

Democratic Services

Reduction in Car Parking Income Task and Finish Group Report December 2017

Contents

	Note on the Text	2
1.	Introduction	3
2.	Membership and Terms of Reference	4
3	Acknowledgements	5
4.	Summary	6
5.	Conclusions	10
6.	Recommendations	12
7.	The Evidence	14
8.	Bibliography	17
	Annex A: CMK Parking Map	18
	What is Scrutiny – An Explanation	19

Note on the Text

Throughout the documentation relating to this review, the terms “the TFG” or “the Group” shall mean the “Reduction in Parking Income Task and Finish Group”.

After the first reference, Milton Keynes Council will be referred to as “the Council” throughout this report.

CMK refers to Central Milton Keynes and for the purposes of this report is the area bounded by H5 Portway to the north, V8 Marlborough Street to the east, H6 Childs Way to the south and the boundary created by the West Coast Main Line to the west.

A Parking Guide to CMK is included as Annex A

1. Introduction

The Reduction in Parking Income Task and Finish Group was established at the request of the Budget Scrutiny Committee to investigate a shortfall in parking income against budget forecasts for the last 2 years and a fall in the actual anticipated income from car parking in Milton Keynes during 2016/17 following several years of increasing income.

Due to the need for any recommendations from the TFG to be fed into the 2018/19 budget setting process, the TFG had to work to a very tight timescale, meeting on three occasions during November to hear evidence from council officers, the relevant Cabinet Member, representatives from the shopping centre / retailers and users of public transport. We also examined a substantial amount of written data, as well as drawing on our own experiences of using the parking facilities in Milton Keynes.

This report, therefore, sets out:

- (i) the work the TFG has carried out to scrutinise the reduction in car parking income during 2016/17; and
- (ii) the TFG's recommendations which will be presented to the Budget Scrutiny Committee on 12 December 2017 and to Cabinet on 2 January 2018.

Councillor K Wilson
Chair, Reduction in Parking Income Task and Finish Group
12 December 2017

2. Membership and Terms of Reference

The membership of the TFG was appointed by the Scrutiny Management Committee on a 2:2:2 basis from the three political groups on Milton Keynes Council, with three of the members, Councillors Bald, R Bradburn and K Wilson, being members of the Budget Scrutiny Committee, together with three other back-bench members, Councillors, Bint, McPake and Wallis. Councillor K Wilson was appointed Chair of the Group and Elizabeth Richardson served as Overview and Scrutiny Officer.

The Terms of Reference for the Group were:

1. To scrutinise the fall in estimated parking income.
2. To investigate the reasons for the fall in parking income, whether the estimate of potential parking income was too optimistic and the result of poor budgeting practices by the Council, or whether it was due to other causes over which the Council had no control.
3. To make recommendations on possible future income forecasting, including how much reliance should be placed on estimated income when trying to balance the budget.

3. Acknowledgements

The TFG would like to thank the following, who provided written or oral evidence to the TFG:

- Councillor Liz Gifford, Cabinet Member Place
- Tom Blackburne-Maze, Service Director: Public Realm;
- Sara Bailey, Strategic Lead: Parking and Taxis:
- Anna Rulton, Strategic Finance Business Partner;
- Sara Haslam, Senior Finance Business Partner;
- Steve Hayes, Head of Transport
- Kevin Duffy, The Centre:MK;
- Mat Kiely, Intu Shopping Centre;
- Alan Francis, Chair of the Milton Keynes Public Transport Group

The TFG is extremely grateful to its Scrutiny Officer, Elizabeth Richardson, who serviced the Group extremely well, going well above and beyond the Group's reasonable expectations.

4. Summary

The TFG was charged with investigating the shortfall in parking income against budget forecasts for the last 2 years and a fall in the actual anticipated income from car parking in Milton Keynes during 2016/17, following several years of increasing income. It set out to scrutinise whether this was a failure of the forecasting process or the result of circumstances which may or may not have been foreseeable at the time the budgets were set.

The TFG was asked by the Scrutiny Management Committee to prepare a report in advance of the publication of the draft 2018/19 budget proposals. The Group met three times in November, and discussed the issue first hand with various witnesses, as well as scrutinising a wide range of paper based evidence.

It is clear that recent forecast incomes have not materialised and the actual income achieved has been falling well short of the assumptions made.

