



Minutes of the meeting of the MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL held on TUESDAY 9 JANUARY 2007 at 7.30 pm

Present: Councillor Carstens (Mayor)
Councillor Barry (Deputy Mayor)
Councillors Box, Brock, Burke, Butler-Ellis, Campbell, Carruthers, Sandra Clark, Stephen Clark, Coventry, Crooks, Drewett, Eastman, Eaton, Edwards, Ferrans, Fraser, Geary, Gerrella, E Henderson, I Henderson, Holroyd, Hopkins, Hoyle, Irons, Jury, Latham, Legg, Lloyd, Long, Mabbott, D McCall, I McCall, McKenzie, Miles, Morris, Pendry, Pugh, Seymour, Snell, Tallack, Tamagnini-Barbosa, Tunney, Wharton, Williams and Wilson

Aldermen Bartlett and Howell were also present

Apologies: Councillors Bristow, Dransfield, Exon and Morsley and Alderman Ellis

Also Present: 28 members of the public

CL96 MINUTES

RESOLVED -

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 12 December 2006, be approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record.

CL97 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Councillor Sandra Clark declared a prejudicial interest in Item 5(b)(i) - Funding of NHS Services in Milton Keynes, as an employee of Milton Keynes Hospital.

Councillor Gerrella declared a prejudicial interest in Item 5(b)(i) - Funding of NHS Services in Milton Keynes, as his spouse was an employee of Milton Keynes Hospital.

Councillor Tamagnini-Barbosa declared a prejudicial interest in Item 5(b)(i) - Funding of NHS Services in Milton Keynes, as his partner was an employee of Milton Keynes Hospital.

Councillor E Henderson declared a personal interest in Item 5(b)(i) - Funding of NHS Services in Milton Keynes, as a Non-Executive Director of the Milton Keynes Primary Care Trust.

Councillor Geary declared a personal interest in Item 5(b)(iii) - Growth of Milton Keynes, as an owner of land in the area identified in the report commissioned by Buckinghamshire County Council and Aylesbury Vale District Council.

Councillor Williams declared a personal interest in Item 5(b)(vi) - Council Submission to the Cave Review of Social Housing Regulation, as a Board Member of a Registered Social Landlord.

Councillors Burke, Carruthers, Sandra Clark, Stephen Clark, Crooks, Drewett, Eastman, Eaton, Exon, Ferrans, Fraser, Gerrella, E Henderson, I Henderson, D McCall, I McCall, Pugh, Seymour, Snell, Tallack, Tamagnini-Barbosa and Williams declared a prejudicial interest in Item 7 - Application for Retrospective Member Indemnity - Part 3 Proceedings, having contributed to the legal costs incurred by Councillor I McCall.

CL98

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- (a) The Mayor congratulated the following residents of Milton Keynes who had been honoured in the New Year's Honours List:
- (i) Professor David Lock, awarded Commander of the Order of the British Empire for services to urban design; and
 - (ii) Miss Cheryl Anderson of Newport Pagnell, awarded Member of the Order of the British Empire for services to higher education.
- (b) The Mayor also announced the death of County Councillor Rodney Royston, who was Buckinghamshire County Council's Cabinet member for Strategic Planning and the County Council's observer on the Milton Keynes Partnership Committee.

CL99

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- (a) Question from Alderman Bartlett to Councillor I McCall (Leader of the Council):

“Will you please provide an update on the development of the ‘Cavendish Site’ at Fullers Slade, detailing what plans are in hand for the regeneration of this site, when completion is planned and details of consultations with English Partnerships, the local community and locally elected Milton Keynes Council and Stony Stratford Town Council Members?”

Answer from Councillor I McCall:

“As you are aware, the site is actually owned by English Partnerships and not Milton Keynes Council. Following the ballot last year about various regeneration options for Fullers Slade, residents decided all they wanted to see was the

redevelopment of the Cavendish Site rather than the redevelopment of the estate. It was expected that English Partnerships would bring forward redevelopment proposals for the Cavendish Site with new housing having the support of the residents of Fullers Slade.

I understand, having been updated on what is happening, that English Partnerships are now suggesting waiting for a few years before putting forward any redevelopment proposals. They have suggested putting temporary community facilities on the site, although there isn't actually any funding identified, either through the Council or Milton Keynes Partnership, to support such facilities. The Fullers Slade Action Group who are taking forward the social and economic regeneration of Fullers Slade, have been consulted about what English Partnerships are suggesting, and they are upset about it. They want to see the site coming forward for redevelopment as housing and as quickly as possible. The residents don't want to see further community facilities because they say there are sufficient. There is a new children's centre on Fullers Slade, which is a superb facility and there is apparently a new youth provision starting in Galley Hill on 18 January 2007. The people on Fullers Slade don't feel that they need community facilities and there doesn't seem to be funding anyway."

Alderman Bartlett asked a supplementary question which was answered by Councillor McCall.

- (b) Question from Mr S Potts to Councillor Jury (Leader of the Conservative Group):

"What representations have you made to your Conservative friends in Aylesbury and Buckinghamshire to attempt to get them to throw out the Buchanan Report?"

Answer from Councillor Jury:

"Buckinghamshire County Council is perfectly entitled to have commissioned and published its own report on behalf of its constituents. We do not agree with the findings and the recommendations contained within that report."

Mr Potts asked a supplementary question which was answered by Councillor Jury.

- (c) Question from Mr J Mitchell to Councillor I McCall (Leader of the Council):

"What infrastructure will be created to support the proposed development east of the M1 Motorway?"

Answer from Councillor I McCall:

"I believe you are talking about the Buchanan proposals commissioned by Buckinghamshire County Council and

Aylesbury Vale District Council, which are suggesting, along with Milton Keynes Forum, that a new development be built to the east of the motorway. I understand, although I have not read the whole report, that it is suggesting some new road links across the motorway. One of the links will come in to the Northfield Roundabout, which is an extremely congested roundabout as it takes the traffic to and from the M1, and that it is probably one of the only spots in Milton Keynes where there is considerable congestion at the moment. The idea of bringing even more traffic from a new development into an already congested area, where we are already having to spend a lot of money to relieve that congestion, is complete lunacy. Bridge links across the motorway are extremely expensive and will cost several £million each. The cost of that will have to be found.

I imagine the report is talking about providing the schools and other infrastructure that would have to go alongside development, but the one that is of particular interest is the road infrastructure in an area that is already very, very difficult.”

Mr Mitchell asked a supplementary question which was answered by Councillor McCall.

