

Agenda Item 6

Amendments to Motions

	Document	Amendments
1.	Councillor R Bradburn – 29 July 2020 Continuation of virtual meetings	None
2.	Councillor Reilly - 9 July 2020 The impact of COVID-19 on BAME communities	None
3.	Councillor D Hopkins – 1 August 2020 Low traffic neighbourhoods	Councillor McCall (page 2)
4.	Councillor Crooks – 2 September 2020 Planning for the future	Councillor Petchey (pages 2 to 4)
4.	Councillor Crooks – 2 September 2020 Planning for the future	Councillor Walker (pages 5 to 7)
5.	Councillor Walker – 3 September 2020 Covid-19 economic recovery	Councillor Ferrans (pages 8 to 11)

Enquiries

Please contact Peter Brown on 01908 253671 or peter.brown@milton-keynes.gov.uk

This agenda is available at <https://milton-keynes.cmis.uk.com/milton-keynes/Committees.aspx>

3. Low traffic neighbourhoods

Councillor McCall moved the following amendment:

- “1. That the word ‘investigates’ be added after Cabinet, and the word ‘introduce’ changed to ‘introducing’.
2. That the words ‘and appropriate,’ added after ‘feasible’.
3. That the words ‘and where available funding allows,’ added after ‘appropriate,’.”

The motion, if amended would read:

“That this Council supports the concept of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and requests the Cabinet investigates introducing them when and where feasible and appropriate, and where available funding allows, in locations where they have the support and involvement of the local community.”

4. Planning for the future

(a) Councillor Petchey moved the following amendment:

“That the following words be added as a new second clause (10):

the threat to archaeology and heritage through the removal of consideration in the planning process for evaluation and mitigation of the effect of development on heritage assets.

and that second clause (10 – 14) be renumbered 11-15 accordingly”

The motion, if amended would read:

That this Council:

- (a) supportive of the Government's commitment that more houses be built;
- (b) mindful of its unanimous commitment to the growth of Milton Keynes expressed in its response to the MK Futures Commission report on 20 July 2016;
- (c) aware that in Milton Keynes under successive administrations, local government has not failed the city - some 16,000 houses have already been granted planning permission, but developers have failed to build them;
- (d) committed to the principles behind the 2011 Localism Act and the importance of Neighbourhood Plans; and
- (e) convinced of the value of a comprehensive democratic input from residents and businesses at all stages of the planning process,

Resolves to encourage the Cabinet to prepare a response to the Government's consultative White Paper *Planning for the Future* which includes the following points:

- (1) the dangers in grounding the Local Plan process on a reduced evidence base, on a potentially inadequate time for public consultation & meaningful involvement, and of introducing the threat of sanctions to already financially challenged councils;
- (2) the removal of the opportunity for local community input and democratic accountability by the proposed increase (within Renewal Zones) of automatic permitted development rights together with the threat to democratic scrutiny by the inclusion of an option to remove the Public Examination process from the approval of a Local Plan and the removal of democratically accountable decision-making on the balancing of competing requirements that emerges at detailed application stage for most developments;
- (3) the undesirability of removing the "duty to cooperate" with neighbouring councils in the preparation of Local Plans, particularly pertinent in Milton Keynes where local boundaries follow historic divisions long overtaken by the city's development;
- (4) the renewal of nationally imposed top down housing targets based on a standard method for calculating housing need regardless of local circumstances, with no indication of any local planning authority's ability to determine key elements of outline plans such as housing size and tenure mix, and access arrangements together with the impact on the principle of mixed neighbourhoods and community cohesion by allowing block allocations of affordable housing and executive housing to be considered on separate planning applications;
- (5) the need to ensure that any housing allocations deliver the required number of bedrooms, not homes with too few bedrooms, to house our population;
- (6) the expectation that "First Homes" will take priority over all other forms of affordable home ownership which may raise barriers to home ownership, not lower them, by lessening the opportunity for shared ownership, and reduce the supply of much needed affordable homes for rent resulting in homelessness;
- (7) the likelihood that the design code provisions will produce either (i) too detailed a manual to be helpful with lots of options and hundreds of pages, or (ii) an "identikit Britain" manual with such limited options that community character will be reduced to a memory, and all innovation stifled, or (iii) a minimalist manual with so few policies that developers will be able to reduce standards;
- (8) the threat to the rural economy, park-based leisure facilities, visitor buildings at historic sites and much else from the binary "development or none" approach to protecting sites;

