

ITEM 1(b)



Minutes of the MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL held on WEDNESDAY 18 OCTOBER 2017 at 7.30 pm

Present: Councillor D Hopkins (Mayor)
Councillors Alexander, Bint, M Bradburn, R Bradburn, Buckley, Burke, Cannon, Clancy, Clifton, Coventry, Crooks, Dransfield, Eastman, Exon, Ferrans, Ganatra, A Geary, Gifford, V Hopkins, Hosking, Jenkins, Khan, Legg, Marland, D McCall, I McCall, McDonald, McKenzie, McLean, McPake, Middleton, Miles, Morris, Nolan, O'Neill, Patey-Smith, Petchey, Small, Walker, Wales, Wallis, Webb, P Williams, C Wilson and K Wilson

Alderman Bristow

Apologies: Councillors Bald, Betteley, Brackenbury, Brunning, Geaney, Gowans, Green, Long, Morla and C Williams and Aldermen Bartlett, Beeley, E Henderson and Howell and Alderwomen Irons, I Henderson, Lloyd and Saunders

Also Present: circa 65 members of the public

CL48 MINUTES

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 20 September 2017 be approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record.

CL49 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Councillor Petchey disclosed a personal interest in item 5(b) 1 (Urban Capacity Study) as a member of Campbell Park Parish Council as the Amendment to the Motion included reference to Springfield which was within the Campbell Park Parish area.

Councillor D McCall declared a personal interest in item 5(b) 3 (Street Homelessness) as an employee of the Winter Night Shelter, a charity working with the homeless.

Councillor P Williams disclosed a personal interest in item 6 (Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee Proposal) as an employee of Luton and Dunstable Hospital.

CL50

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor announced the death earlier today of Mrs Michaelle Geary, mother of Councillors Andrew and Peter Geary. The Mayor indicated that he would be passing on the Council's sympathy and condolences to Councillors A and P Geary at this sad time.

CL51

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

- (a) Question from Mr M Galloway to Councillor Gifford (Cabinet member for Place)

Mr Galloway referred to paragraphs 1.19 and 1.20 of the Plan:MK document and the references to Aylesbury Vale District Council's resolution to approve the development of up to 1855 houses at Salden Chase, to which Milton Keynes Council objected, and the possibility of neighbouring authorities approving other developments on the edge of Milton Keynes.

Mr Galloway also pointed out that the draft Plan:MK referred to Memorandums of Understanding apparently agreed with Aylesbury Vale District Council and Central Bedfordshire Council that seemed to imply that this Council had accepted these developments despite, in the case of Salden Chase, the Council objecting to the development.

Mr Galloway ask Councillor Gifford to supply copies of the Memorandums of Understanding, together with details of how they had been agreed and confirmation that these "agreements" had not undermined or prejudiced the position of the Council to make its own decisions, for example, the Council's objection to the Salden Chase development.

Councillor Gifford indicated that the Memorandum of Understanding with Aylesbury Vale District Council and the Strategic Planning Framework with Central Bedfordshire Council had been drawn up, but not yet agreed. The documents were required to demonstrate that all three councils had met their statutory duty to co-operate in preparing their Local Plans. Such documents were routinely drawn up by councils as part of their plan making.

Councillor Gifford pointed out that the Memorandum of Understanding with Aylesbury Vale District Council did not specifically relate to the planning application for residential development at Salden Chase to which the Council objected.

Councillor Gifford confirmed that the Council's objection to the residential development at Salden Chase remained and once the Memorandum of Understanding with Aylesbury Vale District Council and the Strategic Planning Framework with Central Bedfordshire Council had been finalised they would be published.

Mr Galloway, thanked Councillor Gifford for her confirmation that the Council's objection to the Salden Chase development remained and, as a supplementary question, asked Councillor Gifford if the Council, when considering Plan:MK, could delete the reference to the Memorandum of Understanding with Aylesbury Vale District Council as he believed that if the Memorandum did not refer specifically to Salden Chase it should not be referenced.

Councillor Gifford indicated that the Council needed to show that Plan:MK was sound. The Council would of course look at any minor adjustments to the wording it considered necessary.

(b) Questions from Mrs S Kent to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Mrs Kent, pointing out that Stantonbury residents, had protested in each year since 2014 about the potential disposal of the small green amenity space near their properties, asked Councillor Marland why this site kept coming forward, first in the Site Allocation Plan, then in the Urban Capacity Study, even after assurances given that the site would remain as amenity land.

