

Minutes of the meeting of the CABINET held on TUESDAY 2 JANUARY 2018 at 6.30 pm

Present: Councillor Marland (Chair)
Councillors Gifford, Gowans, Legg, Long, Middleton, Nolan and O'Neill

Officers: M Bracey (Corporate Director -People), P Simpson (Corporate Director - Resources and Commercial Development, S Gonsalves (Acting Director of Policy, Insight and Communications), S Richardson (Service Director [Finance and Resources]), P Cummins (Head of Legal Services), B Leahy (Head of Planning), N Sainsbury (Head of Placemaking), M Zaman (Head of Human Resources), S Lloyd (Policy Project Manager) and S Muir (Committee Manager)

Also Present: Councillors Bald, Bint, R Bradburn, Crooks, P Geary, McDonald, Miles and K Wilson and circa 22 members of the public

C103 CABINET ANNOUNCEMENTS

- (a) Councillor Long (Cabinet Member Adult Care and Housing) thanked colleagues working at Kilkenny House Westcroft on the recently published Care Quality Commission (CQC) inspection report which judged the home as 'good' in every category.

Councillor Long added that this was the third "good" inspection report that had been received for the Council's Sheltered Housing homes and reflected the high quality of trained staff and good leadership at the homes.

- (b) Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council) announced that due to problems with the refuse collection over the Christmas period, some refuse collections had been rescheduled and extra vehicles had been brought in by the Council's contractor Serco to clear the backlog. Residents were asked to put out their refuse on the Christmas date previously announced and it would be collected.

Councillor Marland added that an extensive investigation would be carried out into why this happened and that updates to residents would continue to be communicated through the Council's Twitter and Facebook pages.

- (c) Councillor Marland announced with sadness the recent deaths of two former Councillors.

Isabella Fraser, who represented the old Campbell Park Ward between 2002 and 2012 as well as having served for many years on Woolstone-cum-Willen Parish and Campbell Park Parish Councils; and

Ron Daniels who served on the Council between 1976 and 1983, representing the Loughton Ward, and was also Chairman of Shenley Church End Parish Council for many years.

Those present stood for a few moments of silence as a mark of respect for former Councillors Isabella Fraser and Ron Daniels.

C104 MINUTES

RESOLVED -

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 5 December 2017 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

C105 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

None were made.

C106 DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS

No deputations or petitions were received.

C107 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

- (a) Councillor Gowans (Cabinet Member for Public Realm) received the following questions from members of the public with reference to highways and speeding issues in the Eastern Expansion Area for which individual written responses would be sent:

- (i) Gareth Derham

Gareth Derham asked how the Council had reached the figure of £250K identified in the budget to be spent in Broughton and Brooklands?

- (ii) Murray Pattenden

Murray Pattenden asked how the Council planned to spend the £250K identified for road improvements in Broughton and Brooklands, acknowledging that changes needed to be made.

- (iii) Jayne Leggett

Jayne Leggett stating that the Community Speed Watch programme had proven there was an issue with speeding in Brooklands/Broughton, asked how the Council could support the community to get better

equipment to help them as a community to continue to tackle this problem.

(iv) Franco Volpe

Franco Volpe asked that, as a resident of the Eastern Expansion area, with reference to Goods Vehicles using Fen Street Broughton and Brooklands, if it could be confirmed that the correct signage was in place at the entry points to the Brooklands and Broughton development, showing the restriction on vehicles over 7.5t from entering this ever increasingly populated area and whether it would be correctly and rigidly enforced.

(v) Craig Valberg

Craig Valberg asked, with reference to Travel Plans for Magna Park, if details could be made available as to what travel plans were in place with existing and new businesses in Magna Park - stipulating the use of the Horizontal and Vertical roads rather than local residential roads?

(vi) Ross Abbott

Ross Abbott noting that since the Brooklands Community Speed Watch had been in operation, 295 speeders had been recorded in 14 hours and 15 minutes, what could the Council do to help them alleviate this problem?

(vii) Donna Howes

Donna Howes asked what plans did the Council already have for road improvements and on what parts of Brooklands & Broughton would they impact?"

(ix) Lisa Asbury

Lisa Asbury stated that it was recognised that roads outside schools should be 20mph zones and asked why the speed limit was only 20mph on Fen Street and not on Newport Road when there were 2 school entrances opposite each other.

Ms Astbury also asked whether this could be considered in the road improvement plans and if not, how could they get the flashing 30mph signs that were there, switched on?

- (b) Councillor Long (Cabinet Member Adult Care and Housing) received the following questions from members of the public with reference to voting in Regeneration:MK ballots:**

(i) Bianca Bendig-Ceesay

Bianca Bendig-Ceesay asked how it could be ensured that the outcome of a no vote in the Fullers Slade Regeneration was explained in as much detail to residents, so they could make an informed decision between all options given to them.

Bianca Bendig-Ceesay also asked as a supplementary question, if it could be ensured that the publication of the implications of a no vote received at least as much detail as the other options available and were publicised along with those options on YourMK documentation?

