Executive

Excerpt of the Minutes of the meeting held remotely on Tuesday 17 November 2020 at 6.00pm, which was broadcast live via the Council's YouTube Channel.

Present: Councillors Day (Leader), Cooke, Falp, Grainger, Hales, Matecki and Rhead.

Also Present: Councillors: Boad (Liberal Democrat Group Observer), A Dearing (Green Group Observer), Mangat (Labour Group Observer), Milton (Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee) and Nicholls (Chair of Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee).

Part 1
(Items upon which a decision by the Council was required)

49. **Fees and Charges**

The Executive considered a report from Finance detailing the proposals for discretionary Fees and Charges, in respect of the 2021 calendar year. It also showed the latest Fees and Charges 2020/21 income budgets, initial budgets for 2021/22 and the actual out-turn for 2019/20.

The Council was required to update its Fees and Charges in order that the impact of any changes could be fed into the setting of the budget for 2021/22. Discretionary Fees and Charges for the forthcoming calendar year needed to be approved by Council.

In the financial climate, and with the impact of COVID-19, it was important that the Council carefully monitored its income, eliminated deficits on service specific provisions where possible, and minimised the forecast future General Fund revenue deficit.

Budget Managers were tasked with seeking to achieve additional income of 15%. However, for some Fees and Charges, legislation and other factors made it unviable to achieve this, and so these had been set in accordance with such legislation, and service knowledge provided by the managers. This was intended to make a contribution towards the savings that the Council needed to make in its overall budget over future years, with the timeline for making significant savings being significantly reduced due to the impact of Covid-19

As a result of this, the Fees and Charges, outlined in Appendix A to the report, presented an overall forecast increase in income of 9% (£647,000).

The Regulatory Manager had to ensure that licensing fees reflected the current legislation. The fees charged needed to reflect the amount of officer time and associated costs needed to administer them.

New cremation fees were proposed to meet potential new or differing customer requirements.

Land Charges and Building Control fees were ring fenced accounts. Income levels for Land Charges had reduced, due to the transfer of the LLC1 fee to the Land Registry Service. There had been a corresponding fall in staffing costs and payments to Warwickshire County Council to reflect this. Income and expenditure was carefully monitored to avoid creating a large surplus (or deficit) on the Land Charges Control Account, which needed to break even. Building Control was subject to competition from the private sector and had to set charges that were competitive within this market.

Management of the Council's Leisure Centres was by Everyone Active. The contract definition stated that 'The Contractor shall review the (following) core products and prices each year and submit any proposed changes to the Authority for approval (the "Fees and Charges Report")'. Everyone Active were expected to request an increase on some of these prices, in line with the Retail Prices Index (RPI). Previously, when the leisure centres were operated by the Council, most years the charges were increased by around RPI. It was recommended that, provided the changes proposed by Everyone Active to the core products and prices were within the September RPI, that the Heads of Culture and Finance, in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holders, could accept the changes. In reviewing the proposed increases, officers would consider previous years increases to avoid automatic year on year increases in prices.

Linear car parking charges were to be removed, to be replaced with charges covering specified stay durations. Sunday charges were also to be in place at all car parks from 4 January 2021, and parking for electric vehicles would be free.

New fees were included to reflect the increase in products and services offered as part of the Lifeline service.

The revenue effects of the proposed fees and charges were summarised in the following table (ring fenced accounts had been removed).

General Fund Services	**Actual 2019/20 £**	**Original Budget 2020/21 £**	**Forecast 2020/21 £**	**Forecast 2021/22 £**	**Change 2020/21 Original to 2021/22 %**
Chief Executive's Office	62,726	45,000	30,000	47,300	5.11%
Culture	237,511	209,600	39,600	229,400	9.45%
Development	1,338,974	1,337,700	1,071,900	1,364,000	1.97%
Health & C.P.	2,000	6,800	6,800	7,400	8.82%
Housing	0	84,800	0	0	
Neighbourhood	5,005,386	5,503,900	4,436,500	6,186,700	12.41%
Total General Fund Services	**6,646,597**	**7,187,800**	**5,584,800**	**7,834,800**	**9.00%**
Housing Revenue Account	**413,491**	**443,700**	**430,000**	**445,000**	**0.29%**

Increased income from fees and charges sought to generate income to cover the costs of the provision of respective services. Any increases would reduce the ongoing savings target within the Financial Strategy.