Councillor Marland explained that the Urban Capacity Study had been produced as part of the Plan:MK process. To demonstrate that Plan:MK was sound it had been necessary to assess each site for its suitability for housing. It was made clear in Plan:MK that the site referred to had been assessed and was not suitable for housing development. If the Council had not undertaken the Urban Capacity Study and had not designated the site as not suitable for housing, the Planning Inspector might have included the site in Plan:MK for development.

Councillor Marland took the opportunity to apologise for the way in which details of the Urban Capacity Study had reached the public domain.

CL52

PLAN:MK

Councillor Jenkins moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor V Hopkins:

- "1. That this Council notes that:
 - (a) the development of Plan:MK is the single most important document currently being prepared by this Authority;
 - (b) Government is placing pressure on local authorities to produce local plans that are robust, deliverable and have the evidence base to support their content and recommendations;

- (c) areas of land have been included in the latest version of the draft Plan:MK in the south east of Milton Keynes as future housing expansion areas despite the Council's Cabinet publically declaring the need to retain such areas as reserve corridors for much needed future infrastructure, specifically the Oxford – Milton Keynes – Cambridge Expressway;
 - (d) areas of land on the said eastern flank (so called South East Milton Keynes – east of Old Farm Park) have been included despite the Council's Cabinet declaring the need to allow for the impact of the 3500+ dwellings identified in 2004 (2001-2011 Local Plan) – the so called Strategic Land Allocation – and taken forward in the Core Strategy (2013) - be properly assessed before any additional housing sites are identified;
 - (e) so far, despite the urban expansion area being first identified in 2004 only 37 properties in the so called Strategic Land Allocation in and around Wavendon have been developed;
 - (e) in addition, areas of land between Woburn Sands and Old Farm Park and in and around Bow Brickhill have been included despite the Cabinet's previous commitment to a planning moratorium on any additional development in these areas until 2026 and the agreed boundary to development represented by the Bletchley to Bedford branch line;
 - (f) employment land (so called Caldecotte South) has been included as a last minute afterthought without any due process, public consultation or published evidence base;
 - (g) a seven pitch traveller site has been included in the second draft of Plan:MK despite no such proposals being included in the first draft for consultation; and
 - (h) the consultation has been a sham and that decisions have been taken in private session by a so called 'working group' to which members of the public were excluded and from which no minutes or public notes of discussions are available.
2. That the Council therefore calls upon the Council's Cabinet to:
- (a) abandon this fatally flawed second draft Plan:MK and undertake to return to Council in January 2018 with a revised second draft, evidence based and properly prepared for publication and further consultation;

- (b) allow time for a public session of the so called 'working group' to be arranged to allow for members of the public and other members of this authority to attend and present evidence for the various options for housing sites and employment sites under consideration;
 - (c) allow time for a special one off meeting of the Cabinet to facilitate full public debate of what emerges from the working group session;
 - (d) allow time for officers to fully assess the impacts of the Wavendon Properties planning appeal decision and its effects upon future housing planning numbers;
 - (e) allow time for officers to fully assess the impact of recent government changes to the methodology used to calculate future housing need; and
 - (f) Reinstate a planning moratorium on any urban expansion development in the so called South East Milton Keynes area above and beyond what has been already agreed at least until a decision on the route of the Oxford – Milton Keynes – Cambridge Expressway is agreed and published.
3. That this Council notes that it will not be pushed by various vested interests into taking short term housing decisions at the expense of much needed long term infrastructure improvements."

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

"That all of the words after the word 'therefore' in the introductory sentence to Clause 2 be deleted and replaced with the words 'agrees to'."

The Council heard from three members of the public.

On being put to the vote the motion, as amended was declared lost with 15 councillors voting in favour, 28 councillors voting against and 0 councillors abstaining from voting.

CL53

APPROVAL OF PROPOSED SUBMISSION VERSION OF PLAN:MK

Councillor Marland moved and Councillor Miles seconded 'that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 21.1, Council Procedure Rule 13.6(c) (Ownership of Motions) be suspended in order that the ownership of the motion remained with the mover of the original motion in respect of this item'.

The procedural motion was agreed by acclamation.

Councillor Gifford (Cabinet member for Place) moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 3 October 2017, which was seconded by Councillor Marland:

“That the Council be recommended to publish the Proposed Submission version of Plan:MK, as amended by the Cabinet at its meeting on 3 October 2017, for six weeks’ consultation and then submit Plan:MK to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government under Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended).”

The Mayor moved and the Deputy Mayor seconded ‘that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 21.1, Council Procedure Rule 13.6(a) (Amendments to Motions) be suspended in order that amendments can be moved in respect of this item’.

The procedural motion was agreed by acclamation.