- (9) the implications for environmental protection and biodiversity of the proposal that sustainability appraisals be abolished;
- (10) the threat to archaeology and heritage through the removal of consideration in the planning process for evaluation and mitigation of the effect of development on heritage assets;
- (11) the impracticality of determining the infrastructure requirements and practicality of all sites proposed in just 12 months from the close of the call for zoning proposals - let alone when every Planning Authority in the country will be doing so during the same 12 months;
- (12) the difficulty for local councils that the proposed new national infrastructure levy will only be paid upon occupation leaving councils having to borrow in order to pay for and deliver any infrastructure needed up front, which is aggravated by the lack of any method for ensuring that the infrastructure levy actually covers the cost of the required infrastructure in an area, and by the White Paper's silence on how any infrastructure less unrelated to councils - for example medical facilities and public transport - is to be delivered; and
- (13) that the housing delivery test be replaced by:
 - (a) An agreed timescale for submitting reserved matters or equivalent, and for completion of each phase or parcel, at outline approval of plans on each major site.
 - (b) Addressing the problem of developers who will not bring forward reserved matters or build housing on time through the tax system so that land approved for development does not lie untouched or incomplete as at present.
 - (c) A restriction on the sanctioning of Councils to those who fail to maintain a valid Local Plan that allocates sufficient housing, or who fail wholesale to determine plans within agreed timescales - councils should not be sanctioned when developers fail to build plans that they have assured councils are deliverable.

That this Council further resolves that:

- (14) that the Cabinet be requested to write to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government asking that local councils be given access to sufficient resource to promote large scale investment in quality affordable housing to rent
- (15) that the critical importance of development framework SPDs and related design guides and codes under the proposed system be recognised, and that the Cabinet assess the resource implications of producing them independently of developers in order to retain control over future developments.

4. Planning for the future

(b) Councillor Walker moved the following amendment:

“That in the first clause (b), the words ‘unanimous commitment to the growth of Milton Keynes expressed in its response to the MK Futures Commission report on 20 July 2016’ are replaced with ‘noting of the MK Futures Commission report on 20 July 2016, which has been used to inform the Cabinet’s growth ambitions as outlined in the Council plan.’”

The motion, if amended would read:

That this Council:

- (a) supportive of the Government's commitment that more houses be built;
- (b) mindful of its noting of the MK Futures Commission report on 20 July 2016, which has been used to inform the Cabinet’s growth ambitions as outlined in the Council plan;
- (c) aware that in Milton Keynes under successive administrations, local government has not failed the city - some 16,000 houses have already been granted planning permission, but developers have failed to build them;
- (d) committed to the principles behind the 2011 Localism Act and the importance of Neighbourhood Plans; and
- (e) convinced of the value of a comprehensive democratic input from residents and businesses at all stages of the planning process,

Resolves to encourage the Cabinet to prepare a response to the Government's consultative White Paper *Planning for the Future* which includes the following points:

- (1) the dangers in grounding the Local Plan process on a reduced evidence base, on a potentially inadequate time for public consultation & meaningful involvement, and of introducing the threat of sanctions to already financially challenged councils;
- (2) the removal of the opportunity for local community input and democratic accountability by the proposed increase (within Renewal Zones) of automatic permitted development rights together with the threat to democratic scrutiny by the inclusion of an option to remove the Public Examination process from the approval of a Local Plan and the removal of democratically accountable decision-making on the balancing of competing requirements that emerges at detailed application stage for most developments;

- (3) the undesirability of removing the "duty to cooperate" with neighbouring councils in the preparation of Local Plans, particularly pertinent in Milton Keynes where local boundaries follow historic divisions long overtaken by the city's development;
- (4) the renewal of nationally imposed top down housing targets based on a standard method for calculating housing need regardless of local circumstances, with no indication of any local planning authority's ability to determine key elements of outline plans such as housing size and tenure mix, and access arrangements together with the impact on the principle of mixed neighbourhoods and community cohesion by allowing block allocations of affordable housing and executive housing to be considered on separate planning applications;
- (5) the need to ensure that any housing allocations deliver the required number of bedrooms, not homes with too few bedrooms, to house our population;
- (6) the expectation that "First Homes" will take priority over all other forms of affordable home ownership which may raise barriers to home ownership, not lower them, by lessening the opportunity for shared ownership, and reduce the supply of much needed affordable homes for rent resulting in homelessness;
- (7) the likelihood that the design code provisions will produce either (i) too detailed a manual to be helpful with lots of options and hundreds of pages, or (ii) an "identikit Britain" manual with such limited options that community character will be reduced to a memory, and all innovation stifled, or (iii) a minimalist manual with so few policies that developers will be able to reduce standards;
- (8) the threat to the rural economy, park-based leisure facilities, visitor buildings at historic sites and much else from the binary "development or none" approach to protecting sites;
- (9) the implications for environmental protection and biodiversity of the proposal that sustainability appraisals be abolished;
- (10) the impracticality of determining the infrastructure requirements and practicality of all sites proposed in just 12 months from the close of the call for zoning proposals - let alone when every Planning Authority in the country will be doing so during the same 12 months;