(ii) Maja Dunn -Secretary of the Fullers Slade Residents Association

Maja Dunn stating that it was important that, in voting in any ballot, residents should be fully aware of all of the facts so that they could make an informed choice upon the options available, requested that an assurance be given that, at the point of ballot, that all residents would be given the full facts about how all of the options would apply to them personally, including details of timescales and phasing and the precise location, layout, design and costs, including rent, mortgage, Council Tax and disturbance costs and also that these proposals had been independently audited before the ballot so that residents could feel confident it was a fair and viable scheme?

(iii) David Lee - on behalf of Tinkers Bridge Residents Association

David Lee stated that he was grateful to see an assessment of the progress made against the RegenerationMK 2030 Strategy objectives. However, it appeared to reflect only the YourMK view, and so should not be taken by others as an objective result and accordingly put forward his own assessment.

Mr Lee asked Councillor Long if he would agree that the truth was probably somewhere between the rose-tinted version of YourMK and his own grey-tinted version, and therefore modify the recommendation before Cabinet.

Mr Lee also asked as a supplementary question, if Councillor Long could explain why the figures originally listed with these objectives had not been used in the Annex attached to item 10, and when an assessment against those figures will be available?

(iv) Stewart Dunn

Stewart Dunn with reference to Fullers Slade Regeneration and Item 10 on the Agenda Regeneration:MK, which stated "It was important that people felt fully engaged in the process and owned the outcome", asked why were YourMK preventing the only democratically elected Residents Association with a Council agreed constitution and a Platinum accreditation from meaningful involvement and not answering their questions? Instead YourMK had set up its own ineffective, tightly controlled non-constitutional steering group which had not even had its first public meeting.

Stewart Dunn also asked as a supplementary question, if the Council had passed a resolution that residents represented by Fullers Slade Residents Association were to be excluded from regeneration involvement so preventing the Fullers Slade Residents Association from offering a costed alternative option for consideration?

Councillor Long thanked the residents for their questions.

Councillor Long indicated that, with reference to voting in any ballot, people must be aware of what they are voting for. The proposition with reference to Regeneration:MK including what it meant for tenants in terms of rent levels, replacement properties sizes, tenancy rights and, as far as were known, timescales and locations would be clear.

The information would include the scheme to be adopted in terms of home loss payments, disturbance and compensation. It was more difficult to guarantee that information for other residents such as home owners would have such clarity, as until individual agreements were reached with home owners, this could not be given. Such agreements would not be reached in advance of a ballot. Councillor Long did, however, confirm that offers to those who wished to remain in the area either as homeowners or in rental properties would be clear.

Councillor Long also responded to the question from Maja Dunn requesting that the proposals be independently audited before the ballot and indicated that to have the proposals independently audited would not add to the process, as the Council would be approving the scheme and many of the figures were derived from legislation.

Councillor Long also indicated his disappointment that the Fullers Slade Residents Association felt excluded from the

project and he stated that he would ensure this was investigated and remedied.

With reference to the question from David Lee about the quantitative assessment of the objectives, Councillor Long indicated that that the Annex referred to was YourMK's assessment of progress and others would have different views. A full Key Performance Indicator suite for YourMK was being established and would be published in due course.

Councillor Long thanked Mr Lee for sharing the Tinkers Bridge Residents Association position and for his support in scrutinising YourMK.

Councillor Long also indicated that he was aware that some of the figures had been updated as part of developing the programme and asked officer colleagues to share the current figures with a note explaining any changes.

- (c) Question from Parish Councillor David Stabler on behalf of Great Linford Parish Council, which was read out by the Leader of the Council in Councillor Stabler's absence, to Councillor Legg (Cabinet Member for Customer Services [Planning]) with reference to the Planning application 17/02748/FULR3 Land to the North of 2 Coltsfoot Place, Conniburrow.

Parish Councillor Stabler asked the Cabinet Member to instruct the Officer responsible for submitting planning application 17/02748/FULR3 to withdraw the application, until such time as the due process and assurances had been followed to identify the site as suitable for housing for the following reasons:

1. It would appear to Great Linford Parish Council that Milton Keynes Council had not complied with due process and assurances given to Great Linford Parish Council in correspondence from the Head of Planning dated 5 July 2017.
2. The Milton Keynes Council had not agreed to develop this site, either at a Cabinet meeting or by a Delegated Decision.
3. The decision to develop the site was not advertised and residents, the Parish Council had not had the chance to make representations.
4. A detailed assessment had not been undertaken as to whether; house building on the site was desirable, the surrounding infrastructure could support it, and whether the planning benefits outweighed the costs, loss of open space or existing facilities.

Councillor Marland, Leader of the Council answered the question on behalf of Councillor Legg and indicated that the Council's position as Planning Authority and Land Owner were very separate and that the Development Control Committee was not an Executive Function, therefore, the Cabinet did not have powers to instruct it. The Development Control Committee would make its determination on the evidence available to it.