Councillor O’Neill moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Marland and accepted by the mover of the motion:

“That the Cabinet recommendation be amended by the addition of the words ‘subject to the Submission Version of Plan:MK being amended by the additional changes put forward by the Plan:MK Working Group (Annex A)’”.

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

“That the following additional clause be added to the recommendation from the Cabinet:

‘That the Council recognising the pledges and assurances given by Cabinet of a Planning Moratorium in South East Milton Keynes, reaffirms its commitment to such and agrees that any proposed buffer included in this area will not be brought forward before 2026, so allowing the routes of the Oxford - Milton Keynes - Cambridge Expressway and East - West rail to be determined and housing planned strategically around them.’”

On being put to the vote the amendment was declared lost with 16 councillors voting in favour, 30 councillors voting against and 0 councillors abstaining from voting.

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

“That the words ‘this figure will be dependent on the amount of land which would be available should the Oxford - Milton Keynes - Cambridge Expressway route impact upon this site’ be deleted from the second sentence of Paragraph 4.17 on page 5 of the ‘Additional Changes put Forward by the Plan:MK Working Group’ and replaced with the words ‘with the aspiration and desire to actively encourage the inclusion and facilitation of the Oxford - Milton Keynes -

Cambridge Expressway, which will provide a much needed infrastructure upgrade for both local residents and the regional economy, Plan:MK recognises that the figure of 9.7% could be reduced depending upon the outcome of future decisions on the alignment of the Oxford - Milton Keynes - Cambridge Expressway’.”

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

“That the following additional clauses be added to the recommendation from the Cabinet:

- ‘1. That this Council notes with concern that legislation, in particular the viability test, prevents the Council requiring the % of affordable housing that the Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicates is needed in Plan:MK.
2. That the Council also notes that some developers on some sites are able, and in some cases proactively willing, to offer more.
3. That the Council therefore amends the proposed Submission version of Plan:MK, Paragraphs A and C (as corrected by Cabinet) of Policy HN2, and item 11 of table 24 (Monitoring framework) to substitute “at least 31%” instead of “31%”.”

Councillor Ferrans moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Crooks:

“That the following additional clauses be added to the recommendation from the Cabinet:

- ‘1. That the Council notes that while endorsing the submission version of Plan:MK together with such amendments as are approved at this meeting, it remains concerned that Government restrictions on planning law prevent the Council planning formally for the number of affordable homes actually required.
2. That Council notes that the numbers requiring affordable housing are continuing to rise, so that the reality is that more affordable accommodation than the plan requirement will, in practice, be needed unless there are radical changes in legislation.
3. That the Council therefore welcomes the initiatives already outlined by the Administration and calls on Cabinet to continue to progress all avenues available to it to encourage developers, and to use Council and Milton Keynes Development Partnership land, to increase the supply of affordable housing beyond the requirements in Plan:MK.

4. That the Council requests the Chief Executive to write again to the Department for Communities and Local Government drawing attention to the restricting effect that current legislation, particularly the “one-size-fits-all” nature of the viability test, and current restrictions on Council borrowing for council housing, are having on the Council’s ability to meet known demand in this area, and urging the Government to reconsider its policies in relation to planning and financing affordable housing.
5. The Council requests the Chief Executive to write to our MPs to ask for their support in this matter, and to relay their response back to Councillors.”

On being put to the vote the amendment was declared carried with 30 councillors voting in favour, 16 councillors voting against and 0 councillors abstaining from voting.

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

“That the following additional clauses be added to the recommendation from the Cabinet:

- ‘1. That this Council notes the Government’s project to build an expressway through the Oxford - Cambridge Arc, and welcomes and endorses Plan:MK’s wish to exploit Milton Keynes’ central position in this arc for the benefit of our residents.
2. That the Council notes with concern that other authorities are now actively exploring routes for the expressway through the surrounding area and that there is therefore a danger that a route will be chosen that does not bring the maximum benefit to Milton Keynes.
3. That the Council therefore calls on the Cabinet to step up work assessing possible routes for both the expressway and the links between it and the existing strategic highway network and railways in and close to Milton Keynes Borough with options given to, and input from, the Plan:MK Working Group, which advises the Cabinet Member for Place, and bring forward a desired route as quickly as possible.”

