

Minutes of the MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL held on WEDNESDAY 21 JUNE 2017  
at 7.30 pm

**Present:** Councillor D Hopkins (Mayor)  
Councillors Alexander, Bald, Betteley, Bint, Brackenbury, M  
Bradburn, R Bradburn, Bramall, Brunning, Buckley, Burke, Clancy,  
Clifton, Coventry, Dransfield, Eastman, Exon, Ferrans, Geaney, A  
Geary, P Geary, Gifford, Green, V Hopkins, Hosking, Khan, Legg,  
Long, Marland, D McCall, I McCall, McDonald, McKenzie, McLean,  
McPake, Middleton, Miles, Nolan, O'Neill, Patey-Smith, Petchey,  
Walker, Wales, Wallis, Webb, C Williams, P Williams, C Wilson and  
K Wilson

**Apologies:** Councillors Cannon, Crooks, Ganatra, Gowans, Morla, Morris and  
Small and Aldermen Bartlett, Beeley, Bristow, E Henderson and  
Howell and Alderwomen I Henderson, Irons, Lloyd and Saunders

**Also Present:** 38 members of the public

**CL15 MINUTES**

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 17 May 2017  
be approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record, subject to  
Alderman Bristow's apologies, rather than his attendance, being  
recorded.

**CL16 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

Councillor A Geary disclosed a personal and prejudicial interest in  
respect of Item 4(c) (Minerals Local Plan) as he owned land within  
the area covered by the Plan and previously had business dealings  
with other land owners within the Plan area.

**CL17 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. Terrorist Incidents in Manchester and London, the Fire at  
Grenfell Tower, North Kensington, London and the Forest  
Fires in Portugal

The Mayor indicated that he had written to the Mayors of the  
areas affected by the tragic events of the terrorist attacks in  
Manchester and London, the fire at Grenfell Tower in North  
Kensington and the forest fires in Portugal expressing the  
Council's sympathies.

The Council stood as a mark of respect.

2. Mr R Rook, Chair of Ravenstone Parish Council

The Mayor announced the death on 8 June of Mr R Rook, Chair of Ravenstone Parish Council after a long battle with cancer. Mr Rook's funeral was to be on the 23 June 2017 at 3pm at Ravenstone Parish Church.

3. PCSO Maria Toniolo

The Mayor announced the death on 3 May 2017 of Thames Valley Police Community Support Officer Maria Toniolo. Maria was always held in high regard by the public in Bletchley, serving with the force in Bletchley between 2007 and 2011 and again from January 2016. In 2009 Maria's work was recognised across the whole of Thames Valley when she was awarded the accolade of Police Community Support Officer of the Year.

4. Councillor Gowans

The Mayor congratulated Councillor Gowans and his wife Agata on the birth of their daughter Annabella on 5 June 2017.

5. The Queen's Birthday Honours

The Mayor also congratulated Mrs Hilary Terry, a Youth Leader at the Olney Bible Club, who had been awarded a British Empire Medal for services to the community of Olney. The Mayor indicated that he would be inviting Mrs Terry to join him before a future Council meeting.

6. Presentation from the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chief Constable

The Mayor welcomed Mr Anthony Stansfeld, the Police and Crime Commissioner, the Chief Constable Francis Habgood and Superintendent Yvette Hitch, the Local Police Area Commander to the.

**CL18**

**PRESENTATION FROM THE CHIEF CONSTABLE**

The Council received presentations from Mr Anthony Stansfeld, the Police and Crime Commissioner and Mr Francis Habgood the Chief Constable of Thames Valley Police.

The Police and Crime Commissioner referred to the levels of crime which remained low despite an increase in recorded crime. He also indicated that Thames Valley Police was rated as 'good' in the recent PEEL assessment and victim satisfaction rates remained high compared to the national average.

The Police and Crime Commissioner outlined the results of consultations which were being used to inform his new 5 year and the strategic priorities.

The Chief Constable outlined Thames Valley Police's commitments to the public in the Thames Valley area, together with details of the police's performance in Milton Keynes compared with performance across the Thames Valley area.