Councillor Marland continued that with regard to the Planning Application, the opinions of the Planning Officer and recommendations were based solely on Planning Legislation and Local Policies. Additionally, extensive consultation had been undertaken with Great Linford Parish Council, local residents and Ward members prior to the planning application being brought forward.

Councillor Marland also requested that a full response be forwarded to the Chair and Clerk of Great Linford Parish Council as the question was asked on the Parish Council's behalf.

C108

ITEM SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR CROOKS WITH REFERENCE TO ROAD TRAFFIC ISSUES IN BROOKLANDS AND BROUGHTON

In response to an item submitted by Councillor Crooks with reference to road traffic issues in Brooklands and Broughton the Cabinet heard from several residents of the Eastern Expansion Area who advised of the following further concerns and comments in addition to those outlined in the questions set out at Minute C107(a) above:

- The Community Speed Watch programme had proven there were urgent issues with speeding and provided evidence of:
 - vehicles including Arriva buses travelling at speeds of 24mph in a 20 mph zone;
 - vehicles again including Arriva buses, travelling at speeds of 37mph in a 20 mph zone with some recorded as travelling at up to 57mph;
- more than 170 buses per day using Fen Street and damaging parts of the roads;
- damage to grass verges;
- the need to extend yellow lines around corners;
- parking bays should be extended and the Zebra Crossing moved or changed;
- the Bus stop outside Brooklands Park Primary School on Fen Street should be moved to increase road visibility for young people;

- the 30mph sign on Fen Street should be moved closer to The Coach Ways Bus Station;
- Newport Road was now a residential Street and the 60mph limit should be reduced;
- residents and Thames Valley Police representatives should be invited to sit on the Working Group set up with Councillors, Parish Council, Developers and partners;
- that there was no sense of urgency from Council officers to resolve the issues that had been frequently discussed; and
- local residents should be invited to join the Eastern Expansion Area Working group with Councillors, Developers and Partners.

Councillor Gowans, the Cabinet member for Public Realm agreed that the statistics provided by the Community Speed Watch team were horrendous and thanked the volunteers for their work and the hours spent in undertaking the Speed Watch initiative. He stated that he would ask Thames Valley Police to provide a speed camera on Fen Street and also indicated that the information about Arriva buses was helpful.

Councillor Gowans confirmed that he had undertaken a visit to the Eastern Expansion Area to evaluate the issues being reported and agreed with many of the points that were raised.

Councillor Gowans also invited those residents attending the Cabinet meeting to join the Working group in order that their ideas could be thoroughly investigated and acceptable outcomes found. A date would be found as soon as possible for the next Working Group to meet and this would be forwarded to them

Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council) thanked the residents for their sustained pressure about the priorities which were important to them. He stated that it was encouraging that residents wished to be involved in designing solutions to improve their area.

Councillor Marland indicated that it was important to recognise that the budget of £250k earmarked for the Eastern Expansion Area was to meet essential priorities. Councillor Marland explained that the Cabinet needed to balance the needs of the whole borough when setting the budgets, but if priorities came forward from residents, they would be considered separately and he quoted the V4 Crossings Project as an example.

Councillor Marland added that it was also important that a list of essential requirements was drafted and to recognise that that some issues that were considered as essential now, might be mitigated once a properly designed plan had been produced. Desirable but non-essential items could be investigated at a later date.

The Cabinet also heard from Councillor Bint, a Ward member for Broughton, who indicated that residents were profoundly dissatisfied

at the rate of progress and speed at which officer colleagues were resolving the issues.

Councillor Bint also indicated that the transport plans for the Eastern Expansion Area by officer colleagues were now obsolete; the layout and operation of the roads needed to be greatly changed and requested that a plan, process and commitment from the Cabinet was forthcoming.

RESOLVED -

1. That the Working Group membership be amended to include residents.
2. That the Cabinet member, Ward Members, officer colleagues and the Working Group undertake a Design Brief for works, by March 2018.
3. That a detailed design for the Design Brief with costs be established by May 2018 and brought to Cabinet to consider by September 2018.
4. That this decision supersedes previous Decisions taken by the Cabinet or Cabinet members and be undertaken as a priority.

C109

**REFERRAL FROM COUNCIL - 22 NOVEMBER 2017 -
REGENERATION:MK: REASSURANCE TO RESIDENTS**

The Cabinet received a referral from the Council's meeting of 22 November 2017 requesting that the Cabinet clarify policy, in particular ensuring that the referendum offered residents the final say on any proposals, and specifically that:

- (i) the ballot should contain a clear YES or NO option;
- (ii) Milton Keynes Council's Electoral Services should conduct the referendum;
- (iii) only those on the electoral roll in each regeneration area should be able to vote;
- (iv) in conformity with the motion passed by Council on 15 July 2015 (Minute CL42 refers), the electoral franchise should include all young people aged 16 years and over; and
- (v) every effort was made to ensure registration on affected estates was improved before any ballot

The Council had also requested the Cabinet to reaffirm:

- (a) the commitment that existing Council tenants would be offered accommodation at least equal to their current circumstances (in room number), unless they explicitly wished otherwise;
- (b) the commitment that new social housing would meet the Parker Morris space standards.

