



Minutes of the meeting of the REGENERATION CABINET SUB-COMMITTEE held on THURSDAY 15 FEBRUARY 2018 at 6.15pm

Present: Councillors Long, Middleton and O'Neill

Officers: D Sharkey (Corporate Director, Place), Bridglalsingh (Service Director [Legal and Democratic Services]), P Cummings (Head of Legal Services and Deputy Monitoring Officer) and S Muir (Committee Manager).

Also Present: D Gleeson (Managing Director YourMK), Councillor Miles and circa 20 members of the public.

RSC 01 TO ELECT A CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE

Councillor Middleton proposed that Councillor Long, the responsible Cabinet member for Adult Care and Housing be elected as Chair of the Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee; this was seconded by Councillor O'Neill.

RESOLVED

Councillor Long, the responsible Cabinet member for Adult Care and Housing be elected as Chair of the Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee.

RSC 02 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

None were received.

RSC 03 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Members of the public asked the following questions and highlighted their concerns:

- Milton Keynes Council's statements that the Regeneration Programme must be "community led" were welcomed, however if this was to mean anything in practice then the community groups had to be fully involved in the briefing and design development meetings with the design teams.
- How would the Council ensure that the public would have access to cost and value information as the designs developed so that they could offer meaningful input to the Regeneration plans.
- Page 6 of the YourMK's progress report January 2018, YourMK indicated that information regarding the stock condition survey had been made available. The Progress Report included a link to the Fullers Slade stock condition

data narrative of 8 November 2017; however, this link did not give any information about the stock condition survey.

- Community involvement was a crucial feature in the Council's Regeneration Strategy which stated that its modus operandi was to be resident led. Such a Strategy required complete openness and transparency, empowering residents to take an active role.

Despite frequent requests directly to YourMK, Milton Keynes Council Cabinet, Regeneration and Housing Committee and Full Council, information had not been forthcoming and Fullers Slade Residents Association had submitted Freedom of Information requests for the following essential information to be released on the grounds that without it there cannot be a Community Led Design:

- Milton Keynes Council properties types and rents income
- Electrical test visit schedule for 278 Milton Keynes Council properties
- Ground Geo-technic Survey
- Concrete Condition Survey reports.

Councillor Long responded to the issues and indicated that any plans or designs would be agreed by the Cabinet Regeneration Sub-Committee.

Councillor Long also indicated that for the Cabinet Regeneration Sub-Committee to be to be successful, it was intended that residents would be co-opted to the Sub Committee.

Councillor Long further indicated that the aim of the Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee would be take control of the Regeneration process, as the accountable body.

- The Fullers Slade Residents Association was preparing an alternative regeneration option to progress towards a viable win/win solution for all residents and could not proceed without the following information which Milton Keynes Council had declined to release on the grounds of commercial sensitivity.

- Pennington Stock Survey report
- Cost Report to Pennington Stock Survey
- Structural Survey Report
- M&E Building Services Survey reports

This was survey information that related to the Council's existing housing stock and would have an impact upon future

repair and maintenance costs: it was therefore of legitimate public interest. Without it there was no clarity, realistic focus or direction and withholding this information subverted the whole notion of community-led regeneration.

Councillor Long indicated that residents could not make informed conclusions about the options available to them until all the information was available to them.

Councillor Long also clarified that the Data in the Stock Survey that had been carried out was owned by the Council and not Mears, therefore the Council would investigate the reasons for not releasing it.

The Corporate Director, Place, indicated that he would investigate the issues of Data Protection in connection with the information that had been requested and would re-consider which information could be released. However, the reasons for not releasing the information could relate to confidential information of financial data owned by third parties.

- Residents had concerns about the perceived friction between the Residents Association and the Steering group.

Councillor Long indicated he was very disappointed to learn that there was friction between the two groups and stated that he would ensure this was investigated and remedied.

- Residents in Tinkers Bridge were confused about the re-badging and identity of Your:MK and Mears vehicles and this added to their concerns.

The Corporate Director, Place, summarised the operational reasons for the re-badging and indicated that it was not the intention to confuse residents.

- Several questions were received with reference to how it would be ensured that the outcome of a “no” vote in the Fullers Slade and other Regeneration areas was explained in as much detail to residents, so they could make an informed decision between all options given to them.

It was also stated that residents understood from the information given at a meeting in November 2017 that the referendum would take place in March 2018. This had resulted in residents assuming that decisions about the designs and plans had already been taken following the various designs and planning workshops that had taken place. These were the reasons why residents felt excluded from the process, their concerns were not being acknowledged and that the regeneration of their areas would happen regardless of their views.

Councillor Long responded that referendums would not take place in March 2018 and indicated that a report to consider the definition of a 'no' option at any regeneration ballot, to be formed by the HRA business plan, and the proposed framework for the Serpentine Court regeneration ballot was scheduled to be considered by the Cabinet in June 2018.

- Residents and members of the Serpentine Court Residents Group had attended a workshop and exhibition hosted by YourMK in December 2017. Architects were also present and asked residents to comment, advise their views and work up designs, but the responses to their questions indicated to residents that themes included in the designs had already been decided.