The Chief Constable also outlined the operational priorities for 2017/18.

The Police and Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable then answered questions from councillors which covered such areas as the Police's ability to meet demand; the use of licensed gun holders during heightened terrorist threats; changes to community policing; staffing levels; the availability of crime statistics; partnership working; the role of the Police and Crime Commissioner with regard to fire authorities; levels of hate crime; and rural policing.

## **CL19**

### **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

- (a) Question from Mrs L Inoki to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Mrs Inoki, referring to widespread public protest about the inclusion of green open spaces in a list of potential infill sites in March 2015, which resulted in the Council withdrawing green open spaces which were 'already serving a valued purpose for local residents' from the list in order 'that they remain protected as open space' asked Councillor Marland why the Council had added the same green open spaces to a new list of potential infill sites as part of the Urban Capacity Study, when residents thought that the Council would continue to protect the open spaces for the benefit of all.

Councillor Marland indicated that the Site Allocations Plan and the Urban Capacity Study were separate documents, with the Site Allocations Plan identifying specific sites for development and the Urban Capacity Study being a technical assessment of all areas of land across Milton Keynes which could potentially be developed, which would enable Plan:MK to demonstrate that all possible sites had been assessed for their development potential.

Councillor Marland expressed some regret that, while the results of the Urban Capacity Study had been available since February, it had not been made more widely available and explained better.

Councillor Marland also indicated that the number of identified sites had already been significantly reduced as a result of a technical assessment. The remaining sites would be considered by the Plan:MK Working Group and reviewed against previous decisions taken by the Council.

Councillor Marland emphasised that no sites would be taken forward which had not been subject to public consultation with local people.

Mrs Inoki, asked a supplementary question, asked Councillor Marland to commit to reviewing the entire list of sites in the Urban Capacity Study with local people in a constructive and open way to give those local people some peace of mind.

Councillor Marland undertook to ask officer colleagues to review the technical guidance as to how Plan:MK was constructed and the requirement to assess all sites, specifically those sites previously rejected by the Council.

Councillor Marland also gave an assurance that any sites identified for development would be taken through the Plan:MK Working Group and be the subject of consultation with local residents Councillor Marland told Mrs Inoki he believed that it would be pointless to present Plan:MK to the Council with contentious sites included.

- (b) Question from Mr M Galloway to Councillor Legg (Cabinet member for Customer Service)

Mr M Galloway, refer to Paragraph 193 of the Government's National Planning Policy Framework which gave guidance that planning authorities should publish a local validation list for planning applications and review it on a frequent basis, asked Councillor Legg why the Council did not have local list in place at present, why there was no detail on the website about this, when was it proposed that the necessary work including public consultation will be done so there was a local validation list in place and what was to be done in the meantime to protect communities from the danger that arose from not having a list.

Councillor Legg indicated that work was underway to produce a local validation list and it was hoped to complete that work by early September, depending on the requirement to consult on the list which, if necessary, might delay the process slightly. Recognising that it was only guidance that the Council should have a local validation list, Councillor Legg undertook to investigate why the Council currently did not have such a list and provide a fuller reply by the end of the week.

The Mayor deferred the asking of submitted questions on the Minerals Local Plan, in order that they may be asked as part of the Council's consideration of the Plan.

## **CL20**

### **CORPORATE PARENTING PANEL ANNUAL REPORT**

The Council received the Corporate Parenting Panel Annual Report which was presented by Councillor Miles, Chair of the Corporate Parenting Panel.

**CL21**

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SCHEME OF OFFICER  
DELEGATION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MEETINGS –  
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – SPEAKING ARRANGEMENTS**

Councillor Eastman (Chair of the Development Control Committee) moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 11 May 2017, which was seconded by Councillor McLean:

“That the Development Control Scheme of Delegation and the Development Control Speaking Arrangements; Access to Information - Annex A of the Council Constitution be recommended to Council for Adoption.”

The Council heard from three members of the public during its consideration of this item.

On being put to the vote the recommendation from the Development Control Committee was declared carried by acclamation.