- (d) Question from Mrs J Mitchell to Councillor I McCall (Leader of the Council):

“Why when Option 6 has been thrown out is it now back on the table without consultation?”

Answer from Councillor I McCall:

“I am asking that myself. Many of you will have seen the public consultation leaflet, which went out over the summer. It clearly shows no development to the east of the M1, which was Option 6. That was clearly discarded. This document, which went out for public consultation, was signed up to by Milton Keynes Council, Mid-Bedfordshire District Council, Buckinghamshire County Council, Bedfordshire County Council and Milton Keynes Partnership. The public was consulted on these proposals, i.e. no housing to the east of the motorway, and now the County Council has tried to stitch us up by commissioning a report which tries to rubbish the strategy that the consultation was based on, and to come up with proposals on which people have had no opportunity to comment.”

- (e) Question from Ms S Martin to Councillor I McCall (Leader of the Council):

“Junction 14 is at a standstill tonight because of a crash on the M1.

How can any sane person propose a new town of up to 12,500 houses just the other side of that Junction?"

Answer from Councillor I McCall:

"It is not, as you will appreciate, this Council that is suggesting this. It is a report that has been commissioned by Buckinghamshire County Council and Aylesbury Vale District Council, despite the consultation that took place over the summer. I think the proposals are completely mad. I don't think anyone in their right mind would be proposing this. I have asked officers of the Council to commission our own report to challenge the Buchanan report, because I think we all feel that the report is flawed and that we need to highlight all these flaws"

- (f) Question from Ms C Jackson to Councillor Sandra Clark (Cabinet Member responsible for Schools):

"The waiting list for schools is incorrect and discriminates. I was told in December 2005 that this would be reviewed. I am now told that it won't be. I am willing to go to prison in order to get this waiting list reviewed.

What lengths will the Council go to in order to continue this discrimination?"

Answer from Councillor Sandra Clark:

"Your concerns were only brought to my attention earlier today. I believe it relates to one particular school. I know that not all schools keep waiting lists. I am aware that officers have, today, been in contact with you via e-mail. I need to go and meet with those senior officers to discuss the matter in full. I will respond to you in person as soon as I am in receipt of all of the facts."

Ms Jackson asked a supplementary question which was answered by Councillor Sandra Clark.

CL100

REPORTS FROM CABINET AND COMMITTEES

Cabinet - 19 December 2006

Cultural Strategy

Councillor Williams moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 19 December 2006, which was seconded by Councillor D McCall:

"That the Submission Draft of the Waste Development Plan Document be approved for submission to the Secretary of State."

On being put to the vote the recommendation was declared carried with 34 Members voting in favour, 12 Members voting against and 1 Member abstaining from voting.

RESOLVED -

That the Submission Draft of the Waste Development Plan Document be approved for submission to the Secretary of State.

CL101 PROCEDURAL ANNOUNCEMENT

The Mayor announced that he would be bring forward the Item on the Growth of Milton Keynes to this point in the meeting.

CL102 GROWTH OF MILTON KEYNES

Councillor I McCall moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Seymour:

"That this Council:

1. is committed to securing growth that is advantageous for Milton Keynes, subject to the provision of timely infrastructure;
2. regrets the separate proposals of Buckinghamshire County Council and Aylesbury Vale District Council to:
 - (a) target the area east of the M1 for future development;
 - (b) propose a doubling of the number of houses within the current city, above that originally proposed in the growth strategy; and
3. affirms its belief that the area to the south west of Milton Keynes affords the best rationale for an urban extension in support of sustainable development and cross-regional linkages."

Councillor Hopkins moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Geary and accepted by the mover of the motion:

"That the following additional clause be added to the end of the motion:

- '4. is committed to the fullest possible debate on the future of Milton Keynes and as such will hold a special meeting of the Full Council in either February, March or April 2007, with a single agenda item on the Growth of Milton Keynes, to enable every Member of this Authority to have their say through the broadest possible debate and with the objective of developing a shared vision for the future of Milton Keynes.'"

The Council heard from one member of the public on this item.

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

RESOLVED -

That this Council:

1. is committed to securing growth that is advantageous for Milton Keynes, subject to the provision of timely infrastructure;
2. regrets the separate proposals of Buckinghamshire County Council and Aylesbury Vale District Council to:
 - (a) target the area east of the M1 for future development;
 - (b) propose a doubling of the number of houses within the current city, above that originally proposed in the growth strategy; and
3. affirms its belief that the area to the south west of Milton Keynes affords the best rationale for an urban extension in support of sustainable development and cross-regional linkages.
4. is committed to the fullest possible debate on the future of Milton Keynes and as such will hold a special meeting of the Full Council in either February, March or April 2007, with a single agenda item on the Growth of Milton Keynes, to enable every Member of this Authority to have their say through the broadest possible debate and with the objective of developing a shared vision for the future of Milton Keynes.

(Councillor Geary declared a personal interest in this Item.)

CL103

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

- (a) Question from Councillor E Henderson to Councillor Long:

“At the last Council meeting, I asked you a question because you had suggested, during the debate on the Bletchley Schools Review, that the Headteacher of Abbeys Primary School had, some years ago, been in favour of her school closing. Christine Burnett, Headteacher of Abbeys Primary School, has written to John Moffoot and copied it to you, and, in part, her letter says:

‘I would like to point out to you that Councillor Long’s recollection “that Christine Burnett was very much in favour of closing the school” is completely inaccurate. I have worked extremely hard alongside my parents, staff and governors to keep Abbeys Primary School open, and there will be many people who would be able to testify to that. It gives me great concern that an inaccurate statement as this should appear in a public document, as people who do not know me might think it is true’.

In light of this, will you now admit that your recollection was faulty and that the Headteacher certainly wants to keep her school open and not help it to close?”

Answer from Councillor Long:

"Following the last meeting, I discussed the issue with a number of colleagues who have clearly got better memories than me. I think it is fair to say that their recollection of what I said was not, in fact, the case. I withdraw what I said and I apologise to the lady concerned."

Councillor E Henderson asked a supplementary question, which was answered by Councillor Long.

(b) Question from Councillor Hoyle to Councillor I McCall:

"A resident in my area raises the problem of cyclists careering around on footpaths and redways in an inconsiderate, if not downright dangerous, manner and so I ask the Leader of the Council:

1. will you write to all local schools in Milton Keynes, requesting them to inculcate consideration and good manners, on an ongoing basis, in their pupils whilst riding their bicycles on the redways and other footpaths; and
2. what else can the Council do to encourage the cycling classes to show courtesy and consideration especially towards pedestrians?"