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

“That the following additional clause be added to the recommendation from the Cabinet:

‘That this Council notes that the logic for Policy L7 on the siting of noisy sports is incorrect, and amends it to:

“Planning permission will only be permitted for noisy sports provided there is no unacceptable disturbance to farm livestock and wildlife and where:

- (a) the ambient noise level of the area is already high, and the noise generated by the new activity will not be dominant; and/or
- (b) the noise experienced at nearby noise sensitive development, or public rights of way and other areas of informal countryside recreation would not be significantly increased; and/ or
- (c) there is a need to facilitate sports to ensure that people have the opportunity to play as part of regularly maintaining a healthy lifestyle and noise levels can be effectively reduced by siting and screening.””

RESOLVED –

1. That the Proposed Submission version of Plan:MK be approved for six weeks’ consultation and then submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government under Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended), subject to the Submission Version of Plan:MK being amended by the additional changes put forward by the Plan:MK Working Group (**Annex A**) and the words ‘this figure will be dependent on the amount of land which would be available should the Oxford - Milton Keynes - Cambridge Expressway route impact upon this site’ be deleted from the second sentence of Paragraph 4.17 on page 5 of the ‘Additional Changes put Forward by the Plan:MK Working Group’ and replaced with the words ‘with the aspiration and desire to actively encourage the inclusion and facilitation of the Oxford - Milton Keynes - Cambridge Expressway, which will provide a much needed infrastructure upgrade for both local residents and the regional economy, Plan:MK recognises that the figure of 9.7% could be reduced depending upon the outcome of future decisions on the alignment of the Oxford- Milton Keynes -Cambridge Expressway’.
2. That this Council notes with concern that legislation, in particular the viability test, prevents the Council requiring the % of affordable housing that the Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicates is needed in Plan:MK.
3. That the Council also notes that some developers on some sites are able, and in some cases proactively willing, to offer more.
4. That the Council therefore amends the proposed Submission version of Plan:MK, Paragraphs A and C (as corrected by Cabinet) of Policy HN2, and item 11 of table 24 (Monitoring framework) to substitute “at least 31%” instead of “31%”.

5. That the Council notes that while endorsing the submission version of Plan:MK together with such amendments as are approved at this meeting, it remains concerned that Government restrictions on planning law prevent the Council planning formally for the number of affordable homes actually required.
6. That Council notes that the numbers requiring affordable housing are continuing to rise, so that the reality is that more affordable accommodation than the plan requirement will, in practice, be needed unless there are radical changes in legislation.
7. That the Council therefore welcomes the initiatives already outlined by the Administration and calls on Cabinet to continue to progress all avenues available to it to encourage developers, and to use Council and Milton Keynes Development Partnership land, to increase the supply of affordable housing beyond the requirements in Plan:MK.
8. That the Council requests the Chief Executive to write again to the Department for Communities and Local Government drawing attention to the restricting effect that current legislation, particularly the “one-size-fits-all” nature of the viability test, and current restrictions on Council borrowing for council housing, are having on the Council’s ability to meet known demand in this area, and urging the Government to reconsider its policies in relation to planning and financing affordable housing.
9. That the Council requests the Chief Executive to write to our MPs to ask for their support in this matter, and to relay their response back to Councillors.
10. That this Council notes the Government’s project to build an expressway through the Oxford - Cambridge Arc, and welcomes and endorses Plan:MK’s wish to exploit Milton Keynes’ central position in this arc for the benefit of our residents.
11. That the Council notes with concern that other authorities are now actively exploring routes for the expressway through the surrounding area and that there is therefore a danger that a route will be chosen that does not bring the maximum benefit to Milton Keynes.
12. That the Council therefore calls on the Cabinet to step up work assessing possible routes for both the expressway and the links between it and the existing strategic highway network and railways in and close to Milton Keynes Borough with options given to, and input from, the Plan:MK Working Group, which advises the Cabinet Member for Place, and bring forward a desired route as quickly as possible.

13. That this Council notes that the logic for Policy L7 on the siting of noisy sports is incorrect, and amends it to:

“Planning permission will only be permitted for noisy sports provided there is no unacceptable disturbance to farm livestock and wildlife and where:

- (a) the ambient noise level of the area is already high, and the noise generated by the new activity will not be dominant; and/ or
- (b) the noise experienced at nearby noise sensitive development, or public rights of way and other areas of informal countryside recreation would not be significantly increased; and/ or
- (c) there is a need to facilitate sports to ensure that people have the opportunity to play as part of regularly maintaining a healthy lifestyle and noise levels can be effectively reduced by siting and screening”.

CL54

MAKING OF CASTLETHORPE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Councillor Gifford (Cabinet member for Place) moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 3 October 2017, which was seconded by Councillor Marland:

“That the Council makes the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan pursuant to the provisions of Section 38(A)(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.”

On being put to the vote the recommendation from the Cabinet was declared carried unanimously.