Along with the referral from the Council, the Cabinet considered the report included at Item 10 Regeneration:MK.

The Cabinet noted that in line with the original commitment, Your:MK had reported that it had developed a community led approach to regeneration which fully incorporated a resident led 'co-design' process that sought to develop a range of possible masterplans upon which the resident community would be balloted. This was fully aligned to current national best practice.

It was also reported that since July 2017, Your:MK had held several engagement events that sought to deliver a genuinely community led regeneration vision and outcome. This engagement process extended beyond what would be expected on most estate regeneration schemes as it embedded community involvement in the fundamental design and decision making process.

Councillor Long (Cabinet Member Adult Care and Community) heard from several residents who advised further concerns and comments in addition to the questions at Minute C107(b) above:

- £6000 had been suggested as a compensation figure for Fuller Slade tenants and this could prejudice the referendum result;
- there was £17m in the Housing Revenue Account which had not been spent in maintaining properties, which were now run down;
- the houses were originally designed and built in the regeneration areas with good sized rooms and gardens and could be easily and more economically refurbished rather than demolished;
- 6000 people consulted and less than 50 responses received was not a good indicator of opinion, therefore further engagement with clear information was needed;
- residents were suspicious that like would not be replaced with like and balconies and garages would be lost;
- there was a lack of trust and concerns about the future as information given to date was confusing and contradictory;
- a new consultation was required with resident involvement in the wording;
- the opinions of residents in Tinkers Bridge would be very different from those in Fullers Slade and the Lakes Estate as the issues on each neighbourhood were very diverse;
- contradictory and confusing information had been given by the architects at the Serpentine Court 'Drop In' about the regeneration of the Lakes Estate and Serpentine Court;

- a clear explanation of the “no” option; did this mean no demolition or no refurbishment; and
- Mears were asking for additional funding, but any work that this was for should have been properly costed by Mears and included at the start of the project.

Councillor Long indicated, in addition to his responses at C107(b) above, that all the proposals and options would need to come from residents . Exhaustive and open engagement was needed with a bottom up approach to enable trust to be re-built with residents. He wanted consensus from residents and Your:MK was aware of this.

With reference to the amounts of compensation payments, Councillor Long referred to his response at C107(b) and indicated he was not aware of the £6k figure that had been mentioned and would raise this with officer colleagues.

With reference to the questions about Mears, Councillor Long indicated that Mears had been contracted to carry out repairs which were not part of the Regeneration contract, and the request for additional funding might relate to this other contract.

Councillor Long also recognised that over the years, many stock condition surveys had been carried out and the information from these had not been collated. Some houses and areas might just require refurbishing to meet modern standards. However, any new social housing designs in regeneration areas would meet those outlined in the 1961 Parker Morris report on space standards.

Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council) indicated that the item had been included on the agenda as the Cabinet recognised it was a community led project where progress had slowed and engagement and consultation with residents was being questioned. This was an opportunity to pause, reflect and ensure that the project was properly resourced to enable leadership and engagement by the residents.

Councillor Marland continued that the Cabinet was also very clear that a wide range of voices needed to be heard including those of residents associations and individual residents. However, nothing would be achieved unless trust and confidence was improved between all the partners. With regard to a referendum, this would not be triggered until further comprehensive involvement of local people which included Residents Associations was undertaken, as otherwise the response would be “No”. The options to be considered would be different for each area as the issues were diverse and complex and each area would be assessed separately. The Council was not promoting the option of demolition, but if residents wanted this, it should be included.

Councillor Marland also indicated that the Cabinet recognised the passion felt by residents about their homes; however regeneration was also about improving skills, education, health and wellbeing.

The Cabinet also heard from Councillor Bint who indicated that it took a very long time to win residents trust and therefore the timescales should be extended, and from Councillor Bald, who indicated that with reference to the proposal that cross party sub-committee be set up to progress this, the responsibility for Regeneration lay with the Cabinet and would be dissipated should this come about.