Answer from Councillor I McCall:

"Your question implies that it's the children of Milton Keynes who are racing around on bikes and causing a danger to everybody. When we discussed this in our Group meeting earlier, everyone thought it was adults who were more guilty of this. However, I understand that there is actually a Redway Code in existence as to how you should behave on the redways. We are happy to send that out to local schools so that children are made aware and maybe we should be publicising it more widely.

The other point to make is that given that most of our roads system is 60mph and 70mph grid roads, I think most of us feel that we would rather see cyclists on redways cycling responsibly. If you have any other suggestions about how we could improve people's conduct on the redways, I am sure that officers will be pleased to hear them."

Councillor Hoyle asked a supplementary question, which was answered by Councillor I McCall.

(c) Question from Councillor Lloyd to Councillor Sandra Clark:

"Could you explain the reason for unilaterally raising the threshold required to qualify for School Action Plus for pupils with Special Educational Needs?"

Answer from Councillor Sandra Clark:

“The threshold requirements for School Action Plus have not changed since 2004. What has changed is that we have implemented a new moderation process and the document entitled ‘Funding for Pupils with Special Educational Needs at School Action Plus in Primary Schools’ was published in October 2006. It sets out a new process which tries to ensure fairer distribution of Special Educational Needs funding but, more importantly, enables the quality assurance of Individual Education Plans for children under School Action Plus.

It was felt that we needed to have some consistency right across the city for all pupils, and that need for consistency came to light via the Special Educational Needs Strategy Group, which consists of some officers and representatives from schools. The consultation document was drawn up to deal with the matter and went to stakeholders in February 2006. The changes were then made and the final paper was produced in October 2006. I believe that most Special Educational Needs Co-ordinators have attended the relevant training courses.

I think what the document has thrown up though, is that the thresholds themselves have now become a concern to some of the schools, and a small working group has been set up to look at this further. When we agreed the thresholds back in 2004, they were comparable, if not slightly more favourable, than our statistical neighbours, but now, three years on, I think it is healthy to conduct a review. I think the most important thing is that all schools in Milton Keynes do use the same criteria. Perhaps the Learning and Development Policy Development Committee might wish to look at the piece of work once it has been finalised.”

Councillor Lloyd asked a supplementary question, which was answered by Councillor Sandra Clark

(d) Question from Councillor Campbell to Councillor I Henderson:

"At the Council meeting in October 2006, I asked you about this Council's worsening performance on void properties, where re-let times had risen under your watch from 39.83 days in 2003/04 to 53.39 days in August 2006. You promised to sort the problem out. This month, official figures have shown that void performance has actually deteriorated further to 58.3 days. Could you explain just what exactly you plan to do to sort out this problem?"

Answer from Councillor I Henderson:

“The void indicator for October, November and December 2006 was 58 days and remains at that amount, which is not good. I looked into this particular performance indicator and it is very interesting what is hiding underneath it. In this past

couple of months we have re-let 39 hard to let sheltered units. These are units which have been empty for more than a 100 days. As long as they remain in the hard to let bracket, they are not counted in the figures and the moment they are re-let, they are counted in the figures, so you can imagine what that does to the average. A perverse indicator indeed because all the efforts of the staff to re-let them have actually been paid back by an indicator that is going in the wrong direction.

The second point about that is that we are, as I am sure you are aware, decommissioning a couple of sheltered units at the moment. When you actually remove the sheltered units from the count, what we are left with is 49 days, which is an improvement. I am not saying for a moment that that is a good performance, but at least it is moving in the right direction.

As to what plans I may have, actually the plans are in place and are being implemented. I have three pages of examples that officers have put together, and I will be glad to let you have them at some point. I will give you three examples of things that have been put in place. Firstly, we now use key safes, so that when a contractor goes the keys are in one place and everybody can access them. Secondly, there are now visits by prospective tenants to tenanted properties which have not yet been emptied and, thirdly, we have implemented a new tracking process for the voids as well as all the contractors working together. Taking into account all of that together, the improvement is in place and it is beginning to happen.

I would like to finish by saying that would you ask me again in three months time the same question, so that I will have pleasure in telling you that all these plans being implemented at the moment actually produced the goods. I can assure you that this is an area of work that I keep a very, very close watch on."

Councillor Campbell asked a supplementary question, which was answered by Councillor I Henderson.

(e) Question from Councillor Miles to Councillor E Henderson:

"Will you please bring Council up to date on the short and long term arrangements and proposals for the housing and management of the Music Service?"

Answer from Councillor E Henderson:

"With regard to the management of the Music Service, Members of the Council are probably aware that, with great regret, Stephen James, the Head of the Music Service, has resigned and is leaving at Easter. What we shall be doing, of course, and what, as far as I am aware, is already being initiated, is the normal procedure for replacing somebody who

leaves the service, because we are absolutely committed to the service and to its continuation.

In relation to accommodation, the loss of the accommodation at Stantonbury was regrettable but understandable. It has left a problem to be solved because the accommodation that is being used this year at Oxley Park and Shenley Brook End schools is a temporary arrangement, which had to be put in place very quickly and is by no means 100% satisfactory. Short term, we are investigating a number of options for accommodation from May / June 2007, which is when the Service has to vacate the Oxley Park space, in order for the school to use it from September 2007 as its numbers increase. In the slightly longer term, but I hope it will be very much medium term, our belief is that the best thing that we can do is to return it into some purpose built additional accommodation at one of our major secondary schools. I cannot, in public, say what the options are precisely that are being explored because, in some cases, they haven't yet been discussed with school governing bodies, only with headteachers."

(f) Question from Councillor I McCall to Councillor Long:

"Why have the Labour Group failed to contribute to the Council's response to the Examination in Public consultations? All three political parties have been asked to get involved in the response because it is a major issue for Milton Keynes, and we want to make sure that we have a response that we can all sign up to. You were given several opportunities to contribute, and your Group hasn't done so."

Answer from Councillor Long:

"We have made contributions at every single stage of the process over growth. In addition, we have talked to Ministers about various issues. We will be making a submission on the South East Plan, but it won't be with the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats."

Councillor I McCall asked a supplementary question, which was answered by Councillor Long.

(g) Question from Councillor Long to Councillor I Henderson:

"I have recently looked at the Council's letting policy, and my view is that the policy is potentially open to legal challenge. Would you look at the policy, discuss it with officers and perhaps come back to me, and other Members, in writing with your view on the legality? Can you also tell us when the Council is going to be moving to the new choice-based letting scheme, which councils around the country are moving to and is a legal requirement from the Government? Again, I will be happy to have this in writing, if you so wish."