RESOLVED –

That the Council makes the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan pursuant to the provisions of Section 38(A)(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

CL55

MAKING OF SHERINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Councillor Gifford (Cabinet member for Place) moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 3 October 2017, which was seconded by Councillor Marland:

“That the Council makes the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan pursuant to the provisions of Section 38(A)(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.”

On being put to the vote the recommendation from the Cabinet was declared carried unanimously.

RESOLVED –

That the Council makes the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan pursuant to the provisions of Section 38(A)(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

CL56**PROPOSED HOUSING AND REGENERATION RESTRUCTURE**

Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council) moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 3 October 2017, which was seconded by Councillor O'Neill:

"That the funding for the proposed increase to the Housing Staffing establishment of £200k from the Invest to Save reserve in 2017/18 (one-off funding) and an addition to the base revenue budget of £871k from 2018/19 split over two financial years as follows be approved:

- (a) £751,000 in 2018/19; and
- (b) £120,000 in 2019/20."

On being put to the vote the recommendation from the Cabinet was declared carried unanimously.

RESOLVED -

That the funding for the proposed increase to the Housing Staffing establishment of £200k from the Invest to Save reserve in 2017/18 (one-off funding) and an addition to the base revenue budget of £871k from 2018/19 split over two financial years as follows be approved:

- (a) £751,000 in 2018/19; and
- (b) £120,000 in 2019/20.

CL57**COUNCILLORS' QUESTIONS**

- (a) Question from Councillor Eastman to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Councillor Eastman asked Councillor Marland what he thought about Jeremy Corbyn's recent defeat of the Government in a vote on Universal Credit.

Councillor Marland indicated that he understood that Universal Credit was to be rolled out in the near future as part of the NHS computer spine. He believed the real issue was that people would be made to wait for up to six weeks which could put them into debt and place them at serious risk of ongoing debt and becoming homeless. The Government should listen to Parliament.

- (b) Question from Councillor Bint to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Councillor Bint asked Councillor Marland for a briefing paper on why parking sensors were being installed in some parking spaces, specifically:

- (i) what was the scope of the scheme;
- (ii) which parking spaces had been picked and why;
- (iii) what the decision making process was; and

- (iv) why a parking space allocated for the exclusive use of a single household had been included.

Councillor Marland indicated that the survey had been brought forward under the Smart City Programme and he would arrange for a written reply to be given.

- (c) Question from Councillor Walker to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Councillor Walker asked Councillor Marland what conversations he had been having in recent months with neighbouring authorities, particularly in this region, on matters such as transport, housing, infrastructure and strategic regional planning.

Councillor Marland indicated that discussions were on going with all neighbouring authorities in Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire and Oxfordshire regarding the England's Economic Heartland Strategic Partnership. Discussions had also been on going with the Central Area Authorities which were Northamptonshire, the four unitary authorities and the districts in Buckinghamshire on how to progress the National Infrastructure Commission's and the Department for Communities and Local Government's work.

Councillor Marland also indicated that the Acting Director of Policy, Insight and Communications had prepared a briefing note that was discussed briefly by Group Leaders earlier this week.

Councillor Marland offered both Councillor Walker and Councillor A Geary a meeting to discuss further.

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

Councillor Dransfield asked Councillor Marland if, when the Council was holding its meetings at the Church of Christ the Cornerstone, he had noticed the number of rats running wild.

Councillor Marland indicated that he had and he was aware of the problem. As part of the Business Improvement District there was to be a 'Deep Clean' of the area. A survey would also be undertaken of which areas in the city centre had the biggest rat problem and it was intended that the rats in those areas would be humanely disposed of.

Councillor Dransfield, noting that the rat problem was not confined to the area around the Church and was across the city centre, even extending into his Ward of Loughton, suggested that previous Labour administrations had been reluctant to address such problems. As a supplementary question Councillor Dransfield asked Councillor Marland if he would commit to clearing up what was a dangerous situation,

particularly for young children.

Councillor Marland indicated that pest extermination had not been a statutory responsibility for the Council for some time, but he was happy to provide statistics on the number of rats caught.

Councillor Marland outlined that it had been a Conservative Administration, of which Councillor Dransfield had been part, which imposed the original cuts on the pest control service. However, the cuts to the service had been as a consequence of the reduction in funds available to the Council. The Council had already reduced its budget by £130m and faced increasing pressures from amongst other things, homelessness, adult social care and children's care. To meet the reductions in income and the increasing pressures other services had to be reduced or cut altogether.

Councillor Marland suggested that Councillor Dransfield should write to the Prime Minister for an explanation of why she believes the cuts are necessary.