The forecasts for 2020/21 and 2021/22 would be reviewed within both the Base Budget Report in December 2020, and the Budget Setting Report in February 2021. Managers would also continue to review their projections on a monthly basis.

In terms of alternative options, the various options affecting individual charges were outlined in sections 8 to 16 of the report.

Fees and Charges for 2021/22 could remain at the same level as for 2020/21, which would increase the savings to be found over the following five years, unless additional activity could be generated to offset this. This was not a realistic option, given the position of the Financial Strategy, and the level of savings required.

An addendum circulated prior to the meeting advised Members *both new and renewal applications will no longer receive the concession for reduced fees for HMO licensing for landlords with multiple dwellings.*

The addendum also advised Members of an update to Appendix A to the report, where the proposed increase in the price of a season ticket at Linen Street Car Park, which was set out on page 65, was included in error and should have read:

Linen Street Multi Storey (100 spaces)	Charge from 2/4/20	Proposed Charge from 4/1/21
- Per Annum	£521.50	£521.50
- Per Month	£62.00	£62.00

The Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report.

Councillor Hales thanked the Finance and Audit Committee and the Programme Advisory Board for their advice. He then proposed the report as laid out and subject to the addendum as circulated and detailed above.

Recommended to Council that

(1) the Fees and Charges proposals, as set out in Appendix A to the minutes, to operate from 4 January 2021, be agreed; and

(2) provided the changes proposed by Everyone Active to the core products and prices from January 2021 are within the September RPI, the Heads of Culture and Finance, in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holders, be authorised to accept these charges.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Hales)
Forward Plan Reference 1,138

50. Sherbourne Resource Park – Proposal to become a Partner Council

The Executive considered a report from the Deputy Chief Executive (BH) and Neighbourhood Services proposing that the Council invest in the opportunities presented by the development of a regional Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) and formally join the following local authorities as a Partner Council in the project:

- Coventry City Council (CCC)
- Stratford District Council (SDC)
- Rugby Borough Council (RBC)
- Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council (NBBC)
- North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC)
- Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC)
- Walsall Council (WC)

Warwick District Council (WDC) was collecting approximately 10,000 tonnes of dry mixed recyclate (DMR) materials under its waste collection contract. This was sorted, processed and taken to market by its contractor, with their costs and with a risk premium, reflecting the risk of fluctuations in the value of the processed materials, reflected in the contract price. Under the proposals in the report, the Council would in future send all of its DMR to the MRF.

Evidence from recent procurement exercises in Coventry and in neighbouring Warwickshire authorities had demonstrated an upward trend in the contract costs associated with material recycling. Within the current group of Partner Councils, the gate fees for disposal of recyclates were above £65p/t and these costs, plus the additional haulage costs of transporting waste to recycling facilities, were reflected back in contract prices. Market intelligence indicated that further substantial rises were likely as the private sector continued to move the risk of reducing end market prices, and the likelihood of future additional costs arising from new legislation on recycling to local authorities. It was anticipated that the removal of risk from, and the reduction of cost for the contractor, resulting from the use of the MRF, would reduce the future costs of the proposed new waste collection contract, which was the subject of a separate report considered by the Executive on the 17 November 2020 at Minute Number 56 (Waste Contract Renewal – Update Report).

In 2017/18 an initial feasibility study was undertaken, led by Coventry City Council (CCC), to consider the technical and economic viability of developing a MRF to serve CCC, neighbouring local authorities and commercial businesses across the region. This study indicated a positive business case, subject to more detailed information. That business case had subsequently been developed further and concluded that a MRF with a capacity of processing between 120,000 and 175,000 k/tonnes per annum, with c90,000 k/t, rising to c120,000 k/t from local authorities, would be commercially viable. This base case was prepared on conservative assumptions and sensitivities had been run through the financial modelling, to measure the economic and commercial considerations of additional Partner Councils and third party commercial dry mixed recyclate, and the benefit to each Partner Council.

In order to make the construction of the MRF financially viable and allow both risk and reward to be shared across the local government sector, a formal agreement (the Joint Working Agreement) was put in place between CCC, NBBC, NWBC, RBC, SMBC and WC, who would become Partner Councils in the project, based on the principle of joint decision making, with any formal voting decision weighted on each partner's proportionate stake in the project. Each Partner Council would become a shareholder in a wholly owned arms-length company that would construct and operate the MRF, with their stake based on the principle of proportionality, represented as a percentage stakeholding equivalent to their proportion of the total tonnage of DMR to be provided to the MRF by all the partners. SDC were subsequently offered the opportunity to become a Partner Council, and chose to do so in October 2019.