Answer from Councillor I Henderson:

“I will be very happy to reply in writing if I knew what I was replying to. We are open to legal challenge on what? The letting policy is quite a lengthy and complex document. If you notice that there is something open to legal challenge, I would welcome you telling me what it is and I will certainly look into it.

With reference to the choice based lettings issue, we are already operating choice based lettings through our options interview. When applicants arrive at the Council, they are shown what is called the Property Pool, this shows what properties are available at the time they need them, whether they are in the private sector, in the Council's own ownership or the social landlords. They have a choice. They either wait if they want a house on the Lakes Estate, for example, and that might be in one or four weeks time because we are able to do that. We are actually operating a version of choice based lettings and it is a version that has been agreed with Government Office for the South East and the Government's Homelessness Team in London, which is when we were congratulated for the excellent work we were doing.”

Councillor Long asked a supplementary question, which was answered by Councillor I Henderson.

(h) Question from Councillor Wilson to Councillor I Henderson:

“Given the fact that you wish to gloat should the void turnaround figures improve, will you resign if they fail to do so in three months time?”

Answer from Councillor I Henderson:

“I seem to recall a very short period of time when you became Chair of the Housing Committee, but you didn't last very long because it was actually quite a hard job. At that point, our voids were actually double what they are now. I don't recall you resigning for that reason.”

Councillor Wilson asked a supplementary question, which was answered by Councillor I Henderson.

CL104

QUESTIONS TO THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE POLICE AUTHORITY

1. Question from Councillor Butler-Ellis:

“In relation to the Police Officer Strength data provided at the Full Council in November 2006, can the Police Authority tell us whether the respective figures are inclusive of Police Community Support Officers, Officers on 'Light Duties' and those who are on sick leave? if so, can the Authority give specific numbers for each group? If necessary, please use

average figures over a 12 month period and provide officer numbers, rather than hours lost.

It is of course a great concern to see that the abstraction level of officers in Walton Park Ward is high and I hope that this is not indicative of such poor resource across the borough, is this one of the reasons why the Police Authority feel that it is reasonable to charge the citizens of Milton Keynes twice for their police? Firstly through a direct contribution from the Council Tax, and secondly by asking for more money from the Parish Councils, who receive their precept from the Council Tax.”

The Council noted that these questions had been subject to separate correspondence with Councillor Butler-Ellis and that the answers would be circulated to Members once they were available.

2. Question from Councillor Eastman:

“With the implementation of the new Licensing Act some premises in Central Milton Keynes have been granted extended trading hours. Has this resulted in Thames Valley Police having to spend additional hours policing Milton Keynes City Centre, especially at weekends?

If so:

- (a) how many additional hours?
- (b) what police activity has been reduced to cover the extra hours policing the Milton Keynes City Centre at weekends?
- (c) has this caused any reduction in neighbourhood policing hours ?”

Answer from Councillor Crooks (Representative of the Police Authority appointed to answer questions on its behalf):

“The new Licensing Act allowed licensed premises to extend opening hours under certain circumstances. A number of premises within Milton Keynes chose to do so.

Policing of the City Centre at weekends is covered by Operation ‘DEBUS’. This comprises uniformed operational staff made up of 1 Police Sergeant and 8 Constables. Prior to the changes in the Licensing Laws these officers commenced duty at 1900hrs and worked until 0300hrs. They now work from 2000hrs until 0400hrs. Therefore, this has had no additional cost to the Basic Command Unit. However, it does impact on the time these officers can return to duty the following day.

Operation ‘DEBUS’ comprises officers who are selected on a rotational basis from a range of neighbourhoods and departments. The process is arranged to minimise

abstractions and to balance commitments fairly across the whole Basic Command Unit. Although the number may vary, generally speaking a typical Operation 'DEBUS' will contain 2 to 3 officers who would otherwise be neighbourhood based.

The alternative to this methodology, is to increase the number of officers on the Central Sector on a permanent basis thus reducing the numbers available elsewhere across the City.

In order to try to minimise the impact of 'DEBUS' the officers are generally deployed in two police vans. One of these vehicles is deployed early into the City Centre. The second vehicle is initially deployed onto neighbourhoods where problems have been occurring. The officers act as a Problem Solving Team and remain there until such times as the City Centre has become so busy that they have to deploy to the City."

3. Question from Councillor Eastman:

"At a recent meeting of Milton Keynes Council's Performance Review Panel the Panel was informed that there should be 77 neighbourhood police officers, but only 51 officers were in post, and these can be called away for other operations.

- (a) Of the 51 officers in post are any currently on long-term sick leave? If so, how many?
- (b) how often are officers called away to perform other operations ?
- (c) when can the residents of Milton Keynes, who pay for policing through the precept, expect the establishment of 77 officers to be brought up to full strength?"

Answer from Councillor Crooks (Representative of the Police Authority appointed to answer questions on its behalf):

"The numbers of officers in post, as Neighbourhood Police Officers, quoted at the Performance Review Panel was 51. It should be noted that this figure changes often on a daily basis and the information was used as an example of how police commanders need to balance resources in order to ensure operational effectiveness. By way of example the whole time equivalent at the present time (8 January 2007) is 69.27.

Of the 51 officers in post at the time of the November meeting, one officer was on long-term sick.

Area Beat Officers and Core-Reactive Officers are occasionally called away to perform duty at other operations. Again the numbers vary on a daily basis, and can include major incidents elsewhere in the Force, major sporting events, or other commitments elsewhere on the Milton Keynes Area, e.g. The National Bowl.

What was not made clear in the November figures was the additional resources deployed across the City as Response Units. These are termed Core Reactive Officers. Prior to 2004, all Core Reactive Officers were based at Milton Keynes Police Station. In 2004, 20 Core Reactive Officers were deployed to Bletchley and 16 to Wolverton. Their task was to provide emergency cover over and above that provided by Area Beat Officers. The Core Reactive officers provide a 24/7 cover 365 days per year.

It should also be noted that the Area anticipates a growth of up to 51 Police Community Support Officers to support Neighbourhood Policing. It is hoped these additional resources will be in post by March 2008.

The force does recognise the importance of neighbourhood officers and once neighbourhood policing has been rolled out a number of neighbourhood specialist officers will be identified in each Basic Command Unit. These will be as far as reasonably practicable protected from abstractions.”