RESOLVED –

That the Development Control Scheme of Delegation and the Development Control Speaking Arrangements; Access to Information - Annex A of the Council Constitution be adopted.

**CL22**

**MINERALS LOCAL PLAN**

Questions deferred from Minute CL19 (Questions from Members of the Public)

- (a) Question from Mr J Fishwick (Chair of Lathbury Parish Meeting) to Councillor Gifford (Cabinet member for Place)

Mr J Fishwick asked Councillor Gifford, given that Lathbury Parish meeting had, in several responses during the consultation, raised the matter of the case law arising from recent hearings at the Court of Appeal interpreting Section 66 sub-section 1 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, whether the Council, or its officers sought legal advice on the impact of the case law with regard to sites in the Minerals Local Plan where listed buildings (and other heritage assets) neighbour and/or were in close proximity to the sites and if so, what advice had been given.

Councillor Gifford indicated that legal advice had been obtained on both this and a number of other issues in connection with the Minerals Local Plan.

Mr Fishwick, asked a supplementary question, asked Councillor Gifford if the advice had been from a Counsel specialising in planning law, or a general Counsel.

Councillor Gifford indicated that the advice was from Counsel,

- (b) Question from Mr L Murray to Councillor Gifford (Cabinet member for Place)

Mr Murray, noting that the Minerals Local Plan sought to secure a provision of 0.17 metric tonnes per annum (paragraph 4.6) and that this figure had been used since the start of the consultation almost 4 years ago and given the "slow-down" in construction in the Borough since the provision was calculated, asked Councillor Gifford whether the value had been revisited and if so what was the revised figure.

Councillor Gifford indicated that as the Minerals Local Plan was for a long period a number of factors needed to be taken into account, as a result, there had been some reflection and examination of the figures in the Plan. However, the Inspector was of the view that the approach being taken by the Council was a sensible one as it allowed for the projected growth in the area which would be part of Plan:MK going forward.

Councillor Gifford (Cabinet member for Place) moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 13 June 2017, which was seconded by Councillor Legg and on which a recorded vote was requested:

“That Council be recommended to adopt the Milton Keynes Minerals Local Plan.”

The Council heard from four members of the public during its consideration of this item.

The voting was as follows:

FOR: Councillors Alexander, Betteley, Brackenbury, M Bradburn, R Bradburn, Burke, Clifton, Coventry, Eastman, Exon, Ferrans, Gifford, Khan, Legg, Long, Marland, D McCall, I McCall, McKenzie, McPake, Middleton, Miles, Nolan, O'Neill, Petchey, Wales, Wallis, Webb, C Williams, P Williams, C Wilson, and K Wilson (32)

AGAINST: Councillors Bald, Bint, Brunning, Buckley, Clancy, Dransfield, Geaney, P Geary, Green, D Hopkins, V Hopkins, Hosking, Jenkins, McDonald, McLean, Patey-Smith and Walker (17)

The recommendation was declared carried.

RESOLVED –

That the Milton Keynes Minerals Local Plan be adopted.

(Councillor A Geary having disclosed a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of the Item left the meeting whilst it was considered, taking no part in the debate or the voting thereon.)

**COUNCILLORS' QUESTIONS**

- (a) Question from Councillor Clancy to Councillor Long (Cabinet member for Adult Care and Housing)

Councillor Clancy, referring to the lack of fire safety signs and instructions about what to do in the event of a fire at Ambassador House in Bletchley asked Councillor Long if that could be rectified.

Councillor Long, recognising that the question followed on from the tragedy at Grenfell House reassured the Council that all of the Council's housing properties in the borough complied with fire regulations and had fire safety certificates, but to provide further reassurance all properties were to be checked again.

Councillor Long indicated that as Ambassador House was in private ownership, Councillor Clancy might wish to seek reassurance from Councillor McDonald who was the Vice-chair of the Authority as fire safety at Ambassador House was the responsibility of the Fire and Rescue Authority. However, Councillor Long also indicated that that the Council was liaising with landlords of private properties over fire safety issues.

