status since the previous report of 13<sup>th</sup> December 2007.

It was noted that, following publication of proposals to extend the Government's Growth Points and Eco Towns Programme to cover the north of England in the Housing Green Paper (July 2007), the Council was invited to submit an Expression of Interest (Eol) to Government Office by 31<sup>st</sup> October. The Merseyside Policy Unit (MPU) co-ordinated submission of a joint Eol on behalf of Halton and the other Merseyside authorities, divided into two potential growth areas centred on Liverpool and Wirral Waterfronts, and Halton and St. Helens.

Following post submission advice from Government Office North West (GONW), agreement had been reached with Warrington to co-ordinate its proposals with those from Halton/St. Helens under the "Mid Mersey" banner.

It was advised that the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) had subsequently requested significant post submission reassurances and information, principally in respect of flood risk, transport, affordable housing and governance. Significant joint working had therefore been undertaken involving colleagues from St. Helens, Warrington, GONW, the Environment Agency, the Highways Agency, Mersey Travel and United Utilities to furnish the additional material requested.

Members noted that Halton's Eol was dependent upon bringing forward sites within the Runcorn and Weston Docklands Regeneration Area (Halton UDP). The landowner, Peel Holdings was intent on bringing this site forward as a matter of urgency and had indicated that they wished to work in partnership with the Council to produce a Masterplan to be incorporated into Planning Policy as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in a manner

similar to the joint working with English Partnerships on Sandymoor.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the actions taken following the submission of the Growth Point Expression of interest be ratified;
- (2) officers be authorised to work with the Council's partners in the Mid-Mersey area and, where appropriate, private landowners to further work on the successful delivery of the Growth Point agenda;
- (3) it be approved that Halton offer to act as "Lead Authority" for the Mid-Mersey Growth Point; and
- (4) the intention to work with Peel Holdings to produce a Masterplan and Supplementary Planning Document to inform the development of the Runcorn Docklands site, in advance of the previously proposed date of 2010 for production of this SPD as contained in the 2007 Local Development Scheme, be noted.

#### **EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING HELD ON 20 MARCH 2008**

##### **EXB114 Widnes Regeneration Ltd and the Venture Fields Commercial Leisure Development - "The Hive"**

The Board considered a report of the Chief Executive providing an update on progress made on the Venture Fields Leisure Development ("The Hive").

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the utilisation of £550,000 of Halton Borough Council retained dividend in the Widnes Regeneration Limited Company to support the costs of developing The Hive at Venture Fields be endorsed; and
- (2) the other elements of the funding package for The Hive Venture Fields Development as described in the report be noted and endorsed.

#### **EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING HELD ON 10 APRIL 2008**

##### **EXB125 Mersey Gateway: Overarching Report on the Statutory Process - KEY DECISION**

The Board considered a report of the Strategic Director – Environment relating to the applications and orders required to be promoted in order to secure powers to promote the Mersey Gateway Project (the “Project”), and seeking authority for a number of important matters relating to the Project outlined within the report.

It was noted that the provision of a second crossing of the River Mersey had been a long-held aspiration of the Council. The traffic bottleneck caused by the Silver Jubilee Bridge (SJB) had long been acknowledged as a social and economic constraint. Halton Borough Council had therefore begun to advance proposals and work had been undertaken by and on behalf of the Council between 2000 and 2003 focused on comparing potential alternatives to address problems associated with congestion in Halton. Through this process, certain regional and local objectives had been identified and these were set out in the report for information.

For any scheme to be successful, the Council required it to fulfil as many of the outlined objectives as possible to fit its environment and to be economically viable. Throughout the process a range of alternatives had been considered and those alternatives that satisfied the objectives, fitted their environment and were economically viable had then been considered further until a preferred solution had been identified.

A number of strategic alternatives with the potential to solve congestion problems in Halton and achieve the Council’s objectives been considered throughout the development of the project. These included making better use of existing infrastructure and options for increasing transport capacity. The main topics of investigation were outlined for Members.

Following a thorough assessment of each strategic alternative, it was concluded that a fixed crossing to the east of the SJB represented the only realistic option of delivering improvements in congestion and achieving the identified scheme objectives.

A series of alternative fixed routes had then been considered to the east of the SJB, all of which avoided the more environmentally sensitive lower reaches of the estuary. This concluded that an option known as Route 3A lay naturally on the design line for through traffic and was economic in connecting effectively with the Expressway Network to the north and south of the river.