4. Question from Councillor Eastman:

“At recent meetings it has emerged that the Community Policing team covering the east side of Middleton Ward was 40% to 80% understaffed due to long term sickness and other commitments for much of the last year. In addition at least one estate in that area is marked as ‘causing concern’ by the Police due to rising levels of anti-social behaviour and other crime.

Can the Police Authority explain:

- (a) the frequency with which staff allocation to cover such severe drops is reviewed?
- (b) the criteria on which they would reallocate staff to such an area?
- (c) why no additional staff were allocated to cover the shortfall?”

Answer from Councillor Crooks (Representative of the Police Authority appointed to answer questions on its behalf):

“Operational demand is reviewed by the Basic Command Unit on a daily basis and resources are allocated accordingly. Senior Managers review staff allocation frequently, with the necessity for review determined by demand at any given time. Staff are allocated according to operational need and to ensure effective performance. Therefore, neighbourhood officers cannot be viewed in isolation. Although an individual officer may not be working on their beat, it does not mean they are not working elsewhere on the Basic Command Unit, or that the area is not receiving police cover.”

5. Question from Councillor Mabbott:

“What performance standards do Thames Valley Police have for responding to members of the public who contact them by phone, post, e-mail or in person? Is there a specific set timescale within which people can expect an acknowledgement, then another one within which they can expect a further substantive response?”

Do the performance standards set out above apply only to matters formally reported to police stations and via police control room and given a Unique Reference Number? How does direct communication with individual police officers, such as the Chief Constable, or a sector inspector fit into the scenario?

How can a member of the public progress matters where there has been a limited or unsatisfactory response to direct communication with individual officers? What redress can be sought by a member of the public in the event of the nature of the enquiry or the quality of the response being disputed?”

Answer from Councillor Crooks (Representative of the Police Authority appointed to answer questions on its behalf):

“Thames Valley Police currently has targets for answering 90% of 999 calls within the national target of 10 seconds and answering 90% of non-emergency calls received within the switchboard to be answered within the national target time of 30 seconds.

There are no published Force targets for dealing with other forms of correspondence other than the mandatory 20 day reply target for Freedom of Information requests, however it does comply with the requirements of the National Quality of Service Commitment Contact with the Public (November 2005).

The normal route to progressing the limited or unsatisfactory response to direct communication would be through our Quality of Service Unit whose details are:

Quality of Service Unit
Thames Valley Police Headquarters
Kidlington
Oxford, OX5 2NX

E-mail: QoSUnit@thamesvalley.pnn.police.uk”

CL105

FUNDING OF NHS SERVICES IN MILTON KEYNES

Councillor I Henderson moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Stephen Clark:

“That this Council:

1. notes that the Government is funding the NHS in Milton Keynes at only 95% of what the Government itself says is Milton Keynes' fair funding share;
2. deplores the cuts that are being forced on both hospital and community health services in Milton Keynes as a result of this unfair funding; and
3. resolves to convey to the Strategic Health Authority and to Government that Milton Keynes' growing population needs more health services, not less.”

Councillor Long moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Wilson:

- “1. That clauses 1. and 2. be deleted and replaced with:
 - ‘1. welcomes the massive increase in NHS funding locally and nationally, by the Labour Government since 1997 after decades of under-investment and that this investment has been achieved at the same time as the economy has consistently grown with low inflation and interest rates;
 2. notes that the UK economy has grown in every quarter since Labour came to power, with employment up by two million and 300,000 more businesses since 1997 and that Britain is enjoying the longest period of sustained low inflation and interest rates since the 1960s;
 3. notes that Tories are planning to cut £17 billion in public spending and that this will take the country back to under funding of health services;
 4. notes that Milton Keynes Council has, since 1996, worked hard to build positive relationships and joint provision of services with the Primary Care Trust and that it will continue to support integration of health, housing and care services;
 5. is concerned that the Primary Care Trust and Hospital budgets are under severe pressure despite the massive increase in health investment, but notes that the way health care is provided needs to change and that the integration of housing, health and social care services with joint budgets is one positive feature of the positive close working between Council and the Primary Care Trust. The nature of health care needs to change with greater specialism coupled to a more localised role for GP practices and community based health services.’
2. That the existing clause 3. be renumbered as 6.”

On being put to the vote the amendment was declared lost with 13 Members voting in favour, 31 Members against and 0 Members abstaining from voting.

Councillor Hoyle moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Latham and accepted by the mover of the motion:

“That the following additional clause be added to the motion:

“welcomes the work being done by many groups and individuals to lobby for fair funding for Milton Keynes, including by ‘People’s Voices’, questions asked in the House of Commons by the Member of Parliament for Milton Keynes North-East, and petitions collected by local Conservative and Liberal Democrat activists.”

On being put to the vote the motion, as amended, was declared carried with 31 Members voting in favour, 13 Members against and 0 Members abstaining from voting.

RESOLVED -

That this Council:

1. notes that the Government is funding the NHS in Milton Keynes at only 95% of what the Government itself says is Milton Keynes' fair funding share;
2. deplures the cuts that are being forced on both hospital and community health services in Milton Keynes as a result of this unfair funding;
3. resolves to convey to the Strategic Health Authority and to Government that Milton Keynes' growing population needs more health services, not less; and
4. welcomes the work being done by many groups and individuals to lobby for fair funding for Milton Keynes, including by ‘People’s Voices’, questions asked in the House of Commons by the Member of Parliament for Milton Keynes North-East, and petitions collected by local Conservative and Liberal Democrat activists.

(Councillors Sandra Clark, Gerrella and Tamagnini-Barbosa declared prejudicial interests in this Item and left the meeting, taking no part in the discussion, or voting thereon.)

(Councillor E Henderson declared a personal interest in this Item.)

CL106

OLNEY CAMPUS OF OUSEDALE SCHOOL

Councillor Brock moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Hopkins:

“That this Council:

1. notes with concern the continued delays to the Olney Campus of Ousedale School that are forcing students to

either travel to a temporary school at Oakgrove or to be educated in less than satisfactory temporary classrooms at the Ousedale Campus in Newport Pagnell;

2. apologises to the parents of the affected students for the disturbance and disruption this has caused them and their children, and for the ineffective communication that has come from this Council during this time; and
3. requests the Audit Committee to appoint an experienced, independent person / company to investigate the Olney Campus project with the investigation looking into the whole scheme from conception to completion, paying particular attention to:
 - (a) the efficiency of the acquisition of the land on which the campus is being built;
 - (b) the design and planning process and the efficiency with which these were undertaken;
 - (c) the awarding of contracts for the design and construction phase of the project;
 - (d) the monitoring of external contractors at all stages by this Council; and
 - (e) who the Council can/should pursue for damages

with a view to the Audit Committee receiving a full report no later than its meeting scheduled to be held in September / October 2007.