Councillor Clancy, as a supplementary question, suggested that as some of the residents of Ambassador House were Council tenants the Council had a duty of care to those residents and should take measures to investigate any issues.

Councillor Long indicated that officer colleagues had been asked to undertake checks at private buildings used by the Council for its residents and the Council was working with the Fire and Rescue Authority, which did have the powers to inspect the private properties and ultimately close buildings down which were not safe, to ensure that all such buildings were safe.

- (b) Question from Councillor Dransfield to Councillors Marland (Leader of the Council) and Nolan (Cabinet member for Children and Families)

Councillor Dransfield, referring to the lack of support nationally for the compulsory fitting of sprinkler systems in certain categories of buildings asked if the Cabinet would consider the fitting of such systems in the Council's schools and buildings accommodating vulnerable people.

Councillor Nolan indicated that none of the Council's schools had sprinkler systems fitted, but she understood that the Leader of the Council had asked officer colleagues to review this position.

Councillor Dransfield, as a supplementary question, recognising the situation in the Council's schools, asked that it be made a requirement to install sprinkler systems in Council buildings accommodating vulnerable people.

Councillor Marland agreed to review the situation, but suggested that as there was to be a public enquiry into the fire at Grenfell House it might, before taking any action, be better to await the recommendations from that.

- (c) Question from Councillor Eastman to Councillors Marland (Leader of the Council) and Gifford (Cabinet member for Place)

Councillor Eastman, outlining the problems faced by persons with visual impairments and those deaf or hard of hearing with cyclists sharing routes with pedestrians in the city centre, particularly between the Intu building and the city centre (National Cycle Route 51), asked if it was possible to reroute Route 51 and as far as possible prohibit cycling in the shopping area.

Councillor Gifford undertook to look into the situation.

Councillor Eastman, as a supplementary question, referring to the retail units which were over spilling into the walkways around the city centre shopping area and were a danger for visually impaired people, asked if some form of verbal warning system could be installed to help people with visual impairments avoid such obstacles as chairs and barriers and avoid injury.

Councillor Marland indicated that he would ask the City Centre Management to consider this matter.

- (d) Question from Councillor I McCall to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Councillor I McCall, referring to two sites in Woolstone which had previously been rejected by the Council for development when an undertaking was given by the Cabinet member, asked Councillor Marland why the sites had been included in the Urban Capacity Study and if residents could once again be reassured that the Council would not break its previous promise that the sites would not be developed.

Councillor Marland indicated that that the Urban Capacity Study was a capacity study and was not an allocations study. Referring to his previous answer given at public question time he emphasised that no sites would be developed against the wishes of residents and previous undertakings would be honoured. Councillor Marland also reiterated that it would be pointless to present Plan:MK to the Council with contentious sites included.



Councillor I McCall, as a supplementary question, asked Marland what he considered to be the potential impact on the Plan:MK process which required the support of councillors and residents by the inclusion of controversial sites in the Urban Capacity Study.

Councillor Marland conceded that there were certainly lessons to be learnt about how the Urban Capacity Study had been handled and also reminded fellow councillors that they had a responsibility to ensure that residents were aware of the facts in such situations.

- (e) Question from Councillor V Hopkins to Councillor Gifford (Cabinet member for Place)

Councillor V Hopkins, referring to the Central Bedfordshire draft Local Plan which had recently been published for consultation and recognising the implications for Milton Keynes of potentially building 3000 dwellings on the border of Milton Keynes near Aspley Guise, specifically the Express Way and East West Rail asked Councillor Gifford if it was intended to bring forward an item for debate to the July Council meeting.

Councillor Gifford indicated that she was due to discuss the issue with officer colleagues shortly and would provide a written response.

- (f) Question from Councillor P Geary to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Councillor P Geary asked Councillor Marland if he thought that it was hypocrisy that his Deputy Leader had stood for Parliament on a Manifesto which included abolishing zero hours contracts when the Council still operated 389 such contracts.