CL58 URBAN CAPACITY STUDY

Councillor Walker moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor McDonald:

“That this Council:

1. notes with concern the recent Urban Capacity Study which unhelpfully raises again the concept of development on many green open spaces within the built up environment of Milton Keynes;
2. recalls the decision of Council and Delegated Decision on 25 March 2015 and 23 June 2015 to not include numerous sites of significant recreational and amenity value to local residents;
3. notes and reaffirms this Council's commitment to the values and principles of Milton Keynes including the preservation of green open spaces which was one of the original founding principles of the New City and which remains one of its Unique Selling Points;
4. calls upon the Cabinet as the Executive Arm of this Council to urgently confirm its commitment to the decision of Council as mentioned in point 2 above and for the Leader of the Council to reassure Council that the details of the Urban Capacity Study will not be taken forward in any form as an option for Strategic Development; and
5. asks Cabinet to voluntarily register, the two sites in Woolstone (UCS072 and UCS073), one site in Springfield (UCS074), one site in Stantonbury (UCS100) and one site in Bletchley (UCS107) as Village Greens under the Commons Act 2006

section 15(8) bearing in mind the re-assurance that the Leader gave at Full Council on 21 June 2017 in respect of the Woolstone and Springfield sites and previous Cabinet member assurances in respect of the sites in Bletchley and Stantonbury.”

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

- “1. That in clause 1 of the motion the words ‘the recent Urban Capacity Study which unhelpfully raises again the concept of development on many green open spaces within the built up environment of Milton Keynes’ be deleted and replaced with ‘both the content and process for the recent Urban Capacity Study which:
 - (a) was published without any reference to the Plan:MK Working Group;
 - (b) assessed many green open spaces within the built up environment of Milton Keynes as developable, ignoring responses to the previous consultation and more recent use of the sites; and
 - (c) caused alarm by suggesting development on current sheltered housing sites such as Springfield Court.and the clause renumbered 3.
2. That in clause 2 of the motion the words ‘responses from residents to the previous consultations on some of these sites and the’ be added after the word ‘the’ and the words ‘not exclude numerous’ be replaced by the words ‘exclude the’.
3. That in clause 3 the words ‘notes and’ be deleted, the words ‘in its 50th year be added after the word ‘Keynes’, the words ‘supporting expansion in line with housing need and’ be added after the word ‘including’, all of the words after the word ‘spaces’ be deleted and the clause renumbered 1.
4. That in clause 4 all of the words after ‘the’ in the second line be replaced by the words ‘removal of all of these sites from development’ and the clause renumbered 9.
5. That in clause 5 the word ‘asks’ be replaced by the words ‘calls on the’, the word voluntary be replaced by the words ‘apply to’, the words ‘and the play area and buffer space of the Springfield Boulevard 1 Site (UCS075) be added after ‘(UCS107), all of the words after ‘15(8)’ be deleted and the clause renumbered 11.

6. That the following clauses be added:
 - '4 affirms the role of locally led consultation and decision-making on when sites should be considered for either development or additional protections, primarily through the neighbourhood planning process;
 - 5 reaffirms its commitment to saving five of the spaces, and part of the sixth, namely the two sites in Woolstone (UCS072 and UCS073), one site in Springfield (UCS074), one site in Stantonbury (UCS100) and one site in Bletchley (UCS107) and the land incorporating the popular play area from the Springfield 1 site (UCS075);
 6. welcomes the decision not to include five of these sites as housing sites in the proposed submission version of Plan:MK;
 7. welcomes the reassurance that the Leader gave at Full Council on 21 June 2017 in respect of the Woolstone and two Springfield sites and previous Cabinet member assurances in respect of the remaining sites;
 8. regrets the decision of Campbell Park Parish Council to propose the whole of the Springfield Boulevard 1 site for development, contradicting both their own proposed Neighbourhood Plan policies and those of Milton Keynes Council;
 10. calls upon Campbell Park Parish Council to modify the boundaries of the proposed developable area at Springfield Boulevard 1 (UCS075) to exclude the play area and its surrounding buffer space; and”

The Council heard from two members of the public.

On being put to the vote the motion, as amended was declared carried with 27 councillors voting in favour, 0 councillors voting against and 19 councillors abstaining from voting.