Councillor E Henderson moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Eastman and accepted by the mover of the motion:

“(a) That the following additional clauses be added at the start of the motion:

- ‘1. welcomes the development of the Olney Campus of Ousedale School, which will provide superb educational and community facilities for Olney and neighbouring villages for many years to come;
2. acknowledges the invaluable collaboration with, and support from, Olney Town Council which made this project possible;’

(b) That the words ‘the ineffective’ be deleted from clause 2 and replaced with the words ‘any inadequacies in the’.”

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

RESOLVED -

That this Council:

1. welcomes the development of the Olney Campus of Ousedale School, which will provide superb educational and community facilities for Olney and neighbouring villages for many years to come;
2. acknowledges the invaluable collaboration with, and support from, Olney Town Council which made this project possible;
3. notes with concern the continued delays to the Olney Campus of Ousedale School that are forcing students to either travel to a temporary school at Oakgrove or to be educated in less than satisfactory temporary classrooms at the Ousedale Campus in Newport Pagnell;
4. apologises to the parents of the affected students for the disturbance and disruption this has caused them and their children, and for any inadequacies in the communication that has come from this Council during this time;
5. requests the Audit Committee to appoint an experienced, independent person / company to investigate the Olney Campus project, with the investigation looking into the whole scheme from conception to completion, paying particular attention to:
 - (a) the efficiency of the acquisition of the land on which the campus is being built;
 - (b) the design and planning process and the efficiency with which these were undertaken;
 - (c) the awarding of contracts for the design and construction phase of the project;
 - (d) the monitoring of external contractors at all stages by this Council; and
 - (e) who the Council can/should pursue for damageswith a view to the Audit Committee receiving a full report no later than its meeting scheduled to be held in September / October 2007.

CL107

NEW EQUALITY DUTIES

Councillor Campbell moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Long:

- "1. That this Council welcomes the new duties placed on local authorities as a result of the passing of the Equality Act 2006 and in particular:
 - (a) the new Disability Equality Duty that came into force in December 2006;
 - (b) the pending commencement of the Gender Equality Duty that comes into force in March 2007;

- (c) that these new duties build upon the Race Equality Duty introduced by the 2001 Race Relations Act;
 - (d) that all three duties require local authorities to:
 - (i) eliminate unlawful discrimination in the defined areas of race, disability and gender; and
 - (ii) promote equality of opportunity in the defined areas of race, disability and gender.
2. That the Council further welcomes the publication by this Council of its Disability Equality Scheme.
 3. That the Council agrees to ask the Cabinet to:
 - (a) bring forward proposals setting out how the new duty on gender will be implemented; and
 - (b) publish for Members and the public progress in meeting the Race Equality Duty.”

On being put to the vote the motion was declared carried with 34 Members voting in favour, 0 Members against and 11 Members abstaining from voting.

RESOLVED -

1. That this Council welcomes the new duties placed on local authorities as a result of the passing of the Equality Act 2006 and in particular:
 - (a) the new Disability Equality Duty that came into force in December 2006;
 - (b) the pending commencement of the Gender Equality Duty that comes into force in March 2007;
 - (c) that these new duties build upon the Race Equality Duty introduced by the 2001 Race Relations Act;
 - (d) that all three duties require local authorities to:
 - (i) eliminate unlawful discrimination in the defined areas of race, disability and gender; and
 - (ii) promote equality of opportunity in the defined areas of race, disability and gender.
2. That the Council further welcomes the publication by this Council of its Disability Equality Scheme.
3. That the Council agrees to ask the Cabinet to:
 - (a) bring forward proposals setting out how the new duty on gender will be implemented; and
 - (b) publish for Members and the public progress in meeting the Race Equality Duty.

COMMUNITY COHESION

Councillor Wilson moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Long:

- "1. That this Council notes:
 - (a) that in many areas there is a growing challenge of diversity and often a need to face challenges of deprivation, poor housing and social exclusion;
 - (b) the importance of strong inclusive communities that value all residents;
 - (c) that many communities across Milton Keynes are becoming more diverse and that this offers an opportunity to tackle deprivation and poor estate conditions; and
 - (d) that the development of cohesive communities requires action at both a strategic and a local level.
2. That this Council agrees to ask the Cabinet to:
 - (a) review, with representatives of the city's ethnic minority communities and parish and town councils, how community cohesion will be achieved in all major strategic plans and strategies;
 - (b) consider, with representatives of the city's ethnic minority communities and parish and town councils, how planning policy can be used to promote community cohesion;
 - (c) establish local plans, with representatives of the city's ethnic minority communities and parish and town councils, to promote community cohesion in all areas of Milton Keynes commencing with the most deprived areas first; and
 - (d) allocate £150,000 a year, beginning in the 2007/08 budget for three years to commence this work. "

Councillor I McCall moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Fraser and accepted by the mover of the motion:

- "(a) That clause 1(c) be deleted and replaced with:
 - '(c) that Milton Keynes is becoming an increasingly diverse community and this is to be welcomed;'
- (b) That clause 2 be deleted and replace with:
 - '2. That this Council supports the initiatives already being taken to promote community cohesion including:
 - (a) The Council's establishment of and support for the Council of Faiths which brings faith

communities together and provides a mechanism for consultation on issues affecting them;

- (b) Proposals in the Cabinet's budget for 2007/08 to establish a new fund of £50,000 for community cohesion, which was endorsed by the other political groups;
 - (c) The commissioning of a review of race infrastructure through the Local Strategic Partnership, which will result in the setting up of a Race Equality Partnership by the Racial Equality Council;
 - (d) The holding of three community cohesion events, with a fourth to take place this month to look at best practice models for community cohesion;
 - (e) Specific projects such as "Streetdreams" and "Valued friends".
- (c) That a new clause 3 be added to the motion as follows:
- ‘3. That this Council asks:
- (a) The Local Strategic Partnership to make community cohesion an even higher priority in the Community Strategy when it is reviewed this year;
 - (b) The Cabinet to ensure that community cohesion and the needs of a diverse community are taken into account in the development of the Council's new planning policies; and
 - (c) Milton Keynes Partnership to raise community cohesion much higher up its agenda as it takes forward plans for growth areas.’”

On being put to the vote the motion, as amended, was declared carried with 36 Members voting in favour, 0 Members against and 9 Members abstaining from voting.