Councillor Marland indicated that the Council operated a number of relief contracts for translators, they were not the zero hours contracts as referred to in the Labour Party Manifesto as while the translator was only paid for the work carried they were not bound to work only for the Council. Councillor Marland expressed the view that it would be unrealistic for the Council to employ a bank of translators to cover all of the languages necessary.

Councillor P Geary, as a supplementary question, again asked Councillor Marland if it was hypocrisy that he as Leader supported a Labour Party Manifesto which included abolishing zero hours contracts, when the Council had 389 such contract, particularly as this had risen from 38 when the Conservative Group formed the Administration.

Councillor Marland indicated that he was willing to debate workers' rights, the 'Living Wage' and zero hours contracts if Councillor Geary wished, but that didn't alter the fact that the Council had no zero hours contracts within the Labour Party definition. Translators were employed on a framework contract as previously explained to Councillor Geary by Councillor Middleton.

(g) Question from Councillor Brackenbury to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Councillor Brackenbury, referring to undertakings given in 2015 with regard to Council owned sites being withdrawn from the Site Allocations Plan, particularly two sites in Springfield and one in Downs Barn, asked if the surprise of residents by their inclusion in the Urban Capacity Study could be understood and whether the assurances could be repeated that the sites would come forward in Plan:MK as open space.

Councillor Marland reiterated the role of the Urban Capacity Study and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework which required the Council, as part of the Plan:MK process to come to a housing delivery capacity. The Council's technical assessment of the sites in the Urban Capacity Study had already ruled out an estimated 50% of the sites as not feasible for development. Councillor Marland recognised that the Council needed to explain better to residents the purpose of the various technical stages the Council needed to complete in preparing Plan:MK. Councillor Marland emphasised that any sites which progressed beyond the technical assessment stages would be subject to consultation with the Council's Plan:MK Working Group, ward councillors and residents.

With regard to designating areas of open space councillor Gifford would be addressing that in due course as the Plan:MK process progressed.

Councillor Brackenbury, as a supplementary question, asked Councillor Marland if the Urban Capacity Study was not in fact flawed if it included an estimated 50% of land ruled out for technical reasons and sites which the Council had already promised would not be developed. Councillor Brackenbury also asked if Councillor Marland agreed with him that the building of an additional 3,500 houses in the urban area was unrealistic.

Councillor Marland indicated that Councillor Brackenbury could make his point about the house building target as part of the consultation.

- (h) Question from Councillor Bald to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Councillor Bald, referring to a lack of representation by the Labour Group at the Examination in Public of Aylesbury Vale District Council's Local Plan where the development at Salden Chase was considered, which would have significant implications for Milton Keynes, asked Councillor Marland if the Labour Administration was taking objections to the Plan by residents seriously.

Councillor Marland indicated that he had made a statement on the issue at Cabinet and the Council had unanimously agreed to oppose the development. Counsel had been instructed to identify any grounds for legal challenge and the Labour Group, along with the other groups on the Council had consistently opposed the Salden Chase development.

Councillor Bald, as a supplementary question, asked Marland if he agreed that the Labour Group was putting the Election campaign ahead of the interests of residents.

Councillor Marland said not, referring to Aylesbury Vale District Council, as a Conservative controlled authority, passing the Local Plan in the first instance.

- (i) Question from Councillor Ferrans to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Councillor Ferrans asked Councillor Marland if he considered the temporary repair of potholes six months ago at the H8 / V11 Brinklow Roundabout good value for money, as the potholes had returned causing similar road safety concerns which had prompted the Police to ask for the potholes to be repaired previously.

Councillor Marland indicated that he did not. Councillor Marland drew the Council's attention to the Council Plan and both the Labour Group's Manifesto and the Manifesto of the Liberal Democrat Group which included a commitment to review the Council's Highways Maintenance Policy.

Councillor Ferrans, as a supplementary question, asked Councillor Marland if she could be notified of what repairs were planned for the roundabout, as she had asked six weeks ago and had not received a response.

Councillor Marland undertook to provide a full answer if Councillor Ferrans provided him with the details.