WDC were offered the same opportunity to join the project as a full Partner Council but chose to join at an advanced stage. A planning application was submitted for the MRF on a site allocated for such a facility within the CCC Local Plan, adjacent to the existing Waste to Energy Plant at Bar Road, Coventry, and was due to be considered by the CCC Planning Committee in November 2020. An OJEU compliant procurement exercise was undertaken by CCC (the Procuring Authority) on behalf of the other Partner Councils, as provided by the Joint Working Agreement. To minimise risk, separate packages were procured for a Design and Build civil engineering contract and the fit-out contract, and was subject to a competitive dialogue phase of negotiations prior to final bid submissions being made. The securing of planning consent and the final tender submission prices would allow the project to be brought to 'financial close' on 1 March 2021.

The existing partners made it clear to WDC that a formal decision on whether the Council wished to join the project was required by the end of November 2020, so that the necessary arrangements could be made without compromising the indicative timetable of works. The timetable had been designed to allow contract awards to be made on 1 March 2021, with development to then commence, commissioning of the completed facility to begin in late 2022, and the facility to become fully operational in summer 2023. The key milestone dates in the indicative programme were set out at confidential Appendix Three to the report.

This deadline was driven by the need for all the Partner Councils to understand and budget for their financial contribution to the project. At the financial close of this phase of the project, the Partner Councils would be required to establish jointly an arms-length company (AssetCo), which would enter into the contracts to deliver the recycling solution, funded through loans from the partners.

In agreeing the recommendation to join the project the Council would be:

- committing to its share of the costs of the construction, development and operation of the MRF;
- committing the recycling tonnage of dry material recyclate (DMR) collected within its District for the next 20 years; and
- committing to establishing, being represented on and being bound by the decisions of Assetco, who would control operation of the MRF for 40 years.

In so doing the Council was, along with the other Partner Councils, potentially committing to remain a project partner for 40 years. Once the Joint Working Agreement had been signed, this Council, or any successor body, could only leave the project if:

- the gate fee for use of the MRF was calculated to exceed the agreed maximum gate fee, as specified in the Joint Working Agreement, at confidential Appendix Five to the report, when the final Business Case was assessed at financial close;
- all partners agreed not to proceed with the project, prior to financial close;
- all partners agreed to dissolve AssetCo;
- AssetCo was formally wound-up;
- WDC's shareholding was transferred to another public sector body who took on WDC's responsibilities under the agreements (for example, were changes to be made to the current local government structure within Warwickshire).

The financial business case for WDC to join the project was based on the detailed cashflow modelling set out in confidential Appendix One to the report, and the overall conclusion on project viability was set out in confidential Appendix Two to the report. This modelling was underpinned by the assumption that all DMRs from each of the Partner Councils would be committed to the project. This guaranteed supply of materials made the MRF cost effective, whilst leaving tonnage headroom within its handling capacity for either growth in the future needs of the Partner Councils, as recycling rates increased, or commercial growth and/or the addition of more Partner Councils.

This business case modelling was undertaken on WDC's behalf by KPMG and then analysed thoroughly by WDC's Finance team. It demonstrated that joining the project should deliver significant financial benefits to the Council.

The commitment to the project was potentially for 40 years (the lifespan of the MRF), the loan facility was for 20 years, mirroring the length of the Waste Supply Agreement, and the contracts that Partner Councils would enter into with AssetCo. The financing of the second 20-year period would, therefore, be a decision for the Partner Councils (or their successor bodies) to make.

The use of the MRF allowed the Council to mitigate the known risk of the costs of recyclate processing continuing to rise, and this being passed on to the Council through increased waste collection contract prices. The MRF was designed to provide a flexible solution, capable of producing high quality recyclate, with built-in redundancy to evolve with future changes in waste legislation and targeted material streams. On completion it would be the most advanced facility of its type in the UK, placing WDC and the other Partner Councils in the advantageous position of being at the forefront of change.

The project also offered an opportunity to use WDC's investment power to reduce the long term cost of a key statutory service whilst potentially improving the quality of the recycling service this Council offered and reducing the impact of climate change.

In joining the project, a decision from full Council was needed to provide the authority to add the project to the Council's capital programme, make provision to subscribe for ordinary shares in AssetCo and contribute cash to AssetCo, in accordance with the Joint Working Agreement, and make provision to fund the loan facility that this Council would be required to make available to the AssetCo. The provisions within this recommendation provided the necessary legal and financial approvals for this.