RESOLVED -

1. That this Council notes:
- (a) that in many areas there is a growing challenge of diversity and often a need to face challenges of deprivation, poor housing and social exclusion;
 - (b) the importance of strong inclusive communities that value all residents;
 - (c) that Milton Keynes is becoming an increasingly diverse community and this is to be welcomed; and

- (d) that the development of cohesive communities requires action at both a strategic and a local level.
2. This Council supports the initiatives already being taken to promote community cohesion including:
- (a) The Council's establishment of and support for the Council of Faiths which brings faith communities together and provides a mechanism for consultation on issues affecting them;
 - (b) Proposals in the Cabinet's budget for 2007/08 to establish a new fund of £50,000 for community cohesion, which was endorsed by the other political groups;
 - (c) The commissioning of a review of race infrastructure through the Local Strategic Partnership, which will result in the setting up of a Race Equality Partnership by the Racial Equality Council;
 - (d) The holding of three community cohesion events, with a fourth to take place this month to look at best practice models for community cohesion; and
 - (e) Specific projects such as "Streetdreams" and "Valued friends".
3. That this Council asks:
- (a) The Local Strategic Partnership to make community cohesion an even higher priority in the Community Strategy when it is reviewed this year;
 - (b) The Cabinet to ensure that community cohesion and the needs of a diverse community are taken into account in the development of the Council's new planning policies; and
 - (c) Milton Keynes Partnership to raise community cohesion much higher up its agenda as it takes forward plans for growth areas.

CL109

COUNCIL SUBMISSION TO THE CAVE REVIEW OF SOCIAL HOUSING REGULATION

Councillor Long moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor McKenzie:

"That this Council agrees to ask the Cabinet to make a submission to the recently announced review and to promote within the submission support for:

- 1. social housing regulation to pass from the Housing Corporation to local authorities; and

2. the transfer of social housing investment from the Housing Corporation to local authorities along the same lines as the new London Mayoral role on investment.”

Councillor I Henderson moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Fraser and accepted by the mover of the motion:

“That the word ‘Cabinet’ be deleted from the first line of the motion and replaced with ‘Responsible Cabinet Member’ and the following additional clauses be added to the end of the motion:

- ‘3. making appropriate resources available to local authorities to take on this role.’”

On being put to the vote the motion, as amended, was declared carried with 35 Members voting in favour, 11 Members against and 2 Members abstaining from voting.

RESOLVED -

That this Council agrees to ask the Responsible Cabinet Member to make a submission to the recently announced review and to promote within the submission support for:

1. social housing regulation to pass from the Housing Corporation to local authorities;
2. the transfer of social housing investment from the Housing Corporation to local authorities along the same lines as the new London Mayoral role on investment; and
3. making appropriate resources available to local authorities to take on this role.

(Councillor Williams declared a personal interest in this Item.)

CL110

WARD MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

Councillor Mabbott moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Long:

- “1. That this Council notes:
 - (a) The provisions in the Local Government Act 2000 and the proposals in the Local Government White Paper for increased involvement of ward councillors in decision making and in 'community leadership'; and
 - (b) Milton Keynes Council's longstanding position at the forefront of innovation in the evolution of democratic structures, particularly over the development of parishes and effective partnership arrangements.
2. That this Council believes that:
 - (a) to continue to be at the forefront of democratic renewal, Milton Keynes Council needs to constantly

review its way of working and, where necessary, make changes; and

- (b) to complete the democratic circle, work needs to be done to strengthen the role of individual Ward Members, in line with the national context and local priorities.

3. That this Council resolves that:

- (a) in future, the Council fully involves Ward Members both in decisions affecting their Wards made internally, and in decisions where the Council is involved through partnership organisations;
- (b) creative steps be taken to ensure that Ward Members are fully involved in spending decisions affecting their Ward, including the provision of budgets for Ward Members to match fund other initiatives, such as environmental improvements;
- (c) the Council ensures that Ward Members receive all the information necessary to represent their constituents, both internally and from partner bodies; and
- (d) where the Council enters into arrangements with partner bodies to provide financial or other support, that this is dependent at all times upon a reciprocal agreement to ensure full compliance with legislation on freedom of information, data protection and good conduct, and the principles of open government and the key role of Ward Members in community capacity building.”

Councillor D McCall moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Ferrans and accepted by the mover of the motion:

- “1. That the words ‘in future’, ‘fully involves’, ‘both’ and ‘made internally, and in decisions where the Council is involved through partnership organisations’ be deleted from clause 3(a) and the words ‘consults and informs’ added after the words ‘the Council’.
- 2. That clause 3(b) be deleted.
- 3. That the words ‘both internally and from partner bodies’ be deleted from clause 3(c).
- 4. That clause 3(d) be deleted.”

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

RESOLVED -

- 1. That this Council notes:

- (a) The provisions in the Local Government Act 2000 and the proposals in the Local Government White Paper for increased involvement of ward councillors in decision making and in 'community leadership'; and
 - (b) Milton Keynes Council's longstanding position at the forefront of innovation in the evolution of democratic structures, particularly over the development of parishes and effective partnership arrangements.
2. That this Council believes that:
- (a) to continue to be at the forefront of democratic renewal, Milton Keynes Council needs to constantly review its way of working and, where necessary, make changes; and
 - (b) to complete the democratic circle, work needs to be done to strengthen the role of individual Ward Members, in line with the national context and local priorities.
3. That this Council resolves that:
- (a) the Council consults and informs Ward Members in decisions affecting their Wards; and
 - (b) the Council ensures that Ward Members receive all the information necessary to represent their constituents.

CL111

SCHEME OF MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES 2007/08

Councillor Geary moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor I McCall:

- “1. That the report of the Independent Panel on Members' Allowances be received and that the members of the Panel be thanked for their work.
2. That the overall expenditure on Members' Allowances be no higher, in real terms, in 2007/08 than it is in 2006/07.
3. That the Basic Allowance for 2007/08 remain at £9,148.
4. That the following Special Responsibility Allowances be approved for 2007/08:

	£
(a) Leader of the Council	27,769
(b) Opposition Group Leaders	582
	per Group Member
(c) Cabinet Members equal shares of (excluding the Leader of the Council)	70,566

	£
(d) Chairs of Overview and Scrutiny Committees and Panels	5,082
(e) Chair of Development Control Committee	7,623
(f) Chair of Licensing and Regulatory Committees	7,623
(g) Chair of Audit Committee	5,082
(h) Spokespersons on Overview and Scrutiny Committees / Panels and Audit Committee	1,035
5.	That the Chair of the Standards Committee receive a combined co-optee's and Special Responsibility Allowance of £3,055.
6.	That other voting co-optees on the Council's various committees receive a co-optee's allowance of £600 per annum for 2007/08.
7.	That all co-optees be eligible for travel and subsistence allowances at the Members' rate when carrying out the duties for which they are co-opted.
8.	That the Mayor's Allowance be increased in line with the increase in a Cabinet Member's Allowance, and that the Deputy Mayor's Allowance be 50% of the Mayor's Allowance.
9.	That, in the case of a Member who is in receipt of a Special Responsibility Allowance being unable to carry out the duty for which the Allowance is payable for a period of three months or more, requiring the duty to be carried out by a specific Member as deputy, the Council will consider the circumstances, with the option of ceasing the Special Responsibility Allowance payment to the Member concerned, and making a retrospective payment to the deputising Member for the whole of the three-month period, and continuing until the original Member is able to resume the duty concerned.
10.	That the total amount of money available for Members' allowances be increased with effect from 1 April 2008, and annually thereafter, by the lower of two retail price indices which respectively include and exclude property prices, measured at the previous September.
11.	That all elected Members continue to be eligible for admission to the Local Government Pension Scheme.
12.	That the definition of 'Approved Duty' be extended to include Ward Surgeries, and meetings in the Member's Ward called by a Council Officer or the Parish Council, thereby allowing

child and dependent car allowances and travel and subsistence allowances to be payable.

13. That, in the event of a councillor being suspended from duty following an investigation by the Council's Standards Committee or the Standards Board for England, allowances will not be paid to the councillor concerned during the period of suspension.
14. That, by 31 March 2007, statements of responsibilities for all Members be prepared to reflect their representative role and their positions of special responsibility; that Cabinet Members prepare and publish their key tasks for the year, and report on their achievements at the end of the year; and that all members be invited to prepare annual reports on their achievements during the year for publication on the Council's web-site."

On being put to the vote the motion was declared carried with 33 Members voting in favour, 0 Members against and 13 Members abstaining from voting.

RESOLVED -

1. That the report of the Independent Panel on Members' Allowances be received and that the members of the Panel be thanked for their work.
2. That the overall expenditure on Members' Allowances be no higher, in real terms, in 2007/08 than it is in 2006/07.
3. That the Basic Allowance for 2007/08 remain at £9,148.
4. That the following Special Responsibility Allowances be approved for 2007/08:

	£
(a) Leader of the Council	27,769
(b) Opposition Group Leaders	582
	per Group Member
(c) Cabinet Members equal shares of (excluding the Leader of the Council)	70,566
(d) Chairs of Overview and Scrutiny Committees and Panels	5,082
(e) Chair of Development Control Committee	7,623
(f) Chair of Licensing and Regulatory Committees	7,623
(g) Chair of Audit Committee	5,082

£

(h) Spokespersons on Overview and Scrutiny Committees / Panels and Audit Committee 1,035

5. That the Chair of the Standards Committee receive a combined co-optee's and Special Responsibility Allowance of £3,055.
6. That other voting co-optees on the Council's various committees receive a co-optee's allowance of £600 per annum for 2007/08.
7. That all co-optees be eligible for travel and subsistence allowances at the Members' rate when carrying out the duties for which they are co-opted.
8. That the Mayor's Allowance be increased in line with the increase in a Cabinet Member's Allowance, and that the Deputy Mayor's Allowance be 50% of the Mayor's Allowance.
9. That, in the case of a Member who is in receipt of a Special Responsibility Allowance being unable to carry out the duty for which the Allowance is payable for a period of three months or more, requiring the duty to be carried out by a specific Member as deputy, the Council will consider the circumstances, with the option of ceasing the Special Responsibility Allowance payment to the Member concerned, and making a retrospective payment to the deputising Member for the whole of the three-month period, and continuing until the original Member is able to resume the duty concerned.
10. That the total amount of money available for Members' allowances be increased with effect from 1 April 2008, and annually thereafter, by the lower of two retail price indices which respectively include and exclude property prices, measured at the previous September.
11. That all elected Members continue to be eligible for admission to the Local Government Pension Scheme.
12. That the definition of 'Approved Duty' be extended to include Ward Surgeries, and meetings in the Member's Ward called by a Council Officer or the Parish Council, thereby allowing child and dependent car allowances and travel and subsistence allowances to be payable.
13. That, in the event of a councillor being suspended from duty following an investigation by the Council's Standards Committee or the Standards Board for England, allowances will not be paid to the councillor concerned during the period of suspension.

14. That, by 31 March 2007, statements of responsibilities for all Members be prepared to reflect their representative role and their positions of special responsibility; that Cabinet Members prepare and publish their key tasks for the year, and report on their achievements at the end of the year; and that all members be invited to prepare annual reports on their achievements during the year for publication on the Council's web-site.

CL112

PROVIDING INDEMNITIES FOR MEMBERS

The Mayor moved the following motion, which was seconded by the Deputy Mayor:

“That the following costs incurred in responding to formal allegations of a breach of the Members’ Code of Conduct pursuant to Part 3 of the Local Government Act 2000 by Councillor I McCall, be met:

- (a) those costs which fall within the conditions of any such indemnity granted under the Local Authorities (Indemnities for Members and Officers) Order 2004; and
- (b) those costs which would have met the terms of insurance, had such insurance for an indemnity been in place rather than the Council carrying its own risk, as now made available to all Members in respect of future events.”

On being put to the vote the motion was declared carried on the Mayor’s casting vote, with 13 Members voting in favour, 13 Members voting against and 0 Members abstaining from voting.

RESOLVED -

That the following costs incurred in responding to formal allegations of a breach of the Members’ Code of Conduct pursuant to Part 3 of the Local Government Act 2000 by Councillor I McCall, be met:

- (a) those costs which fall within the conditions of any such indemnity granted under the Local Authorities (Indemnities for Members and Officers) Order 2004; and
- (b) those costs which would have met the terms of insurance, had such insurance for an indemnity been in place rather than the Council carrying its own risk, as now made available to all Members in respect of future events.

(Councillors Burke, Carruthers, Sandra Clark, Stephen Clark, Crooks, Drewett, Eastman, Eaton, Exon, Ferrans, Fraser, Gerrella, E Henderson, I Henderson, D McCall, I McCall, Pugh, Seymour, Snell, Tallack, Tamagnini-Barbosa and Williams declared a prejudicial interest in this Item and left the meeting, taking no part in the discussion, or voting thereon.)

THE MAYOR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 10.48 PM