- (j) Question from Councillor Geaney to Councillor Long (Cabinet member for Adult Care and Housing)

Councillor Geaney, noting that one of the lifts at Melish Court had been out of order for some time asked Councillor Long what were the plans for its repair.

Councillor Long indicated that the lift was being replaced as agreed with residents on 8 April 2017. However he recognised that there were also reliability issues with the other lift and its condition and the need for replacement was being assessed by YourMK. Councillor Long also indicated that a number of the problems with the lifts were caused by vandalism.

Councillor Geaney, as a supplementary question, indicated that she understood that the replacement would not be completed for a further six weeks and asked Councillor Long if he thought it acceptable that residents, many of them with young families, has to cope without a lift for such a long time.

Councillor Long explained that he and Councillors Legg and Wales had met with residents on 8 April when the replacement of the lift had been discussed along with a number of wider issues. He understood the new lift would be operational in three weeks' time.

Councillor Long recognised that the current situation was difficult for residents and an apology for the inconvenience had been provided by Councillor Legg.

Councillor Long emphasised that YourMK was aware of the issues with the lifts, along with a number of other issues which were being addressed. Investment in Melish Court would continue.

(k) Question from Councillor McDonald to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Councillor McDonald, referring to the Urban Capacity Study, asked Councillor Marland if the Council was being told the truth about the Study, because if the 'green sites' previously removed from the Site Allocations Plan were included in the Urban Capacity Study so should all green sites across the borough, so was it a mistake that all green spaces had not been included.

Councillor Marland indicated that he would ask officer colleagues to respond to what was a technical point. Councillor Marland referring to his previous answers reiterated the technical nature of the Urban Capacity Study.

Councillor McDonald, as a supplementary question, asked Councillor Marland to consider withdrawing the Urban Capacity Study until such time that the Open Spaces Assessment, which was the next stage in the process, was completed, particularly because of the confusion which surrounded the status of the Urban Capacity Study.

Councillor Marland stated that Councillor McDonald could ask for the Urban Capacity Study to be withdrawn and his request could be considered, but Councillor Marland imagined not at this stage.

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

Councillor D McCall, referring to the Urban Capacity Study and noting that the study had not been considered by the councillor working Group on Plan:MK, asked Councillor Marland how could residents could comment on the Study, which formed part of the Plan:MK consultation, when the consultation period for Plan:MK had ended on 9 June 2017.

Councillor Marland indicated that the consultation period on the technical assessment had commenced in. Councillor Marland confirmed that the process for consultations on such technical documents would be reviewed for future consultations.

Councillor D McCall, as a supplementary question, reiterated his original question, asking how residents could respond to the issues raised by the Urban Capacity Study if they were not aware of the consultation and the consultation had now closed.

Councillor Marland reaffirmed his response that the consultation was issued in February, stating that the Urban Capacity Study was published as a suite of documents for consultation and it was not incumbent on the Council to identify which of the documents might be more important for certain sections of the community than others. However, Councillor Marland believed that it was important for the context of such technical documents as the Urban Capacity Study to be made aware to councillors; parish and town councils; and interested persons.

**CL24**

### **COUNCIL CALLS FOR MORE APPRENTICES**

Councillor Walker moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor A Geary:

- “1. That this Council notes:
  - (a) the opportunities presented through the new Apprenticeship levy;
  - (b) the benefits apprenticeship schemes provide for the life prospects of young people; and
  - (c) the contribution apprentices make to the creation of a loyal and diverse workforce.
2. That the Council also notes that in the 2017/18 budget only one team, in the Place Directorate, planned for new apprentices (13 in total); Council therefore registers its disappointment that this number is so small, given that the £330k pa levy, funded by Milton Keynes residents, is available to draw down for training purposes and that the Council has had plenty of time to plan for this as the levy was announced in Autumn 2015.

3. That this Council therefore resolves to:
  - (a) endorse the creation of new and / or expand current apprenticeships schemes within the Council;
  - (b) urge Cabinet to bring forward plans to bring the number of apprentices up to 2.3% of the workforce using the training funding from the apprenticeship levy;
  - (c) lead the way in the public sector in Milton Keynes and look at opportunities to work with and encourage other bodies to launch new schemes; and
  - (d) focus recruitment marketing at young people living in the borough of Milton Keynes.”