Despite reviewing a large amount of evidence in a short period, the TFG has not been able to identify a single factor which has been, or may be, responsible for this. It has though, examined a number of factors which may have contributed to the fall in car parking income below the Council's forecast figure and these are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Actual income from parking charges has increased every year since 2012/13 (with the exception of 2016/17, which saw a reduction of around 1%). However from 2015-16, there has been a shortfall, increasing each year, between the forecast income and the actual income. Or to put it another way, from 2015/16 onwards, large increases in income were forecast but much smaller increases (or no increase at all in one year) have been achieved.

The TFG has identified 4 relevant occasions where parking income forecasts were made that subsequently turned out to be significantly over-optimistic:

- January/February 2015 budget process;
- January/February 2016 budget process;
- December 2016 Delegated Decision; and
- January/February 2017 budget process.

During the January/February 2015 budget setting process **representations were made about the increases to parking charges, with opposition councillors disputing the robustness of the forecast figures.** For 2015/16 a forecast of a 20% growth in income was made but the actual increase was only 15%.

Allowing for the late implementation (June 2015) the discrepancy is smaller, but still in the same direction; **the Executive** had over-forecast the income-

During the January/February 2016 budget setting process a forecast for 2016/17 was made showing an income level £300k above the previous year's forecast, but £1m above the actual income for 2015/16. **These estimates had also been challenged previously but the objections were not taken into consideration; hindsight indicates that they were valid and perhaps should have been given more consideration by the Executive.**

The December 2016 Delegated Decision assumed that these changes would generate an additional £600k. In effect, this figure was incorporated into the budget (net of a reduction for late implementation), without any examination of the year to date position and therefore without any recognition of the emerging £1m discrepancy.

During the January/February 2017 budget setting process, there was a reaffirmation of the impact of the changes arising from the Delegated Decision (including a £300k allowance for deferred implementation), but again, no examination of whether the year to date parking income was in line with the parking budget figure, and therefore another missed opportunity to notice the emerging £1m discrepancy.

One of the theories considered by the Group was whether an increase in car parking charges may have led to a decline in use. The Group cannot categorically state that this is the case, or, alternatively, that it was not the case to some extent. However, the evidence examined does not appear to point to a significant correlation, though the Group accepts that there may often be a time lag between the implementation of a change in price and its effect on demand. Thus there may be an immediate, inelastic effect, but over time there may be a more elastic response to a change in price. This could be explained perhaps by the fact that visitors, in particular, would only take note of an increase (or decrease) in price on second and subsequent visits. For irregular visitors it is unlikely that this would be something they thought about in advance of a trip to Milton Keynes or elsewhere. The view expressed by Mr Duffy from the Centre:MK was that increasing parking prices always resulted in reduced demand. Examination of the number of hours sold at the Premium and Standard rates probably supports this view to some extent.

The issue is further complicated by the fact that in CMK there are three distinct parking zones. The first relates to the railway station and commuters. The cost of parking is often seen here as a component of overall transport costs paid by a captive group of people who have no alternative if they need to get to work and thus elasticity is likely to be low. The same is true with employees to a degree, though for different reasons. Employees account for most of the demand in the middle 'Office Sector'. The third and final zone round the central shopping / entertainment area is dominated by visitors to CMK (especially retail visitors) and this section is likely to be the most elastic. Whilst the Group had adequate data on the type of tickets/permits being bought, there was little data on the various and differing occupancy rates in the different parts of CMK and this has restricted the Group's ability to pinpoint causation.

The majority of car parking in CMK is on-street (highway) parking. Whilst a case exists for converting much of this to off-street parking in order to provide greater flexibility with fewer regulations, it is recognised that this is a difficult process that may not even be possible in most cases. However, the Council should consider how to use initiatives even within the on-street parking regime to provide as much flexibility as possible, including the prospect of pay on exit schemes and pricing policies that reflect usage and demand in a much more granular way than is currently possible.

Parking is not a product that is a result of direct demand. Very few people park in order to park. It is a secondary matter necessitated by, or at least derived from, other activities such as going to work, visiting shops, theatre and so on. It is also influenced by the availability of alternative transport options. Thus price responsiveness is always difficult to measure as other factors may play a significant and probably much larger role in determining demand.

We have obtained national data on car parking income in every local authority in the country (courtesy of the RAC Foundation) for the past 5 years. This shows a continued increase in car parking revenue with Milton Keynes still being the 12th highest in the country in 2016/17, despite the reported drop in income (down from 10th in 2015/16). All those with higher income than Milton Keynes were, with the exception of Brighton & Hove, London authorities. Westminster (the highest) increased its income from £55m to £73m over the same period.