In making the decision to join the project, the Council needed to make provision for payment of a share of the costs of developing the project to financial close. These costs were shared by the existing partners, with their respective cost shares determined by the ratio of their 2018/19 DMR tonnages. In joining the project, WDC would be required to pay a proportion of the 'sunk' costs of developing the project up to financial close, with the other Partner Councils share reducing proportionately. This payment would be made to the Procuring Partner, CCC, that had borne the costs of the project work to date.

The detailed of the cost to WDC, not exceeding £300,000, was set out in confidential Appendix Two to the report. It was proposed that this was funded through a Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) loan.

The Council needed to make provision for a one-off payment to subscribe for ordinary shares in AssetCo, at the point of the financial closure of the project. The details of the cost to WDC, not exceeding £100,000, was set out in confidential Appendix Two to the report. It was proposed that this was funded through a PWLB loan.

The appointment of representatives to outside bodies was a decision for full Council, and recommendation 2.2.5 to Council sought a delegation from full Council to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader.

Subject to Council approving recommendation 2.2, the Executive needed to exercise its powers under Section 12 of Local Government Act 2003 and Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 to establish the AssetCo, the 'arms-length' trading company, that would be structured to accommodate both local authority and, through a Teckal compliant subsidiary company, private sector trading. Therefore, for ease it was proposed that the Chief Executive was delegated authority to enter into the relevant legal agreements and associated documents.

Additionally, as set out in paragraph 5.2 of the report and confidential Appendix Two to the report, the Council would need to make provision within its Capital programme for up to a maximum of £400,000 of up-front funding for the delivery of the project.

Prior to the establishment of the AssetCo and the final decision to proceed with the project, the Partner Councils were bound by the terms of the Joint Working Agreement.

To join the project, the Council was required to sign the Deed of Adherence, as set out at confidential Appendix Four to the report, which provided for WDC to be added as a signatory to the Joint Working Agreement, as set out at confidential Appendix Five to the report.

In making their decision on this recommendation, Members considered the contents of the Warwickshire Legal Services advice note, set out at confidential Appendix Six to the report.

The business case for the project, required each Partner Council to make available a minimum loan provision to the AssetCo. The level of the provision required to be made by each Partner Council was based on its future shareholding stake in the AssetCo. The level of that stake was, in turn, derived from its proportion of the total tonnage of DMR to be provided by all the Partner Councils, based on 2018/19 actual tonnages. For WDC, the percentage stake of its future proposed shareholding in the AssetCo was set out in confidential Appendix Nine to the report, and the minimum loan provision was set out in confidential Appendix Two to the report.

However, Council was recommended to make a larger loan provision of up to a maximum of £6m available to AssetCo. This higher level of loan facility would protect the Council against the impact of any price fluctuations generated by the appraisal of the final contract bid submissions on the final Business Case, prior to sign off at financial close.

It was, therefore, proposed that the final level of loan should be determined under delegated authority and should be reported to Council as part of the February 2021 Budget Setting report.

The future governance of the AssetCo would be set out in a future Shareholders Agreement that would be signed by all the Partner Councils prior to contract award.

The current draft of this Agreement was attached at confidential Appendix Seven to the report. It was proposed that the final version would be agreed under the delegated authority, as set out in recommendation 8, with further detailed advice sought from Warwickshire Legal Services, allowing comments to be fed into the drafting process as appropriate.

The Council also needed to commit to the future supply of its DMR to be directed to the MRF for the 20-year period, as set out in the Waste Supply Agreement, that would be signed by all the Partner Councils prior to contract award.

The current draft of this Agreement was attached at confidential Appendix Eight to the report. It was proposed that the final version would be agreed under the delegated authority as set out in recommendation 9, with further detailed advice sought from Warwickshire Legal Services, allowing comments to be fed into the drafting process as appropriate.

The project was managed by a Project Team, comprising officers seconded from Coventry City Council. External, independent advice on legal, financial and the technical aspects of the project, had been procured from Pinsett Mason LLP, KPMG, and Wardle Armstrong respectively. The Project Team reported to a Project Board, comprised of senior officer representatives from each of the Partner Councils. Since the Leadership Coordination Group indicated in-principle support for WDC to become a Partner Council, officers were afforded observer status on the Project Board and the Finance and Legal sub-groups, which were developing the Waste Supply and Partnership

Agreements respectively. These governance arrangements would remain in place until the financial close and the formal establishment of Sherbourne Recycling Limited, the AssetCo.

