

PARTNERSHIPS AND GROWTH SELECT COMMITTEE

THURSDAY 28 OCTOBER 2010

7.30 PM

**MEETING ROOM 2, CIVIC OFFICES
CENTRAL MILTON KEYNES**

A G E N D A

www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/scrutiny

Chair: Councillor P Geary (Chair)
Councillors: Bradburn, Long, (Vice-Chair), D McCall, Morris, Tamagnini-Barbosa
(Vice-Chair), Wharton, White and Zealley

For more information about the meeting please contact Nick Blessing on (01908) 252226 or by e-mail nick.blessing@milton-keynes.gov.uk

What is Overview and Scrutiny?

Each local authority is required by law to establish an overview and scrutiny function to support and scrutinise the Council's executive arrangements.

Each select committee has its own remit as set out in its terms of reference but they each meet to consider issues of local importance.

They have a number of key roles:

1. Providing a critical friend challenge to policy makers and decision makers
2. Enabling the voice and concerns of the public
3. Driving improvement in public services.

The select committees consider issues by receiving information from and questioning officers and external partners to develop an understanding of proposals or practices. They then develop recommendations to provide to officers, Members or external partners that they believe will improve performance, or as a response to public consultations.

As select committees have no executive powers they often present their conclusions in the form of recommendations that can be provided to the Council, elected Members or other external agencies. Members will often request a formal response and progress report on the implementation of recommendations that they have provided to various parties.

Attending Meetings of Select Committees

Meetings of the select committees are held in public and are open for everyone to attend. If you would like to attend then please just turn up but if you can then let us know you are attending in advance of the meeting and whether or not you would like to make a representation to Members on behalf of yourself or others.

If there are specific issues that the meeting must consider in private then they will be asked to consider this at the meeting.

After the meeting the recommendations and Minutes of the meeting, as well as agendas and reports for the majority of the Council's public meetings are available via the Council's website at:

[\(http://cmis.milton-keynes.gov.uk/cmiswebpublic/\)](http://cmis.milton-keynes.gov.uk/cmiswebpublic/).

The Council's Six Strategic Aims

1. **Improve attainment and safeguard children** - working to narrow the gap between those who do well and those who do not, whilst raising expectations of what all children and young people can achieve.
2. **Encourage all sections of our community to get along well together and to make a positive contribution** - promote and support a strong cohesive community that will allow individuals to contribute within it.
3. **Create an environment in which we all feel safe** - working towards a safer community free from crime, discrimination and health related issues.
4. **Develop an economy with a sustainable and long-term future** - providing Milton Keynes a firm foundation for continued growth for businesses and housing.
5. **Improve health and ensure a high quality of life for all aspects of the community** - ensuring everyone in Milton Keynes has the opportunity and support they need.
6. **Develop sustainable transport solutions** - ensuring movement around Milton Keynes meets the requirements for present and future growth to allow easy mobility around the Borough.

Terms of Reference

1. To scrutinise the role, performance and effectiveness of the Local Strategic Partnership.
2. To scrutinise the role, performance and effectiveness of the Thematic Partnerships which report to the Local Strategic Partnership.
3. To monitor the delivery of the Local Area Agreement.
4. To review progress against the Sustainable Community Strategy and related documents.
5. To contribute to the development of future versions of the Sustainable Community Strategy.
6. To review the involvement of the Council in other strategic partnerships to ensure that the relationship adds value to the social, environmental, or economic well-being of the citizens of Milton Keynes.
7. To monitor progress in the delivery of the Milton Keynes and South Midlands Plan.
8. To scrutinise the work of the Milton Keynes Partnership.
9. To seek to ensure that the anticipated needs and aspirations of future Milton Keynes' residents are met in the planning and delivery of new developments.
10. To liaise with other appropriate scrutiny bodies in neighbouring local authorities on issues of growth in the areas adjacent to Milton Keynes' boundaries.

11. To scrutinise the involvement of the Council in regional and national organisations to ensure that the involvement provides value and benefit to Milton Keynes.
12. To conduct such other scrutiny of partnerships, growth and regional and national issues as may arise from time to time, whilst recognising that the scrutiny of growth, partnership working and regional and national issues will form a fundamental part of the work of other Select Committees when considering matters under their remits.