On being put to the vote, the Council agreed to the amendment submitted by Councillor Middleton being withdrawn.

Councillor Ferrans moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Middleton and accepted by Councillor Walker, the mover of the motion:

- “1. That the following new Clauses be added to Clause 1:
  - (d) that although many Council staff are already highly qualified, there is some scope for apprentices at both the basic and higher levels
  - (e) that the shortage of qualified construction workers is reducing the rate of house-building nationally, and that this is a field which can offer a long term career to people in the Milton Keynes area.
2. That in Clause 2 the word ‘Place’ be replaced by the word ‘People’; the word ‘currently’ be added between the words ‘is’ and ‘so’ and the words ‘taxes from’ be added after the words ‘funded by’.
3. That in Clause 3(b) the words ‘investigate if it is feasible to’ be added after the words ‘Cabinet to’; and the words ‘, acknowledging that apprenticeships are training placements and cannot, and should not, replace a skilled workforce’ be added after the word ‘levy’.
4. That in Clause 3(c) the words ‘and continue to’, be added at the beginning; the words ‘and look’ replaced with the words ‘in looking’ and the words ‘such as continuing the work undertaken in securing apprenticeships in new tenders and procurements including development work by MKDP and YourMK’ be added at the end.

5. That a new Clause 3(e) be added as follows:  
'note the work being undertaken by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Innovation with the Head of Human Resources on a new Workforce Strategy, which will include development of the Council's apprenticeship offer, and requests the Cabinet Member to bring forward the report as quickly as possible.'".

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

RESOLVED –

1. That this Council notes:
  - (a) the opportunities presented through the new Apprenticeship levy;
  - (b) the benefits apprenticeship schemes provide for the life prospects of young people;
  - (c) the contribution apprentices make to the creation of a loyal and diverse workforce;
  - (d) that although many Council staff are already highly qualified, there is some scope for apprentices at both the basic and higher levels; and
  - (e) that the shortage of qualified construction workers is reducing the rate of house-building nationally, and that this is a field which can offer a long term career to people in the Milton Keynes area.
2. That the Council also notes that in the 2017/18 budget only one team, in the People Directorate, planned for new apprentices (13 in total); Council therefore registers its disappointment that this number is currently so small, given that the £330k pa levy, funded by taxes from Milton Keynes residents, is available to draw down for training purposes and that the Council has had plenty of time to plan for this as the levy was announced in Autumn 2015.
3. That this Council therefore resolves to:
  - (a) endorse the creation of new and / or expand current apprenticeships schemes within the Council;
  - (b) urge Cabinet to investigate if it is feasible to bring forward plans to bring the number of apprentices up to 2.3% of the workforce using the training funding from the apprenticeship levy, acknowledging that apprenticeships are training placements and cannot, and should not, replace a skilled workforce;

- (c) continue to lead the way in the public sector in Milton Keynes in looking at opportunities to work with and encourage other bodies to launch new schemes such as continuing the work undertaken in securing apprenticeships in new tenders and procurements including development work by MKDP and YourMK;
- (d) focus recruitment marketing at young people living in the borough of Milton Keynes; and
- (e) note the work being undertaken by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Innovation with the Head of Human Resources on a new Workforce Strategy, which will include development of the Council's apprenticeship offer, and requests the Cabinet Member to bring forward the report as quickly as possible.

**CL25                    WARD BASED BUDGETS - 1 APRIL 2016 TO 31 MARCH 2017**

The Council noted that between 1 April 2016 and 31 March 2017 Ward Based Budget applications totalling £53,669 had been approved.

**CL26                    QUARTERLY REPORT ON SPECIAL URGENCY DECISIONS**

The Council noted that, in accordance with Access to Information Procedure Rule 17.4, the Provisions for Special Urgency, as set out in Access to Information Procedure Rule 16, was not used during the period 11 March January 2017 to 31 May 2017.

THE MAYOR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 10:37 PM