The discussions with the Department of Transport, leading up to Programme Entry confirmation being granted in 2006, covered options from the Project. It was confirmed that Mersey Gateway

should be delivered as a toll road and a road user charger machine would also extend to the existing SJB in order to deliver the programme benefits within the limited funding agreed with Government. In developing the project, and as an expression of its ongoing corporate support for the project, Halton Borough Council had identified revised strategic objectives for the Mersey Gateway Project, which were outlined for the Board's consideration. It could be seen from this that the Project would provide substantial transportation, environmental and regeneration benefits. Where the environmental statements submitted with the planning applications for certain parts of the projects revealed some adverse affects, these were few and – balanced against the benefits of the Project – were much more than outweighed by its positive aspects.

In light of this, a compelling case existed, in the public interest, for the promotion and delivery of the Project, including the acquisition of necessary land.

The consultation process undertaken so far was outlined for the Board's consideration and it was advised that, in response to the aspirations of the Borough Council, the needs of the Highway and Transportation Network, and as a product of the consultation outlined, it had been possible to advance to a stage where a design for the Project could be identified. This then had certain additional characteristics in terms of other, ancillary aspects that were described in further detail within the report covering:

- route description;
- Area A – main toll plaza;
- Area B – Ditton Junction to freightline;
- Area C – freightline to St. Helens Canal;
- Area D – Mersey Gateway Bridge;
- Area E – Astmoor Viaduct;
- Area F – Bridgewater Junction;
- Area G – Central Expressway, Lodge Lane Junction and Weston Link Junction;
- Area H – M56 Junction 12; and
- Area I – Silver Jubilee Bridge and Widnes de-

linking.

It could be seen that the works comprised in the Project were both extensive and complex and, in addition to authority to carry out these works, the Project comprised certain other elements that were not works; these also required statutory authority.

It was anticipated that the Project would be procured as a Design Build Finance and Operate (DBFO) scheme. This meant that an organisation, known as a concessionaire, would be responsible for the detailed design and construction of the scheme. The concessionaire would also have to obtain finance that allowed it to construct, operate and maintain the scheme for a defined period. They would repay the finance that they had raised over the period of the contract that they had agreed to, known as the concession period. For schemes of this nature the concession period was typically 30 – 40 years. Although the Department for Transport (DfT) was contributing funding for the project, the scheme would be funded mainly through the Private Finance Initiative (PFI), which meant that the concessionaire would have to raise the money through private finance methods, such as a loan from a bank supported by PFI credit payments from the DfT.

The finance for the Project would rely on revenue recovered from users of the project through tolling and road user charging. To ensure robust revenue forecast and to ensure that the project would ease local congestion, it was proposed that tolls/charges be levied for use of both the new bridge and the SJB. The tolling/charging regimes would also provide a mechanism to manage demand so that freeflow traffic conditions were maintained on the new bridge. This was intended to achieve demonstrable service reliability and standards.

In order to obtain authority to carry out these works and to secure the additional powers described, the applications described within the report were needed and could be divided into two broad categories:

- Main works – these were shown on the plan at Appendix 1 to the report edged in blue; and
- Remote works, including SJB – these were shown on the plan at Appendix 1 edged in red.

Further information about statutory authority in relation to these works, and how it was to be sought, was outlined within the

report.

### Reason for Decision

The recommended decisions were required to support the delivery of Mersey Gateway.

### Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Alternative options for securing the powers to construct, maintain and operate, including tolling, the Mersey Gateway Project had been assessed and rejected.

### Implementation Date

The recommended decisions were required before the next phase of the statutory process took place in May 2008.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the contents of the report be noted;
- (2) full Council be recommended that, in accordance with the terms of Section 239 of the Local Government Act 1972, it should resolve to promote an order under the provisions of Section 3 of the Transport and Works Act 1992 authorising the construction of works that interfere with navigation and certain other matters explained elsewhere within the report;
- (3) consultation be commenced in relation to a Road User Charging Order under the provisions of Part 3 of the Transport Act 2000, imposing charges on motorists for the use of the Silver Jubilee Bridge; and
- (4) the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader, be authorised to take such steps as are necessary and appropriate to give effect to the above.