RESOLVED –

1. That in line with the Council's recommendations (Minute CL75 refers) the following be agreed as the basis for any regeneration referendum:
 - (a) (i) any referendum ballot to contain a clear YES or NO option;
 - (ii) referendum ballots to be conducted by Milton Keynes Council Electoral Services;
 - (iii) only those on electoral roll in each regeneration area to be able to vote;
 - (v) every effort to be made to ensure registration on affected estates is improved before any ballot; and
 - (vi) the electoral franchise to include people aged 16 years and over.
 - (b) existing Council tenants be offered accommodation at least equal to their current circumstances (in room number), unless they explicitly wish otherwise; and
 - (c) any new social housing in regeneration areas to meet Parker Morris space standards.
2. That it also be agreed:
 - (a) to note progress made against the Regeneration:MK 2030 Strategy objectives;
 - (b) to note the extension of the Fullers Slade engagement offered by YourMK with the ballot date to be set in consultation with the local Residents' Steering Group, but likely to be late Summer / early Autumn 2018;
 - (c) to note the current timeline for regeneration of Serpentine Court, with the community ballot scheduled (although subject to continual review) for March 2018;
 - (d) to ensure that YourMK releases information pertaining to regeneration onto its website, including the policy document referred to in the recent Council motion;
 - (e) to establish a Cabinet Committee to review the financial implications of providing the like for like

replacement homes with the financial model being informed by the Housing revenue Account Business Plan, with the Committee providing a recommendation to the March meeting of Cabinet;

- (f) that the Cabinet Committee also review the stock condition estimates and share with residents;
- (g) to make available stock condition data relating to Council assets, in the format as set out in the report, whilst noting that further modelling would refine that data;
- (h) to note the provision of additional funding by the Council to support increased engagement and communication across the regeneration areas;
- (i) to clearly define and explain the “no” option, framed by the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan to be presented to Cabinet for approval in March 2018 alongside the Housing Strategy;
- (j) to include in the referendum ballots, residents and, where appropriate, households in the regeneration areas;
- (k) to consider for approval at the Cabinet meeting in June 2018 the threshold for turnout and age of those allowed to participate in the current ballots, noting this will be on an area by area basis; and
- (l) to only trigger the ballot once 60% of residents and 80% of households have been formally engaged.

C110

REFERRAL FROM CAR PARKING INCOME TASK AND FINISH GROUP - 29 NOVEMBER 2017

The Cabinet received the report of the Car Parking Income Task and Finish Group. It was reported that this Group had been 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.

Councillor K Wilson (Chair of the Car Parking Income Task and Finish Group) introduced the report and indicated that the reasons for the decline in income from car park charges appeared to be quite complex and did not appear to point to a significant correlation between the implementation of a change in price and its effect on demand.

Other factors such as the changes in shopping habits, especially towards on-line purchasing and on line banking, the demise of major shops, the opening of satellite shopping centres at MK1, Westcroft and Kingston with free parking, as well as the increasing trend for

people to work from home 1-2 days per week might have had a significant effect.

Councillor Gifford, the responsible Cabinet Member for Place, thanked the Councillor K Wilson and all those involved in compiling the report and indicated that it provided very helpful analysis of all the factors that should be considered when changes in car parking charges were next contemplated.

Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council) indicated that the information included in the report was very useful and could be used to inform research for other Council strategies including Renaissance:MK. where the dwell time of people using CMK shopping centre for more than 2 hours should be investigated.

Councillor Marland agreed that the study had evidenced that the fees charged for parking was not the only factor that needed to be considered but also how the economy would change over the next 50 years and how this would impact on current projections.

The Cabinet also heard from Councillor Bint who indicated that the report highlighted the errors in previous car parking charges forecasts and the report should be taken into account when considering any future changes to parking fees.

RESOLVED -

That the referral and response be noted and taken into account in future decisions about car parking charges.

C111

**REFERRAL FROM AUDIT COMMITTEE - 28 NOVEMBER 2017
HERTSMERE LEISURE CONTRACT REVIEW**

The Cabinet considered the following referral from the Audit Committee held on 28 November 2017 in respect of the Hertsmere Leisure Contract Review:

- (i) That the Cabinet be asked to consider a future delivery / ownership model for community facilities which allowed for the asset to be harnessed for the benefit of the community in the most effective way.
- (ii) That, noting that the Council already uses 'mystery shoppers to assess its services, the Cabinet be requested to consider how customers' satisfaction / views on levels of service at the Council's Leisure / Community facilities can be assessed, possibly using the methodology used by 'Quest' when conducting customers' satisfaction surveys for the Council".

Councillor P Geary, Chair of the Audit Committee highlighted to the Cabinet that the evidence obtained throughout the review demonstrated that the service performance when measured against the contract requirements and Hertsmere had generally fulfilled the contract. It was however clear that customer service and operational issues had not been monitored sufficiently and there was

a need to have a shared understanding of the priorities and focus expected from the limited client team resources.

Councillor P Geary also indicated that it was clear that the management model for community centres needed to be assessed in light of the comments received from user groups, Ward councillors, parish and town councils and stakeholders during the review. The service area should seek to agree a clear proportional contract management framework, recognising the 'thin client' approach, as this would provide the team with improved clarity and understanding of their expectations and priorities.

Councillor P Geary also suggested that regular satisfaction surveys should be undertaken to monitor standards and to ensure that resident's needs were met.

Councillor Gifford, Cabinet member for Place, indicated that officer colleagues had already started to consider the appropriate ownership/management model for the new community facilities proposed for the expansion areas and would extend this to existing facilities.