RESOLVED –

That this Council:

1. reaffirms this Council's commitment to the values and principles of Milton Keynes in its 50th year including supporting expansion in line with housing need and the preservation of green open spaces;
2. recalls the responses from residents to the previous consultations on some of these sites and the decision of Council and Delegated Decision on 25 March 2015 and 23 June 2015 to exclude the sites of significant recreational and amenity value to local residents;

3. notes with concern both the content and process for the recent Urban Capacity Study which:
 - (a) was published without any reference to the Plan:MK Working Group;
 - (b) assessed many green open spaces within the built up environment of Milton Keynes as developable, ignoring responses to the previous consultation and more recent use of the sites; and
 - (c) caused alarm by suggesting development on current sheltered housing sites such as Springfield Court;
4. affirms the role of locally led consultation and decision-making on when sites should be considered for either development or additional protections, primarily through the neighbourhood planning process;
5. reaffirms its commitment to saving five of the spaces, and part of the sixth, namely the two sites in Woolstone (UCS072 and UCS073), one site in Springfield (UCS074), one site in Stantonbury (UCS100) and one site in Bletchley (UCS107) and the land incorporating the popular play area from the Springfield 1 site (UCS075);
6. welcomes the decision not to include five of these sites as housing sites in the proposed submission version of Plan:MK;
7. welcomes the reassurance that the Leader gave at Full Council on 21 June 2017 in respect of the Woolstone and two Springfield sites and previous Cabinet member assurances in respect of the remaining sites;
8. regrets the decision of Campbell Park Parish Council to propose the whole of the Springfield Boulevard 1 site for development, contradicting both their own proposed Neighbourhood Plan policies and those of Milton Keynes Council;
9. calls upon the Cabinet as the Executive Arm of this Council to urgently confirm its commitment to the removal of all of these sites from development;
10. calls upon Campbell Park Parish Council to modify the boundaries of the proposed developable area at Springfield Boulevard 1 (UCS075) to exclude the play area and its surrounding buffer space; and
11. calls on the Cabinet to apply to register, the two sites in Woolstone (UCS072 and UCS073), one site in Springfield (UCS074), one site in Stantonbury (UCS100) and one site in Bletchley (UCS107) and the play area and buffer space of the Springfield Boulevard 1 Site (UCS075) as Village Greens under the Commons Act 2006 section 15(8).

CL59

REGENERATION:MK

With the consent of the Council, Councillor C Wilson withdrew the motion.

CL60

STREET HOMELESSNESS

Councillor Marland moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor O'Neill:

- “1. That this Council:
 - (a) notes that homelessness of all types is a significant problem in Milton Keynes;
 - (b) believes it is a basic human right to have a safe place to sleep at night; and
 - (c) notes that austerity cuts to welfare, reductions to funding for services that support people, and a lack of social housing supply has increased the problem of homelessness locally and nationally.
2. That this Council further notes the statement given to Cabinet on Tuesday 3 October 2017 by the Leader of the Council regarding the provision of services to street homeless people in Milton Keynes.
3. That this Council therefore:
 - (a) supports the wish to provide at least 30 emergency accommodation places this winter from one-off funds, and the ongoing Roughsleeping Strategy consultation and Budget Scrutiny which will identify if a base pressure provision in future years is required;
 - (b) supports the expansion of the Outreach service, but notes that the money provided by Central Government for the service is not ongoing after 2019;
 - (c) supports working with partners to establish a service provision specification for street homeless people with high needs, and to submit a funding request to Central Government;
 - (d) supports undertaking work to offer street homeless people training or employment, and encouraging businesses and partners to do so;
 - (e) supports in principle establishing an easy way for the public to donate to homeless charities and end cash begging in Milton Keynes;
 - (f) calls on the Cabinet to implement the outlined street homelessness services as quickly as possible;
 - (g) calls on our Members of Parliament to support the submission to Central Government for the High Needs Street Homeless Support Services; and

- (h) calls on the Government to properly fund homelessness services, lift the Housing Revenue Account limit to allow social housing to be built at the levels required, and fund all public services properly ending austerity policies that are the root cause of homelessness.”

Councillor Ganatra moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Jenkins:

“That the following new Clauses 2 and 3 be added to the motion and the remaining Clauses renumbered:

- ‘2. That Council further notes, notwithstanding these difficulties, that the Labour Administration:
 - (a) chose to remove funding from third party providers of hostels for the street homeless in the first 2 years of its administration;
 - (b) wasted this money, and considerably more, on substandard expensive Bed and Breakfast accommodation, casting aside better solutions;
 - (c) removed funding for homelessness prevention;
 - (e) failed to bid for Government funds earmarked for councils to provide accommodation and support for homeless people, especially street homeless;
 - (e) whilst this was happening, embarked on the practice of building up considerable reserves, from tax payers money, in the housing revenue account and the general fund; and
 - (f) allowed considerable suffering by homeless people on a large and growing scale whilst building up these reserves, preferring to blame Central Government for all the Administration’s woes.
- 3. That the Council welcomes the proposed investment in the restructure of the Housing and Regeneration Teams elsewhere on this agenda, but puts on record that this has come too late and that it exposes the ineptitude of the Labour Administration.”

On being put to the vote the amendment was declared lost with 13 councillors voting in favour, 28 councillors voting against and 0 councillors abstaining from voting.

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

RESOLVED –

1. That this Council:
 - (a) notes that homelessness of all types is a significant problem in Milton Keynes;
 - (b) believes it is a basic human right to have a safe place to sleep at night; and
 - (c) That austerity cuts to welfare, reductions to funding for services that support people, and a lack of social housing supply has increased the problem of homelessness locally and nationally.
2. That this Council further notes the statement given to Cabinet on Tuesday 3 October 2017 by the Leader of the Council regarding the provision of services to street homeless people in Milton Keynes.
3. That this Council therefore:
 - (a) supports the wish to provide at least 30 emergency accommodation places this winter from one-off funds, and the ongoing Roughsleeping Strategy consultation and Budget Scrutiny which will identify if a base pressure provision in future years is required;
 - (b) supports the expansion of the Outreach service, but notes that the money provided by Central Government for the service is not ongoing after 2019;
 - (c) supports working with partners to establish a service provision specification for street homeless people with high needs, and to submit a funding request to Central Government;
 - (d) supports undertaking work to offer street homeless people training or employment, and encouraging businesses and partners to do so;
 - (e) supports in principle establishing an easy way for the public to donate to homeless charities and end cash begging in Milton Keynes;
 - (f) calls on the Cabinet to implement the outlined street homelessness services as quickly as possible;
 - (g) calls on our Members of Parliament to support the submission to Central Government for the High Needs Street Homeless Support Services; and
 - (h) calls on the Government to properly fund homelessness services, lift the Housing Revenue Account limit to allow social housing to be built at the levels required, and fund all public services properly ending austerity policies that are the root cause of homelessness.

CL61 THE ABILITY OF COUNCILLORS TO SCRUTINISE OFFICER DECISIONS

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.2 the Council noted that Councillor C Williams had given notice of his intention to move the motion at the meeting of the Council to be held on 22 November 2017.

CL62 JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROPOSAL

Councillor Jenkins moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor R Bradburn:

- “1. That the establishment of a Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (discretionary Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee with statutory scrutiny powers) to scrutinise the Sustainable and Transformation Partnership for Bedford, Bedfordshire, Luton and Milton Keynes be approved.
2. That the model Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee Terms of Reference (Annex B) be approved.
3. That the Chief Executive be delegated authority to approve any variations to the Terms of Reference following further discussion with the other constituent authorities, subject to consultation with the Group Leaders in respect of any proposed significant variations.
4. That the requirement for the Joint Committee to be politically proportionate across the constituent authorities be waived.
5. That Councillors R Bradburn, Coventry and Jenkins be appointed to represent the Council on the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
6. That substitutes for the appointed representatives be agreed at a future meeting of the Council”.

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

RESOLVED -

1. That the establishment of a Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (discretionary Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee with statutory scrutiny powers) to scrutinise the Sustainable and Transformation Partnership for Bedford, Bedfordshire, Luton and Milton Keynes be approved.
2. That the model Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee Terms of Reference (**Annex B**) be approved.
3. That the Chief Executive be delegated authority to approve any variations to the Terms of Reference following further discussion with the other constituent authorities, subject to consultation with the Group Leaders in respect of any proposed significant variations.

4. That the requirement for the Joint Committee to be politically proportionate across the constituent authorities be waived.
5. That Councillors R Bradburn, Coventry and Jenkins be appointed to represent the Council on the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
6. That substitutes for the appointed representatives be agreed at a future meeting of the Council.

CL63

MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES

The Mayor moved and the Deputy Mayor seconded:

“That the appointment of Councillor Bald to replace Councillor McLean on the Budget Scrutiny Committee and the appointment of Councillor Morris to replace Councillor McDonald on the Health and Adult Social Care Committee be confirmed.”

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

RESOLVED –

That the appointment of Councillor Bald to replace Councillor McLean on the Budget Scrutiny Committee and the appointment of Councillor Morris to replace Councillor McDonald on the Health and Adult Social Care Committee be confirmed.

CL64

WARD BASED BUDGETS 2017/18

The Council noted that for the period 1 April 2017 to 30 September 2017, applications totalling £7,095 had been approved.

THE MAYOR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 10:39 PM