However, when AssetCo was established, it required new governance arrangements.

The members of the AssetCo Board would be the managing directors of Sherbourne Recycling Limited, and would have legal responsibilities to the Company, rather than directly to their respective Councils. It was, therefore, critical that the WDC Board Member was aware of the political priorities of the Council so they could ensure that these were properly reflected in Board discussions.

Given the prominence and financial importance of the MRF to the Council and in recognition that this was first time the Council had participated in a jointly managed but wholly local government owned arms-length company, it was proposed that regular briefings were provided to the named Members by the Board Member, so they could receive appropriate guidance on what outcomes this Council sought to achieve through the operation of the AssetCo. How this was done would be a member decision, and alternative options to the arrangement proposed in recommendation 10 were considered.

Members noted that where a decision of the Board could be made under the reserved matter arrangements, as set out in the Shareholders Agreement, a report would be presented to Executive or Council, as appropriate (and mirror reports would be taken through the governance structures of the other Partner Councils), so the Council's views would be determined in advance of any Board decision, and the Board Member would be requested to have regard to the decision when voting.

In addition to the proposal in the recommendation above, it was proposed that the Neighbourhood PAB would receive regular reports on both the operation of the MRF and the implementation and performance of the proposed new joint waste contract with Stratford District Council, that was the subject of a report considered by the Executive on 17 November 2020, at Minute Number 56 - Waste Contract Renewal – to which it was fundamentally linked**.**

The proposed reporting to the PAB was to ensure backbench Members were engaged in the Council's decision-making processes and were able to see when and where their views and suggestions had shaped or influenced outcomes.

Soft market testing of the proposed joint waste contract, provided strong evidence that the removal of kerbside sorting of recyclates, and the guarantee that the DMR materials would be purchased by the MRF for a set gate fee, increased the likelihood of competing and competitive bids being received through an external procurement exercise.

In terms of alternative options, not becoming a Partner Council in the MRF project was not recommended as it would deliver none of the benefits set out in the report, expose the Council to the financial risks arising from either placing the responsibility for making suitable alternative arrangements for DMR processing on the waste collection contractor or taking on that direct responsibility, and would effectively mean that the proposed joint waste contract with SDC could not be progressed without the risk of higher prices being loaded into tender returns, and/or no contractors submitting a tender, because there was not unanimity of recyclate processing arrangements over the whole geography covered by the contract.

The option of deferring a decision to allow the Council to request further information was not recommended, given the time constraints for decision making. However, the Council would be joining a well-established project, nearing financial close, and the range of information available to allow the evaluations underpinning the recommendations was considerable and sufficient to allow an informed decision to be made.

Alternative options were available to provide guidance to the Council's Board representative on AssetCo, for example, replacing the recommended three named members with a group of alternative membership, or dispensing with the arrangement entirely and leaving this function to the Neighbourhood PAB. These options were not recommended because of the prominence and financial importance of the MRF to the Council.

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered this report alongside the report at Minute Number 56 – Waste Contract Renewal – Update Report, because they both dealt with waste management. It noted and accepted the contents of both reports. The comments it made focussed on service delivery and therefore have been recorded in the minutes for that item.

The Committee expressed its thanks to the Portfolio Holder, Councillor Grainger and Julie Lewis, the Head of Neighbourhood Services

The Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report.

Councillor Grainger thanked both of the Scrutiny Committees and proposed the report as laid out.

Recommended to Council that

(1) the project be added to the to the Council's approved capital programme;

(2) a loan facility of up to a maximum of £6m to be made available to Sherbourne Recycling Limited (AssetCo), that will own and operate the MRF, on appropriate commercial market terms funded from Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) borrowing, be approved;

(3) a one-off payment be made of up to £300,000 to the Procuring Authority during financial year 2020/21, funded from PWLB borrowing, as this Council's contribution to the development costs of the project up to financial close-down, in accordance with the terms of the Joint Working

Agreement, be approved;

(4) a one-off payment be made of up to £100,000 during financial year 2020/21, funded from PWLB borrowing, to subscribe for ordinary shares in AssetCo and contribute cash to AssetCo in accordance with the Joint Working Agreement, be approved; and

(5) authority be delegated from the Council to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to appoint an officer as representative of the Council as a director of AssetCo.