Councillor Gifford recognised that the different types of facilities within the Milton Keynes Council portfolio would require different management or ownership models and these would be explored further in the first quarter of 2018.

With reference to the use of "Mystery Shoppers", Councillor Gifford indicated that the Council's Customer Services Department had been contacted to independently assess the quality of Council services on a quarterly basis and a survey could be carried out of facilities within the Hertsmere Leisure Trust contract.

With reference to the use of Quest methodology, Councillor Gifford confirmed that customer service issues at the Bletchley Leisure Centre were assessed by Quest.

RESOLVED -

That the referral and response including the actions being taken be noted.

C112 REGENERATION:MK

This item was considered at Minute C109 above.

C113 DELIVERY OF HOMES IN MILTON KEYNES

Councillor Gifford, the Cabinet member for Place, presented a report regarding performance against the Government's Housing Delivery Test in Milton Keynes, the analysis of delivery failure in Milton Keynes and options for the Council to consider to help increase and accelerate delivery of homes, following the Housing White Paper "Fixing our broken housing market" (7 February 2017) and the possibility of Government intervention in Milton Keynes, to increase housebuilding.

It was reported that a range of options were recommended that would allow the Council to prioritise the development of new homes, proactively facilitate land assembly, use its own land to provide homes and work with existing and new developer interests.

Councillor Gifford indicated that a new Housing Strategy and Action Plan to identify and support delivery of new homes that met identified need in light of the key challenges in Milton Keynes, and an assessment of the options would be prepared. Additionally, a Housing Revenue Account Business Plan for Council owned housing stock that would cover the repair/refurbishment of its existing stock and the scope for building new Council homes was required. A review of the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document was also underway to update the position specifically on the need for affordable homes.

Councillor Gifford also indicated that it was anticipated that a cross-party working group would be set up to develop required agreement for the delivery of new homes a comprehensive 'Action Plan' be developed for the Council to consider the options to increase and accelerate delivery of homes.

Councillor Gifford confirmed that it was implicit that adopted Neighbourhood Plans would form part of the evidence base used to prioritise development and use of land across the borough.

Councillor Marland, Leader of the Council indicated that the main issue was that in some cases, developments were not progressing where planning permissions had been given. The Council was being asked by Government to investigate and evidence that undelivered planning permissions for developments was impeding the delivery of homes including social housing. If the Council was unable to supply the information to Government, then Government would intervene.

Councillor Marland also indicated that issues including parking standards could be investigated by the proposed cross party working group; nothing was pre-determined and what was required to be submitted to the Government was an evidenced hierarchy of requirements.

The Cabinet also heard from three members of the public and Councillor Bint during consideration of the item.

RESOLVED -

1. That a cross-party agreement be developed on the delivery of new homes.
2. That a comprehensive 'Action Plan' be developed for the Council to increase and accelerate delivery of homes, which included taking forward the following topics detailed in the report:
 - (a) addressing unmet requirements through corporate prioritisation of housing delivery;

- (b) assembling Land - Compulsory Purchase;
- (c) Leading Development - bringing forward small-medium sites for development; and
- (d) taking action to encourage site delivery - develop partnering and marketing strategies.

C114

MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL - COUNCIL PLAN 2016/2020

The Cabinet considered progress on the Delivery Plan which supported the Council Plan 2016-2020 and was the fourth quarterly update on how the Council was progressing.

It was reported that Council approved the Milton Keynes Council Delivery Plan at its meeting on 13 July 2016. The Delivery Plan was an integral part of the Council Plan and set out the detailed activities and milestones that it was anticipated would deliver the aspirations of the Council Plan from now until 2020. The Delivery Plan contained three overall headline aims for Milton Keynes:

- to be a place of opportunity;
- an affordable place; and
- a healthy place.

To support these over-arching objectives, there were sixteen priority themes, each with a number of specific actions. The Cabinet received a brief update on progress of these actions, with a narrative and self-reported Red, Amber, and Green (RAG) rating on each to date was also included.

It was also reported that innovative initiatives that were taking place as part of operational service delivery and in future, the updates would include Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) that showed progress on the outcomes of the headline aims for Milton Keynes listed above.

In response to a question from Councillor Bint with reference to the Green RAG rating for 1.3 'Setting a balanced budget each year, which reflected the reality of funding availability and increasing demand' and 1.4 'Engaging service users, citizens, partners, providers and business to aid understanding of the financial context of the Council', Councillor Marland clarified that these were related to budget issues

RESOLVED -

That the progress on the implementation of the Council Plan Delivery Plan be noted and approved.

FORECAST OF GENERAL FUND REVENUE, HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT, DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME OUTTURN FOR THE PERIOD AS AT 31 DECEMBER 2017

The Cabinet considered the forecast of outturn for the General Fund Revenue and Capital Budget, the Housing Revenue Account and the Dedicated Schools Grant as at 31 December 2017 which was introduced by Councillor Middleton, the responsible Cabinet member for Resources and Innovation.