- (11) the difficulty for local councils that the proposed new national infrastructure levy will only be paid upon occupation leaving councils having to borrow in order to pay for and deliver any infrastructure needed up front, which is aggravated by the lack of any method for ensuring that the infrastructure levy actually covers the cost of the required infrastructure in an area, and by the White Paper's silence on how any infrastructure less unrelated to councils - for example medical facilities and public transport - is to be delivered; and
- (12) that the housing delivery test be replaced by:
- (a) An agreed timescale for submitting reserved matters or equivalent, and for completion of each phase or parcel, at outline approval of plans on each major site.
 - (b) Addressing the problem of developers who will not bring forward reserved matters or build housing on time through the tax system so that land approved for development does not lie untouched or incomplete as at present.
 - (c) A restriction on the sanctioning of Councils to those who fail to maintain a valid Local Plan that allocates sufficient housing, or who fail wholesale to determine plans within agreed timescales - councils should not be sanctioned when developers fail to build plans that they have assured councils are deliverable.

That this Council further resolves that:

- (13) that the Cabinet be requested to write to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government asking that local councils be given access to sufficient resource to promote large scale investment in quality affordable housing to rent
- (14) that the critical importance of development framework SPDs and related design guides and codes under the proposed system be recognised, and that the Cabinet assess the resource implications of producing them independently of developers in order to retain control over future developments.

5. Covid-19 economic recovery

Councillor Ferrans moved the following amendment:

- “1. That in the opening sentence the words ‘with concern’ be removed after the word ‘notes’.
2. That in the first clause (a) the words ‘made worse by the Government’s insistence on pushing forward with the economic dislocation of Brexit at the same time’ be insert before the full stop.
3. That in the first clause (b) the words ‘but recovering somewhat in terms of footfall’ be insert before the full stop.
4. That in the first clause (c) be removed since it is covered later in (e) and replaced as a new clause as follows:

The payment of £112M in direct support of 30% of businesses in Milton Keynes.

5. That in the first clause (d) word ‘lack’ is removed and ‘short-term’ is replaced with ‘both short, medium and long term’.
6. That in first clause (e) the words ‘and notes the end date of the Government’s furlough scheme.’ are replaced with the words ‘with further job losses feared with the closing of the Government furlough scheme at the end of October, despite calls to extend the end date for the worst affected sectors such as arts, transportation and leisure.’
7. That after the words ‘Furthermore, that this Council:’ a new second clause (a) is inserted as follows:

Recognises that to ensure the future success of the Milton Keynes economy, more development of Green jobs including those related to carbon reduction is essential jobs and applauds those elements of the economic recovery plan and its £500k Green Recovery Fund” and renumber the remaining clauses of that section.

and that second clauses (a – f) are re designated b – g accordingly.

8. That in the second existing clause (a) the words ‘and understands its importance to supply chains, people’s livelihoods and financial security’ are deleted and replaced with ‘and the need to listen to large and small businesses to determine where this support is most needed’.
9. That the second existing clause (b), is replaced in its entirety with the following:

Understands the importance of drawing on the relevant expertise, and notes the expansion of the Council team already in place, and the commitment to continuing to work closely with its expert partners in Milton Keynes and across SEMLEP.

10. That in the second existing second clause (c) insert the words ‘most vulnerable’ are inserted before the word ‘people’s’.
11. That in existing second clause (d) the words ‘,despite the challenges that Brexit will bring’ are inserted before the full stop.
12. That in existing second clause (e) the words ‘,but urges a more targeted and tapered approach to the end of the furlough scheme than the inflexible end the Government have proposed’ are inserted before the final full stop.
13. That in existing second clause (f) the word ‘Believes’ is replaced with the words ‘Agrees that’, and the words ‘more widely, in areas such as’ is inserted before the word ‘public’ and that the words ‘, child poverty and increased inequalities’ are inserted before the final full stop.
14. That the existing third clause (1) is deleted and replaced with a new clause as follows:

Continue listening and responding to the core concerns of the retail sector in Milton Keynes.
15. That the existing third clause (2) is deleted and replaced with new clause as follows:

Implement the Economic Recovery Plan at pace.
16. That in the existing third clause (3) the words ‘Draft a new and competitive’ are replaced with ‘Update the’.
17. That the existing third clause (4) is deleted and replaced with the following:

Continue to work with our local MPs, SEMLEP and other partners to promote the £2billion package of ‘shovel ready’ projects that can be submitted to Ministers and considered as part of the Government’s ongoing spending review, including major development projects consistent with Plan:MK such as MK:U, hospital investment, the Housing Infrastructure Fund work and the Bletchley Town Deal.
18. That existing clause (5) is deleted.
19. That the existing third clause (6) is deleted and replaced with the following:

Focus resources across the council to deal with the economic challenges emerging from COVID-19, to include implementing key recommendations from the Child Poverty Commission, ensuring that children who have been left behind educationally are given support to catch up with their peers, that regeneration work continues to look beyond housing at wider well-being, and focus the Public Health team resource on analysing and addressing public health challenges resulting from the health and economic crisis.

20. Add new a new clause at the conclusion of the motion as follows:

And resolves to request that the Chief Executive write to the Government on behalf of the whole Council, to:

- i) Call on the Government to extend the furlough scheme for sectors which have not been able to return due to COVID-19 restrictions (notably the arts, leisure, transportation and some of the hospitality sector).
- ii) Further call on the Government to implement adequate sick pay and employment protections for employees told to self-isolate due to COVID-19, so that no worker is worse off by following a direction to self-isolate."

The motion, if amended would read:

That this Council notes:

- a) The economic crisis resulting from the global coronavirus pandemic, made worse by the Government's insistence on pushing forward with the economic dislocation of Brexit at the same time.
- b) The Centre for Cities (21st August 2020) report showing Milton Keynes in the bottom 10 towns and cities across the UK for its offline retail recovery in terms of spend but recovering somewhat in terms of footfall.
- c) The payment of £112M in direct support of 30% of businesses in Milton Keynes.
- d) The inclusion of both short, medium and long term policies and initiatives in the Cabinet's Economic Recovery Plan.
- e) The significant rise in unemployment in Milton Keynes and across the country, with further job losses feared with the closing of the Government furlough scheme at the end of October, despite calls to extend the end date for the worst affected sectors such as arts, transportation and leisure.

Furthermore, that this Council:

- a) Recognises that to ensure the future success of the Milton Keynes economy, more development of Green jobs including those related to carbon reduction is essential jobs and applauds those elements of the economic recovery plan and its £500k Green Recovery Fund.
- b) Reaffirms its support for Milton Keynes' retail sector and the need to listen to large and small businesses to determine where this support is most needed.
- c) Understands the importance of drawing on the relevant expertise, and notes the expansion of the Council team already in place, and the commitment to continuing to work closely with its expert partners in Milton Keynes and across SEMLEP.

- d) Highlights its determination to do all it can to protect the most vulnerable people's jobs and income across the entire economy.
- e) Reaffirms its commitment for MK to be a leading European City and encourages inward investment into Milton Keynes from around the globe to support our recovery, despite the challenges that Brexit will bring.
- f) Welcomes the Government's schemes and funding which has protected jobs and helped restart the economy but urges a more targeted and tapered approach to the end of the furlough scheme than the inflexible end the Government have proposed.
- g) Agrees that the consequences of the economic crisis should also be considered more widely, in areas such as public health, child poverty and increased inequalities.

That this Council therefore resolves to request the Cabinet to:

- 1) Continue listening and responding to the core concerns of the retail sector in Milton Keynes.
- 2) Implement the Economic Recovery Plan at pace.
- 3) Update the inward investment strategy that will put MK at the forefront of the UK's economic recovery.
- 4) Continue to work with our local MPs, SEMLEP and other partners to promote the £2billion package of 'shovel ready' projects that can be submitted to Ministers and considered as part of the Government's ongoing spending review, including major development projects consistent with Plan:MK such as MK:U, hospital investment, the Housing Infrastructure Fund work and the Bletchley Town Deal.
- 5) Focus resources across the council to deal with the economic challenges emerging from COVID-19, to include implementing key recommendations from the Child Poverty Commission, ensuring that children who have been left behind educationally are given support to catch up with their peers, that regeneration work continues to look beyond housing at wider well-being, and that the Public Health team focuses resource on analysing and addressing public health challenges resulting from the health and economic crisis.
- 6) Resolves to request that the Chief Executive write to the Government on behalf of the whole Council, to:
 - i) Call on the Government to extend the furlough scheme for sectors which have not been able to return due to COVID-19 restrictions (notably the arts, leisure, transportation and some of the hospitality sector).
 - ii) Further call on the Government to implement adequate sick pay and employment protections for employees told to self-isolate due to COVID-19, so that no worker is worse off by following a direction to self-isolate.