There has been an increase nationally of about 10% year on year. Perhaps more significantly, councils as a whole achieved above forecasts, whereas from 2015/16 on in Milton Keynes we achieved below forecasts. This is perhaps the most salient and significant factor of all. In 2015/16 the Council increased parking charges from 40p to 50p in Standard tariff spaces, from £8 to £10 for commuter parking and from £1.40 to £2 for Premium tariff spaces. This was followed by a significant fall in parking income from the Premium tariff spaces, establishing a clear causal effect on income from some parts of the parking offer in Milton Keynes.

Experiments with “Ladybird” (black and red markings) bays which were priced at employee rates for permit holders or Premium rate for visitors and at weekends, may have led to the view by visitors that the parking regime in parts of CMK was unduly complicated, as these spaces tended to be empty when not taken by permit holders. However, this was not thought to have been of sufficient significance to explain the fall of income under review. When the “Ladybird” bays were changed back to Standard tariff bays, the empty spaces largely disappeared.

As noted above, there may be other factors that have caused the decline against forecasts. The TFG thought it likely that changes in shopping habits, especially towards on-line purchasing and on line banking, as well as the increasing trend for people to work from home 1-2 days per week may have had a significant effect. Although the national results do not

appear to validate that theory to any great extent, it should not be discounted however.

We have been unable to obtain accurate data on the number of employees working in CMK, but this may have had an effect. Over recent years many organisations employing large numbers of people in CMK have reduced and streamlined their workforces. Modern technology has also played a part with a rapid increase in the number of employees taking up the option to work from home on at least a couple of days each week. This is also facilitated by the ability to buy employee day permits for parking at exactly the same day rate as a monthly or annual permit.

Due to the time limited nature of this review, the Group was unable to examine in any detail the income from commuter parking near the station. This is a small proportion of the overall parking income in Milton Keynes but from the financial data supplied there does appear to be a decline in the number of commuter parking permits which have been purchased since they were increased from £8 to £10. However, this needs to be set against the anecdotal evidence that during the week it is almost impossible to park near the station after about 9.30 am and the Group is of the view that there is further work which could be done to review both the level of parking charges near the station and the number of spaces available.

5. Conclusions

We have found that at most of the 4 forecasting decisions we examined, forecasts had failed to take account of all the information available at that time.

As well as possible errors in the budget forecasting process discussed in Section 4, the Group has examined changes specific to CMK which may also have had a negative impact on parking income that **might not have been foreseeable**. These include, but are not limited to:

- a) The demise of British Home Stores;
- b) The move of Waitrose out of CMK completely and Sainsbury's to elsewhere in CMK (with its own car parking – free for the first three hours) and the opening of Morrison's in the "commuter area" (again with its own free parking facilities) may have had an impact;
- c) The opening and subsequent expansion of the MK1 retail and entertainment park may have had an impact, though the year it first opened was before the issues the Group examined set in. However, once again there may be a lag in customer habits over time;
- d) The reported decline in the use of the outdoor market in CMK, perhaps as part of the general decline in food shopping in the retail sector of CMK, could well be another factor, though the TFG recognises that some market traders may feel this was a response to car park charges being too high;
- e) The changes that have been made during the period under scrutiny to the type of permits available and methods of payment. In particular the TFG felt that the change to cashless payments enables car park users to avoid over-paying and that this may have had an impact. Typically, with a pay and display scheme via a cash machine, users estimate the likely maximum time they will require and often end up over-paying. With cashless systems this is not necessary as a payment can be topped up away from the vehicle if necessary.

However, Kevin Duffy, from the Centre:MK, took the opposite view, that a cashless system meant that people were more likely to prolong their stay as they could top-up their parking payment on the spot, as and when required, rather than having to hurry back to their car.

- f) Footfall figures for the CMK retail sector indicate a downward trend over several years. The Group was advised that bus operators had also observed a similar decline in bus usage by passengers coming into CMK. This is clearly not an impact of car parking charges alone and does suggest that other factors may have been more salient.
- g) **Changes in modern working patterns may also be significant. There has been a shift towards more flexible working, with many organisations with offices / businesses in CMK now allowing or even encouraging, their employees to work from home when possible. The ability of**

employees to pay for parking on a daily 'as required' basis at the same day rate as buying a monthly or annual permit meant this was seen as a very economical option.