It was reported that:

- (a) The General Fund Revenue Account was reporting a forecasted overspend of £2.643m. This included a £8.153m reported overspend within the service areas and an underspend of £5.5m in debt financing (which was due to savings on debt financing following a change to the Council's Minimum Revenue Provision policy (MRP)). This was an increase in the directorate reported position of £1.231m since 30 November 2017 and an improvement within debt financing of £5.5m, as at 30 September 2017).

The forecast overspend of £2.643m had been reduced by the use of £2.432m from reserves. This net transfer consisted of £3.710m from demand led reserves to fund unbudgeted pressures, plus £4.222m from other earmarked reserves, less a £5.5m contribution to the General Fund working balance which had reduced the overall projected deficit to £0.211m. This net projected overspend would be funded from the General Fund Working Balance.

- (b) The Dedicated Schools Grant budget was set with an estimated deficit carry forward into 2018/19 of £0.264m, the forecast position was at 31 December and was a surplus carry forward of £0.240m.
- (c) The Housing Revenue Account forecasted a surplus of £1.023m.
- (d) Capital Programme - total forecasted expenditure was £231.810m, which it was anticipated would result in an underspend of £9.114m against the approved plan of £240.924m (£10.551m of expenditure planned in 2017/18 had been re-phased into later years).

Councillor Middleton indicated that the position with the overspends had slightly improved although they were still at (£2.643m). The main areas contributing to this were the demand led areas of Housing, Adult Social Care and Children's Social Care which were largely the result of the housing crisis and the reduced support from Government.

Councillor Middleton quoted examples that had contributed towards the overspends such as changes in the numbers of 'Looked After Children' and commented that whilst, the number of 'Looked After Children' coming into the service had reduced to 2011 levels, the current number of 'Looked After Children' at November 2017 was 382, a reduction from the position at the beginning of the financial year of 403. These also included six very high cost cases, ranging from £0.025m to £0.050m per child.

Councillor Middleton also indicated that Parking Income was £0.900m below budget after the planned use of £0.300m from the car parking reserve and £.100m from an underspent expenditure budget.

In addition to the suggested reasons for this reduction in income which had been considered earlier in the meeting at Minute C110

'Car Parking Income Task and Finish Group', Councillor Middleton confirmed that a management action plan was in place for the medium term which included the re-procurement of both the current parking systems and enforcement services.

Councillor Middleton further indicated that all underspends were being investigated and comprehensive written answers to specific issues could be provided on request and clarified where the latest reduction in parking revenue was reported.

The Cabinet also heard from Councillor Bald who requested details of the overspend by Housing Heating Projects.

RESOLVED -

1. That the General Fund Revenue Account forecast of outturn of £0.211m overspend, after the use of £3.710m of demand led reserves and £4.222m of unplanned other reserves less the contribution to general fund working balance of £5.500m, and the mitigating management actions to minimise the overspend be noted.
2. That the use of one-off resources to offset risks and higher than expected levels of demand, be noted.
3. That the forecast outturn surplus on the Housing Revenue Account of £1.023m be noted.
4. That the Dedicated Schools Grant estimated budget deficit carry forward into 2018/19 of £0.264m and the forecast surplus carry forward of £0.240m be noted.
5. That the forecast outturn spend on the Capital Programme of £231.810m and re-phasing of £10.551m into 2018/19 be noted.

C116

REVISIONS TO THE CAPITAL PROGRAMME AND SPEND APPROVALS

The Cabinet considered the revisions to the Capital Programme and Spend Approvals which were introduced by Councillor Middleton (Cabinet member for Resources and Innovation).

It was reported that the changes outlined in the report resulted in a revised Capital Programme for 2017/18 of £231.01m. Spend approval at £230.37m had been given to enable individual projects in the Programme to commence or continue. A review of resources allocated in the Capital Programme had also been completed which had resulted in additional requested for changes to the phasing of existing projects.

It was also reported that, should the recommendations included in the report be approved, the Milton Keynes Tariff Programme for 2017/18, which forward funded infrastructure in the expansion areas, would be £21.75m, with the total spend approval for these contributions at £17.65m.

The Cabinet noted the following new Schemes added to the Capital Programme 2017/18 and amendments to resource allocation that included:

- (a) a reduction in resource allocation and spend approval for Kents Hill Primary School of £0.165m in 2017/18, as the final account agreed was completed under budget; and
- (b) Stacey Bushes Meeting Place roof & rainwater system (resource allocation and spend approval of £0.032m in 2017/18) to upgrade the roof and improve insulation to comply with Building Regulations.

RESOLVED -

- 1. That the additions and amendments to resource allocation and spend approval for the 2017/18 capital programme be approved.
- 2. That the overall funding position for the 2017/18 capital programme be noted.
- 3. That the amendments to resource allocation and spend approvals for the 2017/18 tariff programme be approved.
- 4. That the current position of the 2017/18 tariff programme be noted.