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Apologies

3. Disclosures of Interest

Members and officers to disclose any personal or prejudicial interests they may have in the business to be transacted.

4. Minutes

To approve, and the Chair to sign as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting of the Partnerships and Growth Select Committee held on 28 July 2010 (Item 4) (**Pages 7 to 13**).

5. Regional Structures: Opportunities and Issues

To consider Item 5 (**Pages 14 to 20**)

6. Low Carbon

To consider Item 6 (**Pages 21 to 22**), which will be presented by the Assistant Director (Regulatory Services).

Minutes of the meeting of the PARTNERSHIPS AND GROWTH SELECT COMMITTEE held on WEDNESDAY 28 JULY 2010 at 7.30 pm

Present: Councillor P Geary (Chair)
Councillors Bradburn, Long, D McCall, Morris, Wharton, White and Zealley.

Officers: B Sandom (Corporate Director Environment), P Wheeler (Senior IT and E-Government Manager), L Bailey (IT Consultant), N Sankersingh (Senior Planning Officer [Infrastructure Delivery], S Evans (Strategic Environmental Infrastructure Manager), J Entwistle (Growth Co-ordination and Delivery Manager) and F Bower (Overview and Scrutiny Officer)

Also Present: Councillors Bint, Crooks, Dransfield and Hopkins
Callum Knowles (Expert Witness on Broadband)
Ian Adkins (Analysys Mason)

Members of the public: 8

PG10 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Councillor White declared a personal interest in the Item (Broadband and Digital Infrastructure in Milton Keynes), as the Chair of the National Energy Foundation, the Secretary of a local branch of the Federation of Small Businesses and a member of Milton Keynes Partnership.

Councillor Crooks declared a personal interest in the Item (Broadband and Digital Infrastructure in Milton Keynes), as the Chair of ConnectMK.

Councillor Bint declared a personal interest in the Item (Broadband and Digital Infrastructure in Milton Keynes), as a member of the Broadband for Milton Keynes Group.

PG11 MINUTES

RESOLVED -

That the Minutes of the meetings of the Partnerships and Growth Select Committee held on 25 May and 23 June 2010, be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record, subject to the following amendments to the minutes of 23 June:

- Councillor White declared a personal interest in Item 6 (Enabling the Development of Central Milton Keynes) as a Member of the United Sustainable Energy Agency
- Councillor Long declared a personal interest in Item 6 (Enabling the Development of Central Milton Keynes) as an employee of a company working with the Homes and Communities Agency.

PG12

BROADBAND AND DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE IN MILTON KEYNES

The Committee received a presentation from officers on the benefits and challenges presented by broadband technology and realistic objectives for Milton Keynes. Members noted that:

- Superfast broadband access would provide download speeds of up to 100 Megabits per second.
- ConnectMK provided some Milton Keynes residents with wireless Internet access.
- Fibre optics were considered more future-proof than earlier types of infrastructure.
- 47% of people reported a need for daily access to the Internet.
- ‘Telemedicine’ required a very fast Internet connection.
- Superfast broadband added value to properties; however, it was preferable that this should not have to be retro-fitted.
- The Secretary of State responsible for broadband had announced that there was not sufficient funding in place for the Government to achieve universal provision of two Megabits per second by 2012 but it was planned that this should be attained by 2015.
- The Government was concentrating on bringing provision of Internet access to rural areas up to the level of provision to urban areas.
- The Digital Infrastructure Strategy covered the digital switchover in April 2011 as well as broadband and was intended to enable co-ordination under the leadership of the Council.
- Virgin Media and BT Openreach had been requested to send representatives to the meeting but had not done so.

Members noted the following written submissions:

- (i) A response from BT Openreach on the success of the fibre optic trial and its plans for future fibre optic deployment;
- (ii) A submission from a web developer working in Shenley Lodge on local deficiencies in broadband provision and the effect on private and business use of the Internet.

Members of the public raised concerns that 4,000 houses in Wavendon Gate were excluded from the fibre optic trial and expressed the opinion that small businesses in village communities would campaign particularly vigorously to bring forward better Internet access. If the means of joining the trial were better publicised, that would create the commercial demand that was needed. Provision to certain areas, such as rural or deprived ones, might not be as commercially viable.

