

Minutes of the MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL held on WEDNESDAY 25 MARCH 2015  
at 7.30 pm

**Present:** Councillor Eastman (Mayor)  
Councillors Alexander, Bald, Bint, Brackenbury, Bramall, Brunning,  
M Burke, S Burke, Cannon, Clancy, Clifton, Coventry, Crooks,  
Dransfield, Exon, Ferrans, A Geary, P Geary, E Gifford, R Gifford,  
Gowans, Green, D Hopkins, V Hopkins, Hosking, Khan, Legg,  
Lewis, Long, Marland, D McCall, I McCall, McDonald, McKenzie,  
McLean McPake, Middleton, Miles, Morris, Nolan, O'Neill, Pallett,  
Patey-Smith, Petchey, Priestley, Small, Wallis, Webb, White,  
C Williams, P Williams and Wilson

**Apologies:** Councillors Betteley, Morla and Nash and Alderpersons Beeley,  
Bristow, I Henderson, E Henderson, Howell, Irons, Lloyd and  
Saunders

**Also Present:** circa 100 members of the public

**CL99 MINUTES**

RESOLVED -

That the Minutes of the meetings of the Council held on  
11 February 2015 and 18/25 February 2015, be approved and  
signed by the Mayor as a correct records.

**CL100 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

Councillors P Geary and V Hopkins disclosed personal pecuniary  
interests in Item 4(a) (Consultation on Additional Sites as Part of the  
Site Allocations Plan) as there was a potential conflict with land in  
family ownership.

Councillors Bint, Exon, A Geary, Gowans, Green, Legg, Lewis,  
Middleton, Petchey, White, and C Williams indicated that as either  
members or substitute members of the Development Control  
Committee, they would leave the meeting during consideration of  
Item 5(b) (South West Milton Keynes (Salden Chase) Development  
Proposals), taking no part in the debate or voting thereon.

**CL101 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

(a) Former Councillor Judith Daniels

The Mayor announced the death in 2005 of former Councillor  
Judith Daniels.

(b) Councillor Brackenbury

The Mayor offered the Council's congratulations to Councillor  
Brackenbury and his wife Martina on the recent birth of their  
son Lukas Alexander.

- (c) Councillor Hosking

The Mayor announced that Councillor Hosking was running the Milton Keynes Marathon on 4 May 2015 to raise money for the Royal British Legion.

**CL102**

**CALL-IN OF CABINET MEMBER DECISION – CONSULTATION ON ADDITIONAL SITES AS PART OF THE SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN**

The Council considered the following referral in relation to the Site Allocations Plan from the Executive Scrutiny Panel held on 26 February 2015, which was introduced by Councillor Alexander to which Councillor Legg (Cabinet member for Public Realm) responded.

“That, having considered the weight of evidence presented, the Executive Scrutiny Panel is sufficiently concerned about the current interpretation of planning policy and its application to sites included in the Site Allocations Plan, including the impact across the wider spectrum of sites in the Plan in addition to those sites considered by the Panel, that the matter should be referred to Council for debate, in order that the Council may refer its comments to the Cabinet member who took the original decision for consideration.”

The Mayor moved the following Procedural Motion which was seconded by the Deputy Mayor:

“That, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 21.1, the following Council Procedure Rules be suspended:

11.1 (To allow a motion to be moved)

13.6(a) (to allow any amendments to the motion to be moved).”

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

Councillor Brackenbury moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor McDonald, on which a recorded vote was requested:

“That the Council:

- (a) thanks the Executive Scrutiny Panel members for their detailed scrutiny of the proposed Site Allocations Plan consultation, and welcomes their unanimous recommendation to Full Council;
- (b) acknowledges the foresight of the early planners of Milton Keynes in recognising the benefit of communal green spaces to local communities;
- (c) recognises that the sites in the consultation, amounting to 8000 dwellings, and those sites already consulted on, amounting to 3000 dwellings, would together deliver in the order of 11,000 dwellings, against an urban land requirement

of 1,100 to ensure a 5-year land supply, and therefore believes that the integrity of the consultation would not be damaged by removing a number of inappropriate sites as the initial sites deliver a 15 year supply;

- (d) in recognising its policy-setting role, does not believe that a number of sites, particularly, but not exclusively, on land