C117

FUTURE PROVISION OF AGENCY WORKERS

The Cabinet considered the future provisions for Agency Workers that were introduced by Councillor Middleton, the Cabinet member for Resources and Innovation.

It was reported that the item was previously considered by Procurement and Commissioning on 12 October 2017, when it was

agreed to extend the use of the Hays contract for the supply of temporary staff to 31 August 2018.

It was also reported that the original three year contract was awarded following a compliant procurement process, with a possible extension of up to a maximum of 12 months. The contract could not be extended beyond 31 August 2018.

The Cabinet heard that approval was being sought for delegated authority for the Corporate Director - Resources to develop a business case for the Council to either select a managed service provider through the Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation (ESPO) purchasing consortium or to become a shareholder and part owner of Opus LGSS People Solutions Ltd (Opus LGSS) and for that company to provide agency resources for the Council in the future.

Councillor Middleton thanked the Head of Human Resources for her work in producing the report and indicated that the Council was to become a shareholder of Opus LGSS. Councillor Middleton suggested that the share of the company owned by the three LGSS Partners would increase to 48%.

This option also had the advantage of utilising an approach already adopted by Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) and Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and included the use of a Dynamic Purchasing System that it was anticipated would enable local agency providers to be added to the supply chain.

As a publically owned company, each shareholder would receive an annual dividend based on profits made by the company.

The alternative option would be to undertake a new procurement exercise utilising a framework contract. This option would involve a direct call off from the ESPO framework and was an economically acceptable solution that was widely used in the public sector with pre-agreed terms and conditions in place. This allowed organisations to undertake a shortened process to identify a provider to work with. Suppliers would be invited to tender against a specification which would then be scored.

Councillor Middleton further indicated that an appraisal of each option would be completed by the Corporate Director - Resources and a further report with recommendations would be presented to the Cabinet for approval. The decision by Cabinet was required by March 2018 so that the new contract could start in September 2018.

Councillor Bald raised concerns in respect of the proposal to set up a Joint Venture with OPUS as she had heard some negative comments about this company. The Leader of the Council asked that these be forwarded to him.

RESOLVED -

1. That authority be delegated to the Corporate Director - Resources to explore the following two options:
 - (i) the setting up of a joint arrangement and appropriate company structure with Opus LGSS, including the Council becoming a shareholder in the new company; and
 - (ii) a mini competition via the ESPO framework contract covering the provision of agency workers and, following the evaluation, to subsequently award a contract for a period of up to four years to the provider that offers the most economically advantageous approach.
2. That any concerns about OPUS be forwarded to the Leader of the Council.

C118

MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL - MK DIGITAL STRATEGY 2018 - 2025

The Cabinet considered the MK Digital Strategy 2018 - 2025 which was introduced by Councillor Marland, Leader of the Council.

It was reported that the Council's three priorities were:

- digital connectivity;
- digital services; and
- digital economy.

These priorities recognised the Council's role as a partner and enabler in ensuring that physical connections to digital services were in place, to create the best possible digital environment for residents and all types of businesses to make the most of digital connections.

It was also reported that the Council recognised that for digital transformation to create truly digital public services it must also work with partners. Digital was a key strand of the Council's work with health colleagues on the Bedfordshire, Luton and Milton Keynes Sustainability and Transformation Plan, which was bringing together Local Authorities and the NHS to improve health and care. It was key that the Council understood how these digital networking and communication infrastructures that provided a global platform over which people and organisations, devised strategies, interacted and communicated, could affect the future economy of Milton Keynes.

Councillor Marland highlighted some minor changes to the first sentence on the fourth page of the Strategy document and clarified that, as the cost of rolling out super-fast broadband to rural areas was often expensive, the Council worked with neighbouring Central Bedfordshire Council, Bedford Borough Council and Luton Council and the delivery partners BDUK and BT on the Central Superfast

Broadband project to ensure most premises could receive a broadband service of 2 Mbps minimum over 30Mbps.

Councillor Marland indicated that digital connectivity to all parts of Milton Keynes should be investigated to ensure that the older developments such as Willen Extra Care Village, older estates and also housing association tenants were not excluded and residents and small businesses were given support and guidance.

Councillor Marland continued that, as an example, the days of separate providers for telephone, broadband and TV services were now being replaced by one provider for all, making access quicker.

Councillor Nolan, Cabinet member for Children and Families indicated that digital inclusion was a key priority as 25% of disabled adults and women of over 75 years had never used the internet and the benefits of internet and I T for these and other vulnerable groups was huge.

Councillor Nolan also indicated that schools and libraries were encouraging internet use with free computer training and unlimited free Wi-Fi access in MK libraries for those with their own devices.

The Cabinet also heard from Councillor Bint during consideration of the item.

RESOLVED -

1. That the MK Digital Strategy 2018/2025 be adopted.
2. That a Delivery Plan be developed that defines the outcomes and actions required to deliver the Strategy.

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 9.50 PM

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink is positioned above two long, sweeping, upward-curving lines that extend across the width of the page.