It is clear that the Council, together with private sector organisations in CMK, are facing a difficult economic climate and need to consider and find strategies to boost the attractiveness of the offer to encourage people to visit CMK. The growth of on-line banking and shopping facilities and enhanced competition from elsewhere in Milton Keynes and other places, allied to a sense that the city centre is feeling its age, makes it imperative that everyone with an interest in Milton Keynes should work together to significantly improve the offer of CMK. Doing nothing is likely to result in a continuing decline in visitor numbers to CMK.

CMK has some 20,000 Council owned spaces, a small number of commercially operated multi-storey car parks, and no privately owned car parks for most of its offices and shops. There is little overall data for other comparable towns, other than the fact that other towns seem, anecdotally, to have more commercial multi-storey parking, more private car parks for shops and offices, and fewer council-operated parking spaces. CMK is competing with other retail destinations within MK, other nearby traditional town/city centres, and major out of town retail destinations such as Thurrock, Blue Water and Meadowhall.

Finally, it is worth commenting on the fact that Milton Keynes has a very large number of car parking spaces in CMK, and that whilst residents may often complain about the difficulty of finding spaces, if one is prepared to pay the Premium rate or can walk a significant distance, it is almost certainly the case that it is easier to park in here than in virtually any other major town or city. Thus whilst many towns and cities will enjoy an occupancy rate close to 100%, it is almost certainly lower in the larger geographical area of CMK. Indeed those towns and cities with fewer spaces than we have will often have a large unmet demand (drivers who would use their car to get to the centre if they thought they could readily find a car parking space but whom instead have found other ways to travel in). Thus in many other towns and cities there may be little impact on car parking usage given other negative changes, whereas in Milton Keynes we may be much more vulnerable to prices and other changes impacting on car parking demand.

6. Recommendations

Whilst the TFG has been unable to provide a single, simple answer as to the causes for the reduction in parking income during 2016/17, we would make the following recommendations:

Budget Forecasting

- 1) That it should be recognised that forecasts of income are difficult to predict, but that in doing so, the Cabinet and council officers should take into account factors that are not in their immediate control but which may have a continuing detrimental impact on parking income and should, therefore, make less optimistic assumptions as to the level of parking income in the future.
- 2) That when forecasting revenue changes associated with any proposed Cabinet Decision or other Delegated Decision, council officers should always report on the most recent full year of parking income and the latest "year to date" position for the current year, in comparison with the corresponding forecasts, and therefore create a revised income forecast based on all available facts, not just the impact of a decision in isolation.

Parking Charges and Their Impact

- 3) That the Cabinet and council officers should assess the possible impact of fee changes on local businesses and on the attractiveness of CMK as a destination for retail, leisure and culture, and should report all relevant views to councillors.
- 4) That when considering possible increases in parking fees, the Cabinet and council officers should remember that increases in on-street car parking charges are not lawful for revenue generation reasons alone.

Changing Trends

- 5) That new technology and contracts should be utilised to collect more data to enable proper analysis of volumes, prices and occupancies, ensuring that a better understanding of parking habits and influencing factors is available, so that refined reactions and decisions can be responsive to real facts and trends more certainly and decisively.
- 6) That the decisions on future car parking policies and prices be much finer grained, taking account of discernible trends, both locally and nationally, such as the increase in working from home or increases in the use of electrical vehicles, as well as market conditions (and improved location data).
- 7) The way in which people now work, shop, bank and travel, both by private means and on public transport, is changing quickly and there

is a need for the Council to be aware of these trends and their direction, taking them into consideration when devising future car parking and other transport strategies.

Improving the Offer

- 8) The Council should consider reducing the price differential between the Premium and Standard parking tariffs, noting particularly that visitor parking is likely to be more price elastic.
- 9) That the Council should consider revising what many people perceive as complicated car parking arrangements in CMK in order to simplify and demystify the parking scheme and hierarchy of charges, whilst ensuring it is as flexible and responsive to changing patterns and needs as possible.
- 10) That the Council should consider how best to improve parking arrangements in CMK, including but not limited to, improved directions to car parking spaces, lighting, bay marking etc, taking account of modern parking needs.
- 11) That the Council should consider how to make on street parking more responsive and flexible to usage and demand, including the possibility of pay on exit schemes.
- 12) That the Council, along with retailers and others, examines how to better market and promote CMK as a destination. It has been suggested that the Grade II listed building status of the main shopping centre may be a negative factor in attracting investment and modernising the offer, which should be fully examined.
- 13) That along with the above, the Centre:MK should be encouraged to include **provision for small**, local/private retail type of businesses to attract people by the individual nature of the offer.
- 14) That the Council and the private sector in CMK should be encouraged to work towards a medium/long term strategy to develop and enhance CMK as soon as possible.