The representative from Analysys Mason, the consultancy firm that had developed the Digital Infrastructure Strategy for Milton Keynes, outlined the implications on this of Government announcements. Members noted that the commitment to universal broadband provision had been delayed, and the overlap between this provision and that of superfast broadband was to be explored in greater depth. This should mean that more should be accomplished by 2015, but some areas would be without any provision for longer.

None of the activities called for in the Strategy would be prevented by the delay in provision but their profile would be altered. Co-ordination could be affected by the closure of Regional Development Agencies. MKSM was already carrying out work on broadband, and the Council should keep itself abreast of developments. Devolving the work to Local Enterprise Partnerships might provide a solution.

The Expert Witness on Broadband Provision reported the advantages of 'next generation' broadband to the Committee. Members noted that:

- It would create employment and fuel economic growth. Regional Development Agencies such as that in Cornwall were expecting a GDA increase of as much as 12% as a result of a large roll-out.
- With broadband, children were able to attain more educationally, by means of researching on a protected network.
- Social inclusion could be reinforced; it could cost a person who was not on broadband an extra £560 per year for such items as insurance.
- Better access to health and welfare could be provided by means of 'telemedicine'. A recent NHS Connect study concluded that 30% of hospital consultants' appointments could be carried out online.
- Access to public services could be improved. The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs had made it easier and cheaper for farmers to complete their returns online. Where citizens could access the Internet, they could see webcast meetings, information could be given to them more efficiently and they could ask questions more easily.

He highlighted the following areas of the Strategy as particularly important:

- Engagement with BT and Virgin. It would be important to discuss provision with other carriers as well. It was to be hoped that the Government would address the sharing of infrastructure soon. In Saltash, it had been shown that provision to even a small number of homes could be viable if infrastructure was shared.
- Planning permissions and the use of Section 106, which could aid provision; Ashford had enabled delivery of 50 Megabits per second to new properties through the use of Section 106 money. For maximum sustainability, cabling should always be by means of ducts put in place at the time properties were built rather than later.

Members noted the following issues that the Council would have to take into account in setting up infrastructure:

- The Council would be both facilitator and consumer and would have access to networks at cost price. This would provide an opportunity to extend ConnectMK.
- The Council should consider extension of provision into rural areas in the light of consultation with residents. It should be possible for small companies to work with the Council and use its infrastructure to help to provide this service. This was legitimate and an efficient use of resources.
- The landscape in telecommunications was changing quickly. Future-proofing, and hence ducting, was important. Developers could negotiate with BT for provision of infrastructure, with a third party being formed afterwards to maintain the duct; there were several emerging business cases for ownership of the duct.
- The Council should apply for Milton Keynes to be a test area for the enforced sharing of infrastructure.
- Wireless provision was attractive but most suited to highly populated areas. It would always be part of the solution, though for many people only as the final part of the network from the cabinet into the property.
- If wireless were the only form of provision to Milton Keynes, the capacity of one broadband frequency would not be sufficient.
- Switching off analogue signals for radio and television communications would make frequencies available for smart metering. The lower the frequency, the better the penetration into buildings.

Members of the public made the following comments:

- The trial of wireless provision to social housing in Manchester had been a success.
- Future-proof Internet provision to properties was important for the future of employment and the economy in Milton Keynes.

- Broadband deprivation in Milton Keynes was three times the national average.
- The urban-rural divide was not the only factor differentiating provision in Milton Keynes; some rural areas such as Olney had comparatively good provision, whereas some growth areas attained speeds of only half a Megabit per second.
- Social housing would need to be enabled for digital switchover. This was particularly important because the approximately 10% of residents who were most in need of help were also the greatest users of Council services and those who would most benefit from being able to access them online.
- Infrastructure could be provided by existing networks such as ja.net, the education and research network.
- Businesses had a particular need for fast broadband provision as 'cloud' computing required this.
- Small businesses had an important economic impact on Milton Keynes. If broadband provision were not improved they might move away, which would have an effect across other local businesses.
- Becoming an Internet Service Provider could provide the Council with revenue.
- The Council's main role in regard to the Digital Infrastructure Strategy should be to ensure future-proofing of provision.
- Milton Keynes, once a leader in communications technology, had fallen behind.

Officers reported that broadband was included in the ConnectMK service at little additional cost. The people who would otherwise be excluded from use of broadband were generally the highest users of Council services and if they could be given access, this saved both them and the Council money. ConnectMK was a company limited by shares owned by the Council but it could issue rights and could work in partnership with others.

During discussion, Members raised the following points:

- Provision of broadband was not an isolated issue but was linked to employment, housing and the zero carbon agenda.
- The current network was using redundant technology. It was important that infrastructure should be future-proofed, yet because there was no sense of urgency, Milton Keynes was facing the same problems as it had a decade before.
- It was important to consider what action should be taken if Virgin only did part of what was needed or not for as long as was necessary.

- Risk analysis of power cuts should be carried out and action plans to ensure business continuity should be developed.
- The Council should engage with smaller IT companies and social enterprises in tackling the 'digital divide'.
- Whereas new technologies were increasing, opportunities were decreasing due to the current financial climate.
- The Regulator for Communications should be consulted on smart metering.
- Virgin should be challenged on their decision to pass digital signals through the analogue system after the analogue switch-off date.
- Businesses would be more concerned with upload speeds than download speeds, and currently it was impossible to upload large files such as detailed photographs.
- Fast broadband was becoming increasingly important as each connection was required to service several formats at once, for example high definition television, Internet radio and computer work.
- The use of 'cloud computing' should be promoted as this could save a great deal of carbon.
- Section 106 funding should be used to provide ducting or 'fibre to the cabinet' in areas such as Woburn Sands where development was to take place.
- The Council could not solve problems of provision but could only facilitate.
- Agreement on sharing of infrastructure would be difficult to reach.
- Solutions other than underground cable networks should be sought.

RESOLVED –

1. That the following be noted:
 - (i) The Digital Infrastructure Strategy and the associated recommended Action Plan
 - (ii) Changes that have occurred since its publication
 - (iii) The urgency of delivering the infrastructure programme.
2. That the BT Openreach fibre trials and the next generation broadband initiative be welcomed, but that the additional need to engage small Communications Service Providers so that they can play their role also be noted.
3. That Virgin be requested to explain its decision to use the analogue system to transmit digital signals after the analogue switch-off date.

4. That the development of ConnectMK to become an established service provider be supported
5. That the Cabinet be informed of the following concerns of the Committee and that failure to address them will have a serious detrimental impact on the future development of the city:
 - (i) The need to engage with BT, Virgin and also other potential broadband providers;
 - (ii) The need to extend provision into rural areas in the light of consultation with residents;
 - (iii) The need to apply for Milton Keynes to become a test area for the enforced sharing of infrastructure;
 - (iv) The need to future-proof provision of broadband.
6. That the Select Committee revisit the issue of broadband provision in six months' time and that the Cabinet Member and representatives from Virgin and BT be formally asked to attend to give evidence.
7. That the Cabinet be recommended to consider the use of Section 106 and MK Partnership tariff money to ensure that broadband objectives are met.

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 10.15 PM

28 October 2010

Regional Structures: Opportunities and Issues

Report authors: Ian Haynes (Chief Spatial Planner); Roland Payne (Housing Needs Manager)

Contributors: Paul Gibson (Housing Policy and Development Officer); Pam Gosal (Corporate Head of Economic Development), Jonathan Entwistle (Growth Coordination & Delivery Manager)

1. Purpose

1.1 To highlight to the Committee the current issues for Milton Keynes following the abolition of regional structures and work in progress.

2. Background

2.1 The decision of the government to abolish regional structures and strategies has had, and will continue to have, significant implications for Milton Keynes, particularly when other changes to government spending and structures are taken into account. The work required will be considerable and could lead to substantial exposure for the Council in terms of risk, reputation, costs and legal challenges.

2.2 The implications include:

- (a) The opportunity to review the housing targets in the Core Strategy.
- (b) Changes to funding for growth and regeneration; and as a result of the Comprehensive Spending review, it is likely the level of funding to support growth and development infrastructure will be far below the levels of recent years.
- (c) A change to the working relationships between neighbouring local authorities based on common interest rather than fixed regional boundaries.
- (d) The possibility of a new Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) covering the South East Midlands; this would replace the current MKSM sub-regional arrangements and cover a slightly different area. The LEP should have strong private sector involvement and ideally a private sector chair
- (e) The LEP is likely to have a significant role in coordinating major funding applications to government.

- (f) The abolition of SEEDA at the same time will, amongst other things, bring in to doubt the future of our Digital Infrastructure Strategy.
- (g) The changing relationship with HCA and MKP will give the Council the opportunity for a more holistic approach to planning, control and delivery of the growth areas of the borough including retention of funding. However, this change in relationship with the HCA and MKP will provide additional workload through putting in place new structures and procedures.

3. **Issues**

Housing growth and the Core Strategy

- 3.1 Following the government's decision in June 2010 to revoke Regional Strategies, the Council took the opportunity to review the housing targets for the Borough in the Core Strategy. These were previously set at regional level in the South East Plan.
- 3.2 The Local Development Framework Advisory Group considered a range of very broad options for the level of future housing growth in the Borough, both higher and lower than the previous target set at regional level.
- 3.3 In September 2010, Council agreed a revised housing target of 28,000 homes for the period 2010 to 2026, based on average of 1,750 new homes per year. This was based on a realistic view of the amount of new housing that is likely to be delivered, based on past performance.
- 3.4 An average of 1,750 new homes per year is consistent with but slightly higher than the average level achieved in the last 5 years (1,660) in difficult market conditions, and also higher than the average achieved over the last 10 years (1,560) and last 20 years (1,610).
- 3.5 Recognising that the new housing target is well below the level of housing need and demand identified in the SHMA, the LDF Advisory Group wanted to see an early review of the methodology and conclusions of the SHMA by the Partnerships and Growth Select Committee.
- 3.6 This would feed into a 'bottom up' assessment of what the Borough and its residents need. This work should also reflect the impact of changing economic conditions and the real economic geography of the emerging Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), and would feed in to an early review of the Core Strategy once it had been adopted.

Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) - Policy Background

- 3.7 The Government's guidance on Planning and Housing is Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3: Housing (3rd Edition). This was updated by the Coalition Government in June 2010 (and thus PPS3 is still in force).

Paragraph 11 deals with assessing housing need and demand as follows:

“Local Development Documents and Regional Spatial Strategies policies should be informed by a robust, shared evidence base, in particular, of housing need and demand, through a Strategic Housing Market Assessment and land availability, through a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.”

3.8 Para 22 of PPS3 is also relevant as it stresses the importance of considering not just the SHMA but *“other local evidence”*

3.9 The Government has also set out a methodology for carrying out SHMAs in Planning Guidance. This is the *‘Strategic Housing Market Assessments Practice Guidance Version 2’* (August 2007). It sets out a **framework** that local authorities can follow to develop a good understanding of how housing markets operate. It promotes an approach to assessing housing need and demand which can inform the development of local development documents for housing policies, as set out in Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3).

3.10 The Guidance makes it clear that

“Housing markets are dynamic and complex. Because of this, strategic housing market assessments will not provide definitive estimates of housing need, demand and market conditions. However, they can provide valuable insights into how housing markets operate both now and in the future (page 9)”

Milton Keynes SHMA Update 2009

3.11 In 2006, Opinion Research Services (ORS) Limited completed the Milton Keynes Local Housing Assessment on behalf of Milton Keynes Council and English Partnerships (now Milton Keynes Partnership). The Assessment consisted of the following:

- (a) A 4 year annual rolling programme of personal household interviews (the Household Survey)
- (b) Appropriate secondary data sources (such as the Land Registry, NHS Central Register, ONS Migrations Statistics Unit).

3.12 The Household Survey was conducted between January and March 2006 and a total of 2,424 households were successfully interviewed. The sample was based on a simple random probability selection and identified non-response issues were addressed by a comprehensive statistical weighting process. ORS has noted that with regards to accuracy,

“A random sample should be representative of its population to within specified statistical limits, and the Milton Keynes Local Housing Assessment achieved 2,424 personal interviews with households randomly selected throughout the area. The analysis

for such a sample should represent the entire population of households to within ±2.0% points at the 95% level confidence – that is, if all households in Milton Keynes were interviewed, 19 times out of 20 the results would not differ by more than 2.0% points from the results for the sample. (Milton Keynes Local Housing Market Assessment 2006, page 83, paragraph A11.

- 3.13 The Household Survey was subsequently “topped-up” each subsequent year (2007, 2008 and 2009) by a further random sample of 800 households in each year. This was to maintain the accuracy of the data.
- 3.14 The table below (from Figure 101 of the consultation draft October 2009) sets out the main components of household flows in Milton Keynes over the next five years.

Summary of 5-Year Housing Requirements by Household Flows (Source: ORS Housing Market Model, Milton Keynes Housing Requirement Assessment 2007-2009.
Note: Figures may not sum due to rounding)

Housing Type	Inward Flow	Outward Flow	Net Requirement
5-Year Requirement			
Migration – households moving to and from Milton Keynes	19,940	9,665	10,276
Indigenous change – household formations and dissolutions	9,549	2,993	6,556
Established household moves	20,746	20,746	-
Total	50,236	33,404	16,832

- 3.15 ORS notes that “If this number of homes is not provided, one or more flows will have to change. The change in flows could include new households failing to emerge, overcrowding issues failing to be resolved or households leaving the area due to a lack of suitable available housing.”

Housing land supply

- 3.16 Although the housing target in the Core Strategy has been reduced, there is a considerable amount of land that is already committed and available for development, mostly with planning permission already approved.
- 3.17 As at April 2010, there were approximately 16,800 homes with planning permission. The progress of these sites is reviewed each month by the MKC / MKP Joint Housing Delivery Team, with the aim of identifying

and removing any 'blockages' that are preventing sites from being developed.

- 3.18 Subject to the time limits attached to the planning permission, the Council cannot control exactly when these sites will be developed as this will depend on decisions by developers, who will inevitably be reflecting on current market conditions and certainty in the future. This will be dependant on a number of factors.
- 3.19 For those sites that are covered by the Tariff, there is an incentive for developers to bring them forward for development before a 'longstop' date when the remaining Tariff payment becomes due regardless of whether all the houses on the site have been completed or not.
- 3.20 A report to the LDF Advisory Group (9 September 2010) demonstrated that there is just enough land identified within and adjoining in the city to demonstrate a 5 year land supply for housing in accordance with PPS3: Housing, but a shortfall in the remainder of the Borough. The Site Allocations DPD (part of the Local Development Framework) will provide an opportunity to address
- (a) The shortfall in the rest of the Borough; and
 - (b) Whether any additional sites are needed in or adjoining the city to provide some flexibility or contingency in supply if any sites do not progress as forecast, or do not yield the number of homes expected

Local Economic Assessment (LEA)

- 3.21 The LEA is being finalised to go to consultation mid October for 6 weeks. This is an evidence base rather than a strategy document so comments can only be on any gaps and must be based on real evidence. The document itself will be ready on the website in January 2011.
- 3.22 The Economic Development Strategy that will be pulled together from the LEA evidence base and Core Strategy and is scheduled to be considered by Cabinet in March 2011. This will be a high level document that will involve **all** economic development activities.

Jobs / homes ratio

- 3.23 The Core Strategy seeks to ensure that growth is jobs led and that the ratio between new jobs and new housing is 1.5 new jobs per 1 new dwelling. This is not something that will necessarily be achieved each year but will need to be monitored over a period of time.
- 3.24 If the homes / jobs relationship is out of balance, the Council and partners will need to look at ways of supporting and promoting whichever sector is lagging. This will need to be done in conjunction with the Local Enterprise Partnership who will be a key player in

identifying future needs and trends. The announcement on the setting up of the LEP is imminent.

- 3.25 The Council can indirectly influence changes in employment by ensuring sufficient land is available for development, of the right size and in the right place; by working with partners to attract and retain new businesses; and by supporting, wherever possible, the growth of existing companies.

Other factors

- 3.26 There are other factors that will have a role to play:

- (a) The Localism Bill, the Housing Revenue Account reforms and the New Homes Bonus arrangements are likely to come forward in 2011/2012. When further details are known these can be reported to the relevant Committees.
- (b) The role of the Homes & Community Agency, and in particular how and by whom decisions on grant for affordable housing will be made, is currently under review.
- (c) Funding for infrastructure: the total amount of public money available to fund the infrastructure and facilities need to serve new development is likely to be reduced, subject to announcements on the proposed New Homes Bonus. The system for securing developer contributions to such infrastructure (Planning Obligations / S106 agreements) is also changing following introduction of new Community Infrastructure Levy regulations in April 2010. Officers have started to review the existing guidance on planning obligations and are starting to prepare for the possible introduction of a CIL charging schedule in Milton Keynes. This involves extensive consultation across a wide range of local partners and stakeholders.
- (d) The role of Milton Keynes Strategic Housing Partnership / Local Development Framework Advisory Group in monitoring issues regarding development
- (e) The Regional Spatial Strategy also covered other matters such as minerals and provision for Gypsies and Travellers. In view of the abolition of the RSS Milton Keynes Council is:
 - (i) Starting work on new Minerals Development Plan Documents. We have commissioned a study from the British Geological Survey on minerals reserves across the Borough. This will help to inform decisions over the future level of mineral extraction in the Borough.
 - (ii) Continuing to bring forward for development sites allocated for Gypsies and Travellers in the Local Plan, to help meet the need for new sites identified in Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments for the area. The

government has stated their intention to revise national policy guidance on this issue and also to provide financial incentives to those authorities who develop sites where they are needed as part of the New Homes Bonus

- (f) There is also a requirement for cooperation between local authorities. For MK, existing arrangements such as the cross boundary Member Reference Group (MRG) are continuing pending decisions on the proposed South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership. The MRG does not have decision-making powers but meets every 2 months to discuss strategic issues of common interest that cut across local authority boundaries – e.g. at the most recent meeting, progress on East West Rail and the recent NHS White Paper.

4. **Future actions**

4.1 It should be noted that many of the factors which will influence growth are currently in a state of flux, but are important in building a picture for the future:

- (a) The Core Strategy is currently out to consultation and is scheduled to go forward for independent examination early in 2011. Depending on any issues arising from the consultation, a joint meeting could be set up between this Committee and the LDF Advisory Group.
- (b) ORS be requested to attend future meetings and present the methodology of the SHMA, and to discuss future updates of the SHMA. However, due to budget factors the survey will be run every four years and is not due for updating until 2013. In the light of this, there may be a need for be a joint meeting with this Committee and the LDF Advisory Group to decide on whether this should be brought forward.
- (c) Following the commencement of the LEA consultation, a briefing can be made to this Committee.
- (d) The Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) is also being set up, and engagement needs to made by this Committee with the LEP to confirm the commitment to moving forward on and understanding the jobs/homes ratio

4.2 A presentation will be prepared for the Committee on the matters in Section 4, which will allow for a full exploration of the issues and choices involved

28 OCTOBER 2010

Contact Officer: Phil Winsor- Assistant Director (Regulatory Services)

Low Carbon Briefing Note

Historic - MK Interim Climate Change Action Plan endorsed Full Council 2009

Current -

- Cabinet, October 2010
 - Draft Low Carbon Strategy
 - Draft Low Carbon Action Plan (based on work with Energy Saving Trust 2010)
- Milton Keynes 'City wide approach'
 - Low Carbon Prospectus 'vision statement' for a Sustainable Milton Keynes (launch October 2010) commissioned by Milton Keynes Council and the HCA
 - Milton Keynes Low Carbon Living Programme (MKLCLP) developed from 'SMART GRID' proposals.
 - Thematic approach with interdependencies
 - Public Engagement and Research
 - MK Smart 2020 (Central Networks)
 - Renewable Energy
 - Integrated Built Environment
 - Transport

Developing Issues-

- An Energy Service Company for Milton Keynes? visits planned to Southampton and Glasgow councils
- Use of corporate buildings for electricity micro-generation(photovoltaic-PV) fresh impetus due to new government Feed in Tariff's (FiT= financial only or the possibility of free electric vehicles)
- Interest from Germany – Munich& Mannheim in the MKLCLP /Smart Grid proposals and buildings /land based PV's
- MKLCLP considered to be innovative
- Outcome of the Central Networks bid to OFGEM to MK (£20m per year x 3) decision December 2010

Details of the Milton Keynes Low Carbon Living Programme Management Structure is attached as an **Annex**.

THE MILTON KEYNES LOW CARBON LIVING PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