Managing Director YourMK indicated that draft designs had been provided at the workshops as a starting point for discussion and the process involved refining and redrawing these with residents until a unanimously accepted design was reached. He was unaware of the responses that had been supplied and would investigate the matter.

RSC04

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR REGENERATION CABINET SUB-COMMITTEE

A draft set of Terms of Reference for the Committee was circulated at the meeting.

Councillor Long proposed that these be finalised and adopted at the next meeting of the Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee.

It was noted that the draft Terms of Reference included issues such as Deprivation, Communications and Engagement plans for each estate and Resident Associations, members of the public and other stakeholders, involvement.

RESOLVED -

That the Terms of Reference be finalised and brought to the next meeting of the Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee.

RSC 05

FINANCIAL MODELS EVALUATION PROCESS

Councillor Long explained that the Financial Models Evaluation Process was scheduled to be considered by the Cabinet at its meeting in June as part of the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan. This would consider the plan for Council housing at a strategic level for the 30 year Business Plan, and more specifically for the next 5 years. It was anticipated that the Plan would cover how Council tenants' rents would be spent to repair and maintain their homes, in addition to outlining how new Council homes would be built and estates regenerated in Milton Keynes.

YOURMK REGENERATION PROGRESS UPDATE - FEBRUARY 2018

The Managing Director YourMK, introduced and summarised the key points in the February Progress report.

He stated that the aims were to empower people to take ownership of their future, to ensure that people's surroundings made their lives better and to remove the barriers between people and their jobs so that ambitions could be realised. He stated that one of the priorities of YOUR:MK was to understand that every property was someone's home and his team respected this.

He also indicated that the details for the ballots had not yet been agreed on and this process would be managed by the Council's Elections Department.

With reference to engagement with residents, the Managing Director YourMK indicated that he would be meeting with representatives from the Landlords Forum the following week as it was recognised that many of the homes in the Regeneration Areas were privately let and the views of the private landlords and their tenants were also important. It was also recognised that those who rented privately were one of the most vulnerable groups.

The Managing Director YourMK also stated that no designs had been finalised; one co-design session had been carried out to set the scene and establish views as to how residents would like their areas to be improved. High level schematic drawings had been provided with little detail, as a starting point, although some issues had been taken into consideration, such as the Aviation Fuel Pipeline. Viability modelling had not been carried out and this would be completed after the designs and plans had been agreed with the residents from each area. It was also recognised by YOUR:MK that the language used in the Communications needed to change.

The Managing Director YourMK also clarified that new social housing would be built to Parker Morris standards and would be for lifetime use (houses that are flexible). He gave examples of the new housing in Franklins Croft and Fishermead and invited residents to visit these.

The following comments and concerns were received from residents:

- 4 schemes had been put forward in Fullers Slade that did not come from them.
- The displays were very sophisticated which suggested that decisions had already been made as a lot of money had been spent on producing them. They included options / suggestions and figures and costs but there were no options for the refurbishment of current homes.

- Residents had not requested that their neighbourhoods be subject to Regeneration, they had been told it would be done and development would happen automatically. YOUR:MK seemed focussed on development and demolition and there was no information about the planned maintenance of current Council properties.
- They understood that other Regeneration projects had been carried out across the country and they needed the information on the impacts from the residents involved in those.
- It was unclear as to whether day to day maintenance of houses in Regeneration areas would continue to be carried out as many homes in Tinkers Bridge needed work to be done now as the Estate wasn't due to go through the Regeneration process until at least 2020.
- The impression wasn't given to residents that the proposals were from each end of the scale of what could be achieved and that they were a starting point.
- The financial modelling needed to be developed in order to inform the designs and plans. It was difficult to suggest options when there was limited knowledge of the resources available.
- There was inconsistent advice about how Regeneration would be financed from new developments.
- Consultation at the Lakes Estate should be carried out with the residents of Serpentine Court only as they were the ones that were affected.

Councillor Long clarified that although schemes had been put to residents it was clear that the proposals to take these forward needed to come from the communities involved. Each area would determine whether refurbishment, demolition or any other options should be considered. However, as far as he was aware, suggestions to demolish properties had not been made by the Council.

Councillor Long reiterated that accurate financial information needed to be made available to residents in order that the designs and options could be worked up. He also recognised that there were different perceptions of what was being conveyed to residents. He confirmed that programmed day to day maintenance of housing owned by the Council would continue regardless of whether an estate was included in a Regeneration Area or not.

Councillor Long also requested that the presentation be circulated electronically to those present.

The Corporate Director, Place, indicated that work was currently being carried out to clarify planned maintenance on council owned properties and this would be included in the business plan.

Councillor O'Neill indicated that the comments made during the meeting emphasised that effective good communication was fundamental to the success of Regeneration in Milton Keynes. She was pleased that to learn of the space standards and life time use of the proposed new properties.

The Director YourMK indicated that he could arrange for residents from other Regeneration areas nationally to visit, or, to arrange for Residents Associations to visit other areas in the UK to discuss issues and processes that they had been through. He also indicated that he had noted all the comments and points from the representatives at the meeting.

RSC 07

DRAFT MEETINGS PROGRAMME

Councillor Long thanked the residents for attending the meeting and highlighting their issues

Councillor Long indicated that the meetings of the Sub Committee would take place on a monthly basis.

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 7.50 PM