7. The Evidence

The Group received and examined a range of evidence, which included written reports, specially commissioned reports, analysis of the data available and oral presentations from witnesses.

16 November 2017

At the meeting on 16 November the TFG heard from council officers Tom Blackburne-Maze (Service Director (Republic Realm), Sara Bailey (Strategic Lead: Parking and Taxis) and Anna Rulton (Strategic Finance Partner).

During the meeting Sara Bailey advised the Group that the Council's current method of surveying parking space usage was not particularly scientific – it was just a person counting the numbers of occupied / unoccupied spaces at a certain point in time. The survey used to be carried out twice a year in June and December, but now it was only carried out in June as it was thought that the December figures were skewed by the Christmas factor.

She also reported that historically there was no evidence that price increases significantly affected parking space usage.

The Group discussed the cost of parking in Milton Keynes which was thought to be a lot cheaper than other local areas and whether any comparative data was available. Sara Bailey explained that she had benchmarking data on parking facilities, number of spaces, charges etc for a number of other local authorities. Having examined this data it is clear that, even allowing for differing tariff structures elsewhere, the Milton Keynes rate of 50p per hour for long-stay (Standard) parking was certainly one of the cheapest. However, the rate of £2.00 per hour for short-stay (Premium) parking was one of the highest rates quoted. Milton Keynes also had the highest number of public car parking spaces of all the local authorities presented in the data.

It was also reported that over the past 5 years, due to under-use, a 1000 Premium Rate bays had been converted to either Standard Rate or employee parking.

22 November 2017

At the this session the Group discussed the issue with the Cabinet Member for Place, Councillor Liz Gifford, who agreed with many of the conclusions the Group and reached so far.

Predicted income was not being realised and therefore more sophisticated methods of predicting future usage, with more accurate data and better planning were required. Parking sensors were being installed in the car parks in CMK and the provision of more accurate data would be one of the conditions of the new parking management contract when it was let in 2018. Councillor Gifford did comment, however, that collecting data was one

thing; having the time and staff resources to analyse it properly and then make decisions as to what to do with it were another.

It was now possible to purchase employee parking permits on a daily basis via the RingGo Parking app via a mobile 'phone or on-line. The daily rate worked out at exactly the same amount as buying either a monthly or annual permit as there was no discount for "buying in bulk". The increase in flexible working, with people working from home 1-2 days per week, meant that buying a permit on a daily basis, as and when required, was seen as a more economic option **than paying up front for a permit where a proportion of the days paid for would be "wasted"**.

29 November 2017

At the third and final session the Group heard from Steve Hayes (Head of Transport), Sara Haslam, Senior Strategic Finance Partner, and Kevin Duffy from the Centre:MK. Mat Kiely (Sustainable Travel Manager for Intu) submitted a written report.

Steve Hayes confirmed that Pay and Display parking income was down, visitor footfall to CMK was down and there had also been a decrease in the number of annual employee permits being purchased. Employee permits were not seen as being price sensitive, the fall was due to recent, significant changes in work patterns, with many employees across a range of organisations, now working from home on a regular basis. For them, buying a daily permit was more convenient, and cheaper, as there was no discount on the daily rate for buying an annual or monthly permit. Sara Haslam said she thought that the dip in the sale of employee permits had probably bottomed out, and although income from this source might not increase, it should now be relatively stable. She admitted that the Council had not foreseen the current dip in employee permit sales.

Sara Haslam went on to explain that the 2016/17 data up to Period 8 had been used to set the 2017/18 budget forecast for parking income. At that stage a £600k shortfall in actuals was predicted, therefore the base budget was increased by £300k to reduce the shortfall to £300k. During Period 9, parking income started to rise slightly, but then fell again, with most of the 2016/17 shortfall happening in the last 4 months of the financial year.