### **EXB126 Mersey Gateway: The Compulsory Purchase Order and Side Roads Order - KEY DECISION**

The Board considered a report of the Strategic Director – Environment seeking authority to make Compulsory Purchase Orders (“CPOs”) to acquire all necessary interests in and rights over land in Widnes and land in Runcorn, and to enable the works described in the previous report before this meeting to be carried out, operated and maintained and to make Side Road Orders

("SROs") in order to facilitate the Mersey Gateway Project.

It was noted that considerable progress had been made in respect of the preparation of the CPO. This included the appointment of Land Referencing Agents (Persona Associates) who were carrying out title investigations and site enquiries and who had prepared notices for service under Section 16 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 to requisition ownership information from all parties likely to be affected by the Mersey Gateway Project; and the appointment of specialist agents (G.V.A. Grimley) to use the land ownership information to progress negotiations with affected parties.

Whilst negotiations would continue, given the number of interests involved, it was not considered possible to acquire all interest in land required for the Project on acceptable terms within a satisfactory timescale. This meant that the only practical way of ensuring that all necessary land and rights were brought into the Council's ownership with clean title, and the necessary works could be carried out to enable the Mersey Gateway Project to proceed, was by progressing the CPOs and SROs.

It was proposed to make two CPOs – one for the land and rights required in Widnes and one for the land and rights required in Runcorn – under the Highways Act 1980. It was also proposed to make SROs under the Highways Act 1980.

It was noted that the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister Circular 06/2004 stated that "a Compulsory Purchase Order should only be made where there is a compelling case in the public interest". The benefits of the Mersey Gateway Project and the case for the CPOs had been set out in the previous report and it was considered that the CPOs and associated SROs were considered to be in the public interest.

Implications in terms of the Human Rights Act 1998 were outlined for the Board's consideration. In addition, information in respect of the consultation procedure carried out to date was provided. It was anticipated that the making of the CPOs would encourage affected parties to enter into, and actively progress, negotiations to agree terms for compensation and/or relocation.

#### Reason for Decision

The recommended decisions were required to support the delivery of Mersey Gateway.

## Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Alternative options for securing the powers to construct, maintain and operate Mersey Gateway had been assessed and rejected.

## Implementation Date

The recommended decisions were required before the next phase of the statutory process took place in May 2008.

RESOLVED: That:

- i) authority be given for the Council to make CPOs under the powers conferred by Sections 239, 240, 246, 249, and 250 of the Highways Act 1980 (summarised in the table in Appendix 1) to acquire the interests in and rights over land shown on the plans available at the meeting. Similarly, land acquired by agreement should be included in such CPOs for the purpose of overriding covenants and other third party rights in accordance with s260 Highways Act 1980;
- ii) authority be given for the Council to make SROs under section 14 of the Highways Act 1980 in order to stop up or divert or otherwise alter or improve highways which cross, enter or are otherwise affected by the classified roads to be constructed or improved as part of the Mersey Gateway Project and to provide new highways and/or new means of access to premises as required;
- iii) the Chief Executive be authorised to settle the areas subject to the CPOs in accordance with the plans available at the meeting and confirm the roads to be subject to the SROs and also to settle any documentation required for the CPOs and the SROs including the Statement of Reasons for the CPOs which should be based upon the terms of this report and the overarching report before this meeting;
- iv) the Operational Director and Monitoring Officer (Legal, Organisational Development and Human Resources) be authorised to make the CPOs and the SROs and to take all necessary procedural steps prior to and after the making of the CPOs and SROs, including the submission of the CPOs and SROs to the Secretary of State for confirmation, together with the preparation and presentation of the Council's case at any public inquiry;



- v) the Operational Director and Monitoring Officer (Legal, Organisational Development and Human Resources) be authorised to sign and serve any notices or documents necessary to give effect to these recommendations and to take all other actions necessary to give effect to these recommendations; and
- vi) the Operational Director and Monitoring Officer (Legal, Organisational Development and Human Resources) be authorised as soon as the CPOs and SROs are confirmed by the Secretary of State to advertise their confirmation, to serve and publish all necessary notices of confirmation and, once the CPOs become operative, to take all necessary procedural steps to acquire the interests in and new rights over land included in the confirmed CPOs including the service of Notices to Treat under Section 5 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, Notices of Entry under Section 11 of the CPA 1965 and the execution of General Vesting Declarations under the Compulsory Purchase (Vesting Declarations) Act 1981.