Resolved that

(1) the proposal to become a full Partner Council in the Sherbourne Resource Park, Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) project, be supported;

(2) the implications of joining the project, as set out at paragraphs 3.1.5 and 3.1.6 in the report, be noted;

(3) the financial appraisal of the project proposals and the implications for this Council, as set out in confidential Appendices One and Two, be noted;

(4) this Council will be required to confirm to the current Partner Councils whether or not it wishes to become a full investing partner in the project no later than 26 November 2020, be noted;

(5) the indicative programme for the financial close of the project, contract award and the subsequent construction and fit-out periods, as set out at confidential Appendix Three to the report, be noted;

(6) subject to Council on 25 November agreeing the proposed recommendations above, the use of the Council's powers under Section 12 of the Local Government Act 2003 and Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 be approved to (but not limited to):

    (a) authorise the Deputy Chief Executive (BH), in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood and the Leader of the Council, to negotiate, agree and enter into all relevant legal agreements and associated documents necessary to give effect to the proposal;

(b) acquire shares in AssetCo, (Sherbourne Recycling Limited, the wholly owned company to be established by the Partner Councils) funded by Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) loan finance as set out in Section 5 and confidential appendix Two to the report;

(c) negotiate and agree a loan facility of up to a maximum of £6m to be made available to AssetCo on appropriate commercial market terms;

(d) negotiate and agree variations to the terms of the loan facility;

(e) enter into the relevant legal agreements and associated documents necessary to manage and operate AssetCo (the Shareholders Agreement);

(f) enter into a Waste Supply Agreement with AssetCo, committing the Council’s dry material recyclate tonnage for 40 years;

(g) agree to provide upfront funding for the project of up to £400k, as set out in confidential Appendix Two, including the one-off payment to the Procuring Authority as set out in paragraph 2.2.3 and the cash contribution to AssetCo as set out in paragraph 2.2.4, and this be included in the Capital Programme and funded from PWLB borrowing, or other appropriate funding as determined by the Head of Finance in accordance with the Council's Code of Financial Practice.

(7) subject to Council on 25 November agreeing the proposed recommendations above, the signature of the Deed of Adherence to commit the Council to the Joint Working Agreement with the other Partner Councils, as set out at confidential Appendices Four and Five respectively, noting the legal advice from Warwickshire Legal Services set out at confidential Appendix Six to the report, be approved;

(8) subject to Council on 25 November agreeing the proposed recommendations above, authority be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive (BH) and Head of Finance, in consultation with the Finance Portfolio Holder to determine the level of

loan to be provided to AssetCo, up to the maximum threshold of £6m;

(9) subject to Council on 25 November agreeing the proposed recommendations above, current draft of the Waste Supply Agreement, as set out at confidential Appendix Eight to the report, and authority be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive (BH) and Head of Neighbourhood Services, in consultation with the Neighbourhood Portfolio Holder and Leader of the Council to finalise the Agreement, be noted;

(10) subject to Council on 25 November agreeing the proposed recommendations above, the Board of the future AssetCo will be comprised of one appropriately trained senior officer from each Partner Council, be noted;

(11) the Leader of the Council and the Finance and Neighbourhood Portfolio Holders will receive feedback from and provide guidance to the officer representative on the AssetCo Board, be approved and that where a formal Board decision is required that would impact on the partners an appropriate Executive report would be brought forward;

(12) oversight of, and guidance on the future operation of the MRF will also available through the Neighbourhood Programme Advisory Board (PAB), be noted; and

(13) the potential beneficial impact of the approach proposed is subject to the proposed joint waste contract that is the subject of the Waste Contract Renewal Update Report (Minute Number 56), and that the overall financial position will not be known until the proposed waste collection tenders have been analysed in summer/autumn 2021, at which point the Council's Medium Term Financial Projections will be updated.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Grainger)
Forward Plan Reference 1,151

51. **Public and Press**

Resolved that under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 that the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following items by reason of the likely disclosure of exempt information within the paragraph of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local

Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, as set out below.

Minute Numbers	Paragraph Numbers	Reason
58, 59, 60	3	Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

58. **Confidential Appendices to Item 4 – Sherbourne Resource Park – Proposal to become a Partner Council**

The Executive approved the confidential Appendices in relation to Agenda Item 4, Minute Number 50 – Sherbourne Resource Park – Proposal to become a Partner Council.

(The meeting ended at 7.26pm)