Kevin Duffy, from The Centre:MK gave clear evidence that the "offer presented by Central Milton Keynes" could play a significant part in the growth of visitor numbers, and if not growth, at least in sustaining existing visitor numbers. He thought the quality of the car parking was poor, the bays were too narrow, making it harder to park modern cars, the demarcation lines were not very clear and should be repainted regularly, the lighting was poor and the signs near the centre advising of parking space availability did not always work and were not particularly accurate

There was a very limited "Evening Offer" which was attempted by provision of several chain restaurants which were mirrored across the country **and did not therefore, provide a unique dining experience.**

Mr Duffy also pointed to a need to be much more technical with regard to the provision of parking and possibly differing tariffs depending on the area. This was echoed by Steve Hayes, Head of Transport, when he confirmed that the new parking contractor would be required to provide a more technical approach to parking with the introduction of sensors and traffic monitoring in the CMK car parks. There was also the expectation that the new parking management contractor would be able to supply the Council with more accurate and up to date data on the usage of parking bays, sources of income etc.

CMK was perceived as being very expensive to park in, certainly locally, although in reality, compared to other, nearby local authority areas this was not the case. However, it had to compete with the free parking offer at several major 'out of town' retail and entertainment developments in Milton Keynes, as well as the historical legacy of providing free parking for almost 30 years before charges were introduced.

This view was echoed by Mr Kiely from Intu in his written report. All of the major 'out of town' developments offered free parking, a range of retail and recreational opportunities and several, such as Kingston (M1) and MK1 (A5) were strategically placed to benefit from major routes into Milton Keynes, whilst Winterhill and Rooksly were within walking distance of the town centre.

8. Bibliography

- Milton Keynes Council *Parking Annual Report 2016/17*
- CMK Parking Maps and Occupancy Maps
- Budget Data – Car Parking Income
- Carpark Benchmarking Data (neighbouring local authorities)
- CMK Footfall Data
- MK Quadrant Transaction Summary
- RAC Foundation *Annual Report Local Authority Car Parking Income 2016/17*
- Income Data and Trends Analysis
- Association of Town & City Centre Management Report: *Re-Think! Parking on the High Street.*
- Timeline Data

Scrutiny – An Explanation

All local authorities operating a Cabinet and Scrutiny model have a Cabinet consisting of the Leader of the Council and up to nine other members. All executive decisions (i.e. those needed to implement the Policy Framework and Budget approved by the Council) are taken by the Cabinet.

Each local authority is required by law to establish a Scrutiny function to support and scrutinise its executive arrangements.

Scrutiny committees are not “decision making” bodies but are bodies which monitor and influence those that are. The Scrutiny role, carried out by non-Cabinet members, is designed to support the work of the Council in the following ways:

- Reviewing and scrutinising decisions taken by the Cabinet, also known as acting as a “critical friend”, challenging policy makers and decision makers;
- Considering aspects of the Council’s performance;
- Assisting in research, policy review and development and thus driving improvement in public services.
- Involving itself with external organisations operating in the Borough to ensure that the interests of local people are enhanced by collaborative working;
- Enabling the voice and concerns of the public to be heard and listened to.

Each scrutiny committee or task and finish group has its own remit as set out in its terms of reference. The scrutiny committees / task and finish groups consider issues by receiving information from, and the questioning of, both council officers and external witnesses or partners to develop an understanding of proposals or practices. As scrutiny committees have no executive powers they often present their conclusions in the form of recommendations to the Cabinet, full Council, council officers, or external partners that they believe will improve performance, or as a response to public consultations. The committee will often request a formal response and progress report on the implementation of recommendations that they have provided to various parties.

Attending Meetings of Scrutiny Committees / Task and Finish Groups

Meetings of scrutiny committees and task and finish groups are held in public and are open for everyone to attend. If you would like to attend then please just turn up. However, if you would like to make a representation to councillors on behalf of yourself or others, then let us know you are attending before the meeting so that the Chair can be advised in advance: scrutiny@milton-keynes.gov.uk

If there are specific issues that the meeting must consider in private then they will be asked to agree 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://milton-keynes.cmis.uk.com/milton-keynes/Committees.aspx>

Democratic Services

Overview and Scrutiny

Milton Keynes Council
Civic Offices
1 Saxon Gate East
Central Milton Keynes
MK9 3EJ

Elizabeth Richardson
Overview & Scrutiny Officer

T 01908 252629

E scrutiny@milton-keynes.gov.uk

<https://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/overview-and-scrutiny>