### **EXB127 Mersey Gateway: Appropriation - KEY DECISION**

The Board considered a report of the Strategic Director – Environment seeking authority for the appropriation for planning purposes for the Mersey Gateway Development of areas of Council-owned land at St. Michael’s Jubilee Golf Course and west of the Central Expressway (shown on plans at Appendix 1 to the report) as provided for by Section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972 in order to facilitate the Mersey Gateway Project.

It was noted that some of the land required for the Mersey Gateway Project was already owned by the Council. In particular, the Council owned two areas of land which were currently used for informal recreation by the public. One of these areas was at St. Michael’s Jubilee Golf Course which was currently disused as a golf course whilst remediation of underlying contaminated land was undertaken. The second area was an area of land west of the central expressway and south of the Bridgewater Canal which, being near to residential properties, was used for informal recreation by local residents. Both these areas were defined as Open Space.

The appropriation of the land for planning purposes from Open Space purposes as proposed by the report was appropriate in view of the Council’s commitment to the Mersey Gateway Project as the areas in question were required for it. It would also ensure that any existing rights or restrictions over the land, which could prevent the Mersey Gateway Project from proceeding, could be overridden

and would obviate the need for special Parliamentary procedures to be followed to obtain the necessary orders for the project.

If the land on St. Michael's Jubilee Golf Course was appropriated, it would still be possible for the Golf Course to be re-opened at a future date, notwithstanding the loss of part of it for the purposes of the Mersey Gateway Project. Similarly, sufficient open space would be left adjacent to the Central Expressway to allow the informal recreational use there to continue.

Further information regarding appropriation and implications was outlined within the report for the Board's consideration. It was advised that, on 13<sup>th</sup> March and 20<sup>th</sup> March 2008, notice had been published of the Council's intention to appropriate land at St. Michael's Jubilee Golf Course and land west of the Central Expressway for the purposes of the Mersey Gateway Development, inviting representations. The period allowed for representations had expired on 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2008 and none had been received in respect of this matter whatsoever.

#### Reasons for Decision

The appropriation of land proposals were required to support the making of the Mersey Gateway CPO Order.

#### Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

The proposed appropriation was intended to reduce the risks in delivering the Mersey Gateway Project against the "do nothing" option.

#### Implementation Date

If approved, with immediate effect.

RESOLVED: That the appropriation be approved with immediate effect of the Council owned land shown on the plans attached to the report for planning purposes pursuant to Section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972.

### **EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING HELD ON 19 MAY 2008**

**EXB3 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 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 Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

#### **EXB4 Upton Rocks Local Centre**

The Board considered a report of the Strategic Director – Corporate and Policy outlining the current status of this potential development and seeking the Board’s view on the way forward.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the initial offer from Peel Holdings be rejected; and
- (2) if any revised offer does not reflect the District Valuer’s valuation, the site be remarketed.

#### **EXECUTIVE BOARD SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 20 MARCH 2008**

#### **EXB87 Supported Local Bus Service Contracts**

The Sub-Committee was advised that 11 local supported bus service contracts were due for renewal in March 2008. A re-tendering exercise to replace these services was initiated in December 2007. All contracts were advertised using an open tendering system. The existing cost of the contracts up for renewal was £151,645 which equated to 23% of the supported local bus service budget in 2007/8. All the new contracts were due to commence on Thursday 27<sup>th</sup> March 2008.

Under Procurement Standing Order 3.2 the Sub-Committee was advised of the reasons why tenders other than the lowest had been accepted for 7 of these contracts. Four contracts were successfully tendered to the lowest price tender. Details of these contracts and the reasons why these could not be awarded to the lowest tenderer were set out in the report.

RESOLVED: That the Sub-Committee

(1) note the tender report and its conclusions; and

(2) note the decision by the Operational Director (Highways, Transportation and Logistics) to award contracts 200, 281, 282, 292, 290, 251 and 211 to non- lowest price tenderers most able to commence the contracts to the required specification.

**EXB88 Contract for Silver Jubilee Bridge, Runcorn Spandrel (Y5 to L4) - Preparation and Repainting of Steelwork**

The Sub-Committee was advised of the intention to invite tenders for the Silver Jubilee Bridge, Runcorn Spandrel (Y5 to L4) – Preparation and Repainting of Steelwork Contract, the estimated cost of which was £1.4m. In accordance with Procurement Standing Order 2.5, tenders would be invited from the following contractors who had been drawn from the Constructionline database of approved contractors:

Pyeroy Limited

Roy Hankinson Limited

T.I. Protective Coatings

Jack Tighe Ltd.

Tenders were expected to be returned in mid March 2008 with

work commencing on site in June 2008. Award would be assessed on the basis of quality, method of execution and price in accordance with the criteria set out in the instructions for tendering.

RESOLVED: That the Operational Director Highways, Transportation and Logistics be authorised to invite tenders for the Silver Jubilee Bridge, Runcorn Spandrel (Y5 to L4) – Preparation and Repainting of Steelwork Contract, as outlined above, in accordance with Procurement Standing Order 2.5.

### **EXB89 Review of Fees and Charges**

The Sub-Committee considered a report setting out the proposed increase in charges for services relating to Planning, Transportation and Development, Environment and Regulatory areas. A number of areas had been identified where income was not being maximised. As a result, some new charges had been added and were highlighted in the schedule.

RESOLVED: That the proposed fees and charges be agreed and referred to the relevant Policy and Performance Boards for information.

### **EXB90 Procurement of Bridge Maintenance Works**

Prior to 1998 Local Government Review there had been significant underfunding of the maintenance of the Silver Jubilee Bridge and its adjacent structures. As a result, the Council recognised that there was a need to address this neglect as a matter of priority. This culminated in the preparation of 10 year maintenance strategy document, which identified, costed and programmed the structural maintenance activity necessary to bring the condition of the structures to a steady state of maintenance.

Prior to the introduction of the second Local Transport Plan (LTP2), the maintenance strategy for the complex was used to underpin and provide defensible reasoning for the annual bids made through LTP for Major Maintenance and Strengthening Schemes. This identified a total of £25.6m of work (at a 2003 cost base).

During compilation of LTP2, the Council received guidance that the new LTP rules meant that implementation of a 10 year programme of maintenance activity as a strategy would have to be through the Major Scheme Appraisal process. This was a highly procedural process for major transportation initiatives costing greater

than £5m requiring consideration of many issues such as environmental impact, safety, economic benefit, accessibility and integration.

Consequently, the Council engaged consultants Mott MacDonald to prepare a formal Major Scheme Bid for delivery of the 10 year maintenance strategy for the Silver Jubilee Bridge Complex. The final draft was submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT) on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2006.

The preferred option was for a 10 year funding programme delivered by partnership. It was noted that although the level of work identified remained at £25.6m in the Strategy document, by the time it had gone through the economic processes of the Bid (including application of Optimism Bias) the figure had increased to £38.5m.

Although DfT approval of the Major Scheme Bid was yet to be granted, one of the areas of the submission identified as being in need of development included proposals for project procurement. A report was therefore being prepared by Mott Macdonald to investigate the procurement options available for delivering an extended programme of bridge maintenance and to ascertain the option likely to yield the most effective outcomes. The recommended option would involve engagement of a single partnering contractor using a construction framework form of contract based upon the NEC (ECC) Suite of Contracts. This arrangement was viewed to be advantageous in terms of overall flexibility, quality and value for money through continuity of service.

In December 2007, DfT informed the Council that its £14.3m bid for funding through the Primary Route Network (PRN) bridge maintenance had been successful. It was therefore intended to initiate procedures to prepare contract documentation and invite tenders for delivery of major bridge maintenance works through the engagement of a single partnering contractor using a construction framework form of contract.

The term of the contract would be for an initial four-year period plus potential two-year extension with an estimate value range of between £12m and £18m depending on the future success of the Major Scheme Bid. Any decision regarding the potential two-year extension would be at the sole discretion of the Council. It was expected that shortlisted contractors would be invited to tender in May/June 2008 and that the successful contractor would be able to start work on site in late 2008.

RESOLVED: That

(1) authority be given to the Operational Director Highways Transportation and Logistics, in consultation with the portfolio holder Planning, Transportation, Regeneration and Renewal, to invite tenders for delivery of major bridge maintenance works through the engagement of a single partnering contractor using a construction framework form of contract; and

(2) the potential two year extension of the contract, which was dependent on the success of the Major Scheme Bid, be subject to a further report to the Sub Committee.

## **EXECUTIVE BOARD SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 8 MAY 2008**

### **EXB106 PROCUREMENT OF GOODS AND SERVICES BY THE BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS**

The Sub Committee was advised that on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2007 businesses on Astmoor and Halebank Industrial Estates voted in favour of creating a Business Improvement District (BID). The “yes” vote meant that the BID business plans for each estate and all additional services must be delivered from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2008 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013. In accordance with the BID business plans (previously approved by the Executive Board on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2007 and Businesses in the BID ballots) the Council would undertake the role of BID Body for the initial 5-year period of the BIDs.

Over the course of the five years, respective BIDs would require the procurement of additional goods and services. At the start of each financial year from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2008 until 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013 all businesses and property owners in the BID areas would be charged a BID levy, a local increase on the Business Rates bill ring-fenced to fund additional services within the BID area. The contribution from the private sector towards the Astmoor BID would be £746,635 and from the Halebank BID £232,200. This amounted to a total private sector contribution of £978,835. This represented a significant contribution towards the economic regeneration of the borough that would not only benefit resident businesses and the two estates, but would also help to retain jobs and attract investment.

The report set out the governance arrangements for the BIDs Steering Groups and BID Executive Committees.

Over the course of the five years, the respective BIDs would require the procurement of additional goods and services. The Sub-Committee considered a request to waive Procurement Standing Orders for the duration of the respective BIDs with regard to the purchase of goods and services by the Astmoor and Halebank Business Improvement Districts (BIDs). The request for waiver of Procurement Standing Orders was required as individual businesses and property owners would want to influence and decide how the BID money was spent as it was essentially their money. The businesses may, however, want to use the principles of most economically advantageous and value for money, which may not necessarily be the lowest tender or quotation received.

RESOLVED: That for the purposes of Procurement Standing Order (SO) 1.6 and in the light of the devolved decision-making arrangements for the BID areas the Executive Committees for the Astmoor and Halebank BID areas be authorised to award contracts on the basis of the most economically advantageous tender or quotation (not necessarily the lowest) and that SOs 2.2 – 2.6 and SO 2.11 (a)(iii) and SO 2.11 (b)(iv) and SOs 2.12 and 2.13 and SOs 3.6 and 3.7 be waived accordingly.

### **EXB109 Appointment of Urban Vision Partnership Ltd to deal with planning and associated applications made in respect of the Mersey Gateway**

The Sub-Committee was advised that in order to overcome previously identified capacity issues, budget provision had been made to appoint, temporarily, an officer to deal with the applications in connection with the Mersey Gateway Scheme.

Although traditional recruitment processes were followed, no appointment was made due to a lack of suitable candidates. Furthermore, it was recognised that the appointment of an officer, with the required level of experience would not be possible by the time the Transport & Works Act application (the principal application for the Gateway) was submitted to the planning authority for consideration.

Due to the extremely tight timescales and urgent need to have an experienced officer available and in place to process these applications, a decision to recruit a temporary consultant from Urban Vision Partnerships was made. Prior to appointing Urban Vision several other agencies were contacted to ascertain whether it would be possible to recruit via a tender process. In practice not all agencies could provide an officer with the level of experience



required, nor could they do so at a competitive rate.

A fixed fee of £16,000 had been agreed with Urban Vision Partnership Limited which represented very good value for money. It was still hoped that the appointment of an appropriately skilled officer could be made later in the year, to assist with the next stage of the application/inquiry process.

RESOLVED: That the actions taken by the Strategic Director – Environment, to appoint Urban Vision Partnership Limited be approved.

#### **EXECUTIVE BOARD SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 10 APRIL 2008**

#### **EXB110 Award of contract for Silver Jubilee Bridge, Runcorn Spandrel (Y5 to L4) - Preparation and Repainting of Steelwork**

The Sub-Committee was advised of four tenders received for the award of the Silver Jubilee Bridge, Runcorn Spandrel (Y5 to L4) – preparation and repainting of steelwork contract.

The lowest tender was submitted by Roy Hankinson Limited for the sum of £1,066,221.35. Following a detailed review of the returned tenders and the satisfactory completion of a pre-contract meeting the contract had been let to Roy Hankinson Limited.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted