

Minutes of the MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL held on WEDNESDAY 21 MARCH 2018 at 7.30 pm

**Present:** Councillor D Hopkins (Mayor)  
Councillors Bald, Betteley, Bint, Brackenbury, M Bradburn, Brunning, Buckley, Cannon, Clifton, Coventry, Crooks, Dransfield, Exon, Ferrans, Ganatra, Geaney, A Geary, P Geary, Gifford, Gowans, Green, Hosking, Jenkins, Khan, Legg, Marland, D McCall, I McCall, McDonald, McKenzie, McLean, McPake, Middleton, Miles, Morla, Morris, Nolan, O'Neill, Petchey, Walker, Wallis, Webb, C Williams, C Wilson and K Wilson

Alderwomen Saunders

**Apologies:** Councillors Alexander, R Bradburn, Clancy, Eastman, V Hopkins, Long, Patey-Smith, Small, Wales and P Williams and Aldermen Bartlett, Beeley, Bristow, E Henderson and Howell and Alderwomen Irons, I Henderson and Lloyd

**Also Present:** circa 60 members of the public

**CL110 MINUTES**

The Council noted that the recorded vote on the substantive motion (Minute CL107) was incorrectly recorded in the draft minutes and that this has been corrected in the official copy of the minutes to be signed.

RESOLVED -

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 21 February 2018 be approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record.

**C111 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

Councillor I McCall disclosed a pecuniary interest in item 5(b)(iii) (Bletchley Park Institute of Digital Technology), as an employee of Milton Keynes College, which was mentioned in the motion.

Councillor D McCall disclosed a pecuniary interest in item 5(b)(iii) (Bletchley Park Institute of Digital Technology), as the spouse of Councillor I McCall who was an employee of Milton Keynes College, which was mentioned in the motion.

**CL112 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

(a) 678 (Rifles) Squadron, 6 Regiment Army Air Corps

The Mayor announced that he had the pleasure of welcoming the 678 (Rifles) Squadron, 6 Regiment of the Army Air Corps,

which held the Freedom of Milton Keynes, on 11 March 2018, when the Regiment exercised its right to march in Central Milton Keynes.

(b) Councillor Coventry

The Mayor announced that on Thursday, 29 March, Councillor Steve Coventry would be marrying this long term partner Liane. The Mayor expressed the Council's congratulations and best wishes to Steve and Liane.

(c) Elections 2018

The Mayor announced that Councillors Bald, Betteley, Burke, Clifton, Coventry, Gifford and I McCall had decided not to seek re-election in May. The Mayor, on behalf of the Council, wished the councillors the best for the future and thanked them for their service to both the Council and the community.

**CL113**

**PETITION – EATON MILL NURSERY**

The Council received a petition relating to funding for Eaton Mill Nursery.

The Council noted that the petition would be referred to the Cabinet for consideration.

**CL114**

**QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

- (a) Question from Mr E Bobey to Councillor Long (Cabinet member for Adult Care and Housing), which was submitted in writing and asked by the Mayor on behalf of Mr Bobey.

Mr Bobey asked Councillor Long whether Your MK had any statutory powers and if so what they were.

Councillor Long, in a written answer, indicated that YourMK had no statutory powers as these remained with the Council.

- (b) Question from Mrs J Bobey to Councillor Legg (Cabinet member for Customer Services), which was submitted in writing and asked by the Mayor on behalf of Mrs Bobey.

Mrs Bobey asked Councillor Legg whether there was a conflict of interest between Your MK and the Council's planning decisions being made in relation to the regeneration areas.

Councillor Legg, in a written answer, indicated that the Local Planning Authority and its 'statutory decision making function' was independent to the Council and any other body, therefore there was no conflict.

Councillor Legg also indicated that all planning applications were considered in isolation and on their own merits in terms of complying with both local and national policies.

- (c) Questions from Mr R Ward to Councillor Gowans (Cabinet member for Public Realm)

Mr Ward, referring to the Council's draft Mobility Strategy, which was to be considered later in the meeting, and the City's grid road network, indicated that Old Woughton Parish Council had been in dialogue with the Council for nearly a year regarding concerns about noise, speed and traffic growth raised by residents living in close proximity to the local grid roads, particularly the elevated section of Standing Way (A 421). Specifically the need to review grid road speed limits which, for dual carriageways, had remained at 70 mph since the 1970s. The Parish Council had also sent the results of a residents' survey to the Head of Highways last July, but no progress had been made to address the results. Mr Ward asked Councillor Gowans what plans the Council had to review its policy and implement a lower speed limit across the grid road network.

Councillor Gowans indicated that road safety was his top priority and that yesterday he had taken a decision to commence a grid road safety review which would report by September 2018. The review would include a wide range of issues, including speed limits.

- (d) Question from Mr D Lee (Tinkers Bridge Residents Association) to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Mr Lee, indicating that residents associations were partially funded by a support grant from the Housing Revenue Account, the size of which was dependent on an annual health check for that association, ask Councillor Marland if the health check process was to be used this year as it appeared uncertain at present.

Councillor Marland, referring to ongoing changes in the Housing Service, indicated that the grants to residents' associations would be maintained in 2018/19, together with an inflationary uplift.

As a supplementary question Mr Lee, referring to the level of funding provided by the Council to residents' associations being based on the number of Council own properties on an estate, asked Councillor Marland if there would be a time when the Council would provide funding for all residents' associations irrespective of whether there were any Council housing properties included in its area.

Councillor Marland indicated that funding for tenant and resident associations was provided through the Housing Revenue Account, a ring fenced account paid for by the Council's housing tenants, which was why the grants to associations were based on the number of Council owned

properties on an estate. While the Council would like to provide funding for all tenant and resident associations that would result in a significant draw on the Council's resources. The Council would, however, look at other ways of supporting associations, for example, through the Homelessness Prevention Act to work with the Council to prevent homelessness.

- (e) Question from Mr T Baines to Councillor Gowans (Cabinet member for Public Realm)

Mr Baines, referring to the increasing number of potholes in the roads in Milton Keynes, asked Councillor Gowans how long it would take to repair the potholes, specifically the ones in the grid roads.

Councillor Gowans, acknowledging the impact the winter had had on the condition of the borough's roads, indicated that Cabinet had allocated an additional £200,000 towards the repairs of highway defects. It was estimated that this sum would enable the repair of 5,000 over the next two months.

As a supplementary question Mr Baines, referring to the likely increasing number of motorcyclists using the grid roads with the lighter nights, asked Councillor Gowans to ensure that the roundabouts were specifically checked for potholes because of the likely increased number of accidents involving motorcyclists which might occur as a result of the potholes.

Councillor Gowans indicated that under the Council's new Highways Asset Management Strategy priority given to the repair of defects would be risk based. Therefore, if a pothole was likely to provide a greater risk to a more vulnerable group such as motorcyclists or cyclists, then repair of that defect would have a higher priority.

**CL115 PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2018/19**

Councillor Middleton moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Joint Negotiating Committee (Employer's Side) held on 19 February 2018, which was seconded by Councillor Morris:

"That the Pay Policy Statement 2018/19 be agreed."

On being put to the vote the recommendation was declared carried by acclamation.

RESOLVED –

That the Pay Policy Statement 2018/19 be agreed.

**CL116 MILTON KEYNES MOBILITY STRATEGY 2018/2036**

Councillor Gifford moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 6 March 2018, which was seconded by Councillor Gowans:

- “1. That the Mobility Strategy (LTP4) 2018/2036 be approved and referred to Council for adoption.
2. That an action plan for the next 3 years detailing progress be brought back to the Cabinet by September 2018.
3. That it be noted that the ‘First-Last Mile’ provisions are subsumed within the Mobility Strategy and any implementation plans will be consulted on, as appropriate, in the future.
4. That the Head of Transport be asked to develop a Statement of Engagement.”

Councillor Marland moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Coventry and accepted by the mover of the motion:

“That Clause 3 of the recommendation be deleted and replaced with the following words:

‘That it be noted that the references to “First and Last Mile Strategy” are to an emerging and changing set of ideas, and that any future policy or financial commitment will be subject to the proper further decision making and consultation processes of this Council.’”

The Council heard from one member of the public.

On being put to the vote the recommendation was declared carried by acclamation.

**RESLOVED –**

1. That the Mobility Strategy (LTP4) 2018/2036 be approved.
2. That an action plan for the next 3 years detailing progress be brought back to the Cabinet by September 2018.
3. That it be noted that the references to “First and Last Mile Strategy” are to an emerging and changing set of ideas, and that any future policy or financial commitment will be subject to the proper further decision making and consultation processes of this Council.
4. That the Head of Transport be asked to develop a Statement of Engagement.

**CL117**

### **CENTRAL AREA GROWTH BOARD MEMBERSHIP**

Councillor Marland moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 6 March 2018, which was seconded by Councillor Webb:

“That within the context of the National Infrastructure Commission and Government’s work on the Cambridge - Milton Keynes - Oxford corridor, the Council:

- (a) becomes a full member of the Central Area Growth Board, adopting the Terms of Reference;

- (b) commits to an associated contribution of £5k of ongoing revenue to support the work of the Growth Board; and
- (c) acts as the Accountable Body for the Growth Board."

On being put to the vote the recommendation was declared carried by acclamation.

**RESLOVED –**

That within the context of the National Infrastructure Commission and Government's work on the Cambridge - Milton Keynes - Oxford corridor, the Council:

- (a) becomes a full member of the Central Area Growth Board, adopting the Terms of Reference;
- (b) commits to an associated contribution of £5k of ongoing revenue to support the work of the Growth Board; and
- (c) acts as the Accountable Body for the Growth Board.

**CL118**

**ANNUAL REPORTS**

The Council received the Annual Scrutiny Report from the Chair of the Scrutiny Management Committee, together with reports from the Chairs of the Executive Scrutiny, Licensing and Regulatory Committees.

When receiving the report from the Regulatory Committee, the Council received updated details of all registered Town and Village Greens and the current pending applications, including all internal and external costs incurred by the Council relating to Village Green applications.

The Chair of the Executive Scrutiny Committee, in introducing his report, clarified that call-ins had been resolved at mediation rather than withdrawn, as referred to in the report.

The Council heard from two members of the public on the Annual Reports.

**CL119**

**COUNCILLORS' QUESTIONS**

- (a) Question from Councillor McKenzie to Councillor Gowans (Cabinet member for Public Realm)

Councillor McKenzie asked Councillor Gowans if he would agree to declassify the congested Buckingham Road so that action could be taken to reduce the volume of commercial traffic and especially end the ability of lorries and other heavy vehicles to use the road as a short cut to Central Bletchley and the East flank of Milton Keynes.

Councillor Gowans agreed to look into the possible declassification and take this matter forward.

**(b) Question from Councillor Bint to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)**

Councillor Bint, referring to a proposal for a bid, to fund a bridge over the M1 in the Willen area, which would lead to significantly higher volumes of traffic and had previously been referred to as speculative, asked Councillor Marland what would be the process for a meaningful consultation with the residents in the Willen area and what would the likely mitigation of the impact of the increased traffic likely to be in light of the decision which meant that the new bridge might receive funding.

Councillor Marland indicated that if this matter was to go forward it would only do so after further consideration by the Council, consultation with residents and potentially identifying further funding for infrastructure, as any new bridge was connected with development east of the M1.

Councillor Marland also indicated that any resulting additional development east of the M1 would be subject to consideration in terms of Plan:MK and unless the Council was satisfied that the additional growth was beneficial it should not proceed with the bridge proposal.

**(c) Question from Councillor Green to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)**

Councillor Green, referring to the recent decision of the Planning Inspectorate to grant planning permission for 141 houses at Long Street Road, Hanslope and its view that the Council was using the wrong method to calculate the five year land supply, asked Councillor Marland if he could outline the Administration's view on a potential judicial review of the decision.

Councillor Marland, referring to the impact of the decision on Hanslope, indicated that the Administration did not support speculative development of this nature and was currently assessing Counsel's Opinion. A decision would be taken on whether to challenge the Inspectorate's decision based on the legal advice.

Councillor Marland clarified that there were two methods of calculating the five year land supply and that a new delivery test was to be brought in towards the end of 2018.

Councillor Marland suggested that the Council needed to consider the broader picture, taking account of the Housing Growth Deal as well as housing land supply and other potential measures which were to be introduced. The Council needed to guard against the impact of speculative development, such as at Hanslope, had on the appetite of residents for properly planned growth which was supported by the necessary infrastructure.

Councillor Marland also suggested that Government should be encouraged to allow councils to reject speculative development, particularly where it impacted on planned long term development.

- (d) Question from Councillor Dransfield to Councillor Gowans (Cabinet member for Public Realm)

Councillor Dransfield, referring to the severity of the winter and the increase in the number of potholes, asked Councillor Gowans whether a survey of the additional damage caused as a result of existing potholes not being repaired in advance of the winter had been conducted and how much of that damage could have been avoided if the potholes had been repaired.

Councillor Gowans indicated that he was unable to provide specific figures for this year as yet, but year on year insurance claims were falling as the Council looked after the highways very well.

As a supplementary question Councillor Dransfield, indicating that he understood that damage to vehicles had been significant as a result of unrepaired potholes, asked Councillor Gowans how many garages he had spoken to in order to find out the true position.

Councillor Gowans indicated that he relied on facts rather than anecdotal evidence.

- (e) Question from Councillor Nolan to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Councillor Nolan asked Councillor Marland if he could update the Council on progress with establishing a new university in Milton Keynes, MK:U.

Councillor Marland reported that Cranfield University, in Partnership with Aston University had been selected to lead the MK:U project.

Councillor Marland believed that MK:U was a very positive step for Milton Keynes and the new university would not only provide degrees, it would also be working with Milton Keynes College and employers on apprenticeships and it would provide a significant boost for the economy of Central Milton Keynes.

Councillor Marland took the opportunity to thank the Director of Strategy and Futures for his work on the project.

- (f) Question from Councillor Buckley to Councillor Nolan (Cabinet member for Children and Families)

Councillor Buckley, referring to the impending withdrawal of funding for Eaton Mill Nursery following the recent Ofsted report asked Councillor Nolan what measures were being put in place to help those parents and children affected.



Councillor Nolan outlined that the Nursery had received an 'Inadequate' finding in its most recent Ofsted report, which meant that the Council was required to cease funding places at the Nursery. However, the Council had agreed to provide transitional funding for the Nursery until the end of March and it had been working with the Nursery since Christmas.

Councillor Nolan indicated that she could not explain why the Nursery had left it so late to notify the parents as the situation had been known for some months, also the letter sent to parents incorrectly blamed the Council for the situation.

Councillor Nolan also indicated that the Council would do what it could to help parents and they could contact the Council to discuss ways that the Council could assist.

As a supplementary question Councillor Buckley, recognising that it was not desirable for the Council to fund a Nursery which Ofsted judged to be 'Inadequate' asked Councillor Nolan if there was any opportunity to continue the transition funding a little longer to help reduce the impact on both the parents and children.

Councillor Nolan, agreed that the current situation wasn't satisfactory and reiterated that the Council was not legally allowed to fund places in a nursery judged by Ofsted to be 'Inadequate', but it was permitted to provide a period of transition funding which it had been doing. The Nursery was a private business and as such, it would have been expected to put measures in place to enable it to continue for a number of months.

Councillor Nolan indicated that she understood that Ofsted was scheduled to inspect the Nursery again in early June and nothing prevented the Nursery from continuing to provide none Local Authority funded places. The Council would do what it could to provide alternative places for children where required.

(g) Question from Councillor Ferrans to Councillor Nolan  
(Cabinet member for Children and Families)

Councillor Ferrans, referring to the closure of Kingston Nursery and how this would exacerbate the lack of school holiday provision for children, asked Councillor Nolan what the Council was doing to encourage additional provision.

Councillor Nolan, clarifying that the situation at Kingston Nursery was different to that at Eaton Mill Nursery and that the Council had been working for some time with parents to find suitable provision, indicated that she was aware of a range of other provision of holiday childcare and would provide Councillor Ferrans with a written reply

(h) Question from Councillor McDonald to Councillor Walker  
(Leader of the Conservative Group)

Councillor McDonald asked Councillor Walker if the recent Labour Administration budget showed that the Administration had run out of both ideas and ambition and the Council was in need of new political leadership with new ideas?

Councillor Walker indicated that he agreed with Councillor McDonald and suggested that all that was being heard from the Administration was what it was not doing, rather announcing what new substantive measures it was introducing to address the challenges facing Milton Keynes. In addition the Administration constantly sought to transfer the blame for its lack of ambition to others.

Councillor Walker confirmed that he did believe it was time for a change of Administration.

As a supplementary question Councillor McDonald asked Councillor Walker if he thought the recent defections of councillors from the Labour Party to the Conservative Party on Ashfield District Council showed that the Labour Party was in a mess.

Councillor Walker indicated that he was not surprised by the defections to the Conservative Party which showed that it was a myth that the Labour Party was the Party of working people. Councillor Walker encouraged moderate Labour Party members to stand their ground.

(i) Question from Councillor C Wilson to Councillor Marland  
(Leader of the Council)

Councillor C Wilson asked Councillor Marland if he thought Councillor Walker's speech was a month late

Councillor Marland stated that he didn't really care.

(j) Question from Councillor P Geary to Councillor Legg (Cabinet member for Customer Services)

Councillor P Geary, referring to a planning permission issued for a development in Olney by mistake, asked Councillor Legg what he had done to understand how the mistake had happened and what measure had been put in place to ensure that it didn't happen again.

Councillor Legg indicated that a full review of the process had been conducted and it appeared that the mistake had been as a result of a software issue. This problem has been addressed by the software provider and checks and balances put in place to ensure that it did not happen again. Also Internal Audit had been asked to look at the process

As a supplementary question Councillor P Geary asked Councillor Legg whether a similar mistake had happened before, or whether it was a one off.

Councillor Legg indicated that neither he, nor officer colleagues were aware of a similar mistake occurring previously.

- (k) Question from Councillor A Geary to Councillor Gifford (Cabinet member for Place)

Councillor A Geary, referring to the transfer of a number of play areas from this Council to Newport Pagnell Town Council, asked Councillor Gifford if she could ensure that there was sufficient professional support available to the Community Assets Transfer Programme in order that the transfers could be progressed expeditiously.

Councillor Gifford indicated that the transfers were quite complex and any delays that had occurred were largely as a result of ownership issues, as it had been found that some of the play areas were not in the Council's ownership as previously thought.

Councillor Gifford confirmed that the Council was committed to working with Newport Pagnell Town Council on the transfer of the play areas and any resourcing issue was being addressed.

- (l) Question from Councillor Walker to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Councillor Walker, referring to the reported interference by the Labour National Executive and Momentum in a number of Labour councils across the country and the letter signed by 17 Leaders of Labour condemning National Executive interference in Haringey Council's regeneration programme, asked Councillor Marland why he had not signed the letter.

Councillor Marland indicated that he had not signed the letter as he did not agree with its content.

As a supplementary question Councillor Walker, indicating that he had given Councillor Marland the chance this evening to condemn interference in Haringey Council's regeneration programme and he had not done so, asked Councillor Marland if he would commit to always protecting this Council from similar interference.

Councillor Marland indicated that as far as he was aware the Haringey Regeneration Delivery Vehicle was not supported by the majority of Labour councillors on Haringey Council, the local Labour Members of Parliament, all Constituency Labour Parties in Haringey, or opposition councillors. It appeared that only the Haringey Cabinet supported the delivery vehicle and the Leader of the Council had paid the price for not listening, not just to Momentum members, but to the voters

and people of Haringey. The media had, however, portrayed it as a proxy battle between the Labour Party and Momentum, which it was not.

Councillor Marland confirmed that he would always defend Milton Keynes, and such a situation would never arise while the Labour Group formed the Administration as it listened to the residents.

- (m) Question from Councillor Bald to Councillor Middleton (Cabinet member for Resources and Innovation)

Councillor Bald, referring to £18m she had identified as money she would consider as wasted by the Labour Administration over the last four years, suggested that the money could have funded, amongst other things, half of the Children's Services Budget, the repair of all potholes for the next 50 years and also built some Council housing. Councillor Bald ask Councillor Middleton to be honest with voters and admit that the Labour Administration has wasted £18m.

Councillor Middleton indicated that it sounded like Councillor Bald's experience of the recent austerity budget the Council had been forced to pass by the Government was very different to the one presented by the Leader of the Council.

As a supplementary question Councillor Bald, referring to the level of Reserves held by the Council in £2017/18 and the predicted level of Reserves for 2018/19 which she stated to be of a similar level to the General fund Budget, asked Councillor Middleton if he was satisfied with the Council's financial performance.

Councillor Middleton indicated that he was disappointed that Councillor Bald's only response to austerity was to use Reserves, particularly after the experience of Northamptonshire County Council.

Councillor Middleton informed the Council that the high level of Reserves was because it was planned to use the Reserves to build new schools, new medical centres and new community centres as Milton Keynes grew.

- (n) Question from Councillor Ferrans to Councillor Gowans (Cabinet member for Public Realm)

Councillor Ferrans asked Councillor Gowans if he was aware that it was almost impossible to find any means of getting the claim form for pothole damage from the Council's website. Councillor Ferrans suggested that it was therefore not surprising that the Council did not have the number of claims that a population the size of Milton Keynes suggested there should be.

Councillor Gowans indicated that he would liaise with colleagues to ensure the website was as clear as it could be

and pointed out that some people must find the claim form because there were claims being made.

**CL120**

### **WINTER WEATHER**

Councillor P Geary moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Bint:

“That this Council

- (a) thanks the staff and contractors of the Council who went above and beyond the call of duty working round the clock to keep the city moving and the vulnerable safe in the recent wintry weather;
- (b) acknowledges that this was a multifaceted response with many unseen people working in ways that many would not identify to make sure that the Council's response was complete, these included volunteer drivers of 4x4 vehicles helping to get trained staff to those in need and meals to many who needed them;
- (c) understands that while Milton Keynes was not as bad as many parts of the country with the adverse weather it received, it was the worst seen for a number of years;
- (d) remembers that there have been a number of changes to the way that winter preparedness is undertaken in the past few years;
- (e) requests Cabinet to ensure that:
  - (i) a comprehensive review of the response to winter weather is undertaken which looks to highlight those things that have worked well and ensure that these remain the case in future years, but which also highlights the things that could be improved and asks that recommendations come forward about how these things could be improved in the future;
  - (ii) the review is overarching covering all facets of the response to the people of Milton Keynes, not necessarily just the Council, and it is undertaken by someone with seniority and knowledge of all areas, in time for the appropriate scrutiny committee to consider the report in time to influence the budget build process for 2019/20;
- (f) further acknowledges that the ramifications of the cold weather lasts after the temperature lifts and therefore requests that the Council deploys extra resources, from reserves, if necessary, to repair the potholes that have appeared in the roads and the street furniture (including signs, lamp posts and crash barriers) that has been damaged; and

- (g) requests the Cabinet member with responsibility for Public Realm services to produce, at the earliest opportunity, a report about the state of the highway network and provide regular updates on progress in repairing it.”

Councillor Gowans moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Miles and accepted by the mover of the motion:

“That all words in paragraph (f) after the word ‘therefore’ be deleted and replaced with the words:

‘recognises and supports the immediate extra £200,000 earmarked by Cabinet at its March meeting to more than double pothole repairs to the roads and Redways of Milton Keynes by investing in new and innovative technology, and welcomes the implementation of the Council Plan commitment to fix more pothole clusters, which will further improve highways and Redways;”

On being put to the vote the recommendation was declared carried by acclamation.

**RESOLVED –**

That this Council

- (a) thanks the staff and contractors of the Council who went above and beyond the call of duty working round the clock to keep the city moving and the vulnerable safe in the recent wintry weather;
- (b) acknowledges that this was a multifaceted response with many unseen people working in ways that many would not identify to make sure that the Council’s response was complete, these included volunteer drivers of 4x4 vehicles helping to get trained staff to those in need and meals to many who needed them;
- (c) understands that while Milton Keynes was not as bad as many parts of the country with the adverse weather it received, it was the worst seen for a number of years;
- (d) remembers that there have been a number of changes to the way that winter preparedness is undertaken in the past few years;
- (e) requests Cabinet to ensure that:
- (i) a comprehensive review of the response to winter weather is undertaken which looks to highlight those things that have worked well and ensure that these remain the case in future years, but which also highlights the things that could be improved and asks that recommendations come forward about how these things could be improved in the future;

- (ii) the review is overarching covering all facets of the response to the people of Milton Keynes, not necessarily just the Council, and it is undertaken by someone with seniority and knowledge of all areas, in time for the appropriate scrutiny committee to consider the report in time to influence the budget build process for 2019/20;
- (f) further acknowledges that the ramifications of the cold weather lasts after the temperature lifts and therefore recognises and supports the immediate extra £200,000 earmarked by Cabinet at its March meeting to more than double pothole repairs to the roads and Redways of Milton Keynes by investing in new and innovative technology, and welcomes the implementation of the Council Plan commitment to fix more pothole clusters, which will further improve highways and Redways; and
- (g) requests the Cabinet member with responsibility for Public Realm services to produce, at the earliest opportunity, a report about the state of the highway network and provide regular updates on progress in repairing it.

**CL121**

**HOUSING SUPPLY**

Councillor Crooks moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Ferrans:

“That the Council:

- (a) takes note of the Prime Minister's Housing statement on Monday 5 March;
- (b) aware of the number of unbuilt houses with planning permission that are such an issue in Milton Keynes, supports the proposal to relate future planning permissions to developer build out rates;
- (c) regrets the failure to enact the promise in the Autumn budget to allow councils to double the Council Tax liability on empty properties, and believes that this should be trebled;
- (d) laments the continuing failure, deplored by all political parties on the Local Government Association, to lift the borrowing cap on local councils which would allow Milton Keynes Council once again to build affordable houses for rent; and
- (e) instructs the Chief Executive to write to the Borough's MPs, and the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, with the content of this motion.”

On being put to the vote the motion was declared carried with 28 councillors voting in favour, 0 councillors voting against and 18 councillors abstaining from voting.

**RESOLVED –**

**That the Council:**

- (a) takes note of the Prime Minister's Housing statement on Monday 5 March;
- (b) aware of the number of unbuilt houses with planning permission that are such an issue in Milton Keynes, supports the proposal to relate future planning permissions to developer build out rates;
- (c) regrets the failure to enact the promise in the Autumn budget to allow councils to double the Council Tax liability on empty properties, and believes that this should be trebled;
- (d) laments the continuing failure, deplored by all political parties on the Local Government Association, to lift the borrowing cap on local councils which would allow Milton Keynes Council once again to build affordable houses for rent; and
- (e) instructs the Chief Executive to write to the Borough's MPs, and the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, with the content of this motion.

**CL122**

**BLETCHLEY PARK INSTITUTE OF DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY**

Councillor Brackenbury moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Cannon:

"That the Council:

- (a) recognises the rich legacy and heritage left by the wartime code-breaking operations at Bletchley Park;
- (b) recognises the need for a new generation of digital skills in areas such as cyber security which will contribute to the Learning 2050 project from the MK Futures Commission;
- (c) welcomes the proposal led by MK College to restore Block D of Bletchley Park for use as an Institute of Digital Technology, covering technical qualifications, apprenticeships and training to anticipate and address this demand;
- (d) welcomes the partnership working involved in this proposal between MK College, Bletchley Park Trust, Microsoft, City & Guilds and local employers;
- (e) notes that this project is dependent on a successful bid to the Government's Institutes of Technology fund, aiming to create a pipeline of highly technically skilled young people, and that the bid was submitted on 1 March; and
- (f) asks the Group Leaders to write to the Department of Education to make the cross-party political support for this bid clear, in addition to the statement of support from the Council, attached to the bid document."



On being put to the vote the motion was declared carried by acclamation.

**RESOLVED –**

That the Council:

- (a) recognises the rich legacy and heritage left by the wartime code-breaking operations at Bletchley Park;
- (b) recognises the need for a new generation of digital skills in areas such as cyber security which will contribute to the Learning 2050 project from the MK Futures Commission;
- (c) welcomes the proposal led by MK College to restore Block D of Bletchley Park for use as an Institute of Digital Technology, covering technical qualifications, apprenticeships and training to anticipate and address this demand;
- (d) welcomes the partnership working involved in this proposal between MK College, Bletchley Park Trust, Microsoft, City & Guilds and local employers;
- (e) notes that this project is dependent on a successful bid to the Government's Institutes of Technology fund, aiming to create a pipeline of highly technically skilled young people, and that the bid was submitted on 1 March; and
- (f) asks the Group Leaders to write to the Department of Education to make the cross-party political support for this bid clear, in addition to the statement of support from the Council, attached to the bid document.

**CL123**

### **RETURNING OFFICER'S FEES**

The Council considered the fees for the Council's Returning Officer for any Borough or Parish elections and Neighbourhood Plan Referendums during 2018/19.

The Mayor moved and the Deputy Mayor seconded that:

"That the schedule of fees and disbursements for acting as Returning Officer for Borough and Parish Elections and Neighbourhood Plan Referendums for 2018/19 be agreed."

On being put to the vote the motion was declared carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED –**

That the schedule of fees and disbursements for acting as Returning Officer for Borough and Parish Elections and Neighbourhood Plan Referendums for 2018/19 be agreed.

**CL124**

### **WARD BASED BUDGETS 2017/18**

The Council noted that for the period 1 April 2017 to 28 February 2018, applications totalling £48,566 have been approved.

**CL125**

**QUARTERLY REPORT ON SPECIAL URGENCY DECISIONS**

In accordance with Access to Information Procedure Rule 17.4, the Council noted that the Provisions for Special Urgency, as set out in Access to Information Procedure Rule 16, and Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16(j) were used once during the period 1 January 2018 to 10 March 2018, when the call-in provisions were waived in respect of the decision taken by the Cabinet member for Resources and Innovation on 22 February 2018 in respect of the Residual Waste Treatment Facility – Deed of Variation, due to the urgent need for a decision because of the likely prejudice to the Council's interest if implementation of the decision was to be delayed

**THE MAYOR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 9:59 PM**

21 March 2018

**MAYOR'S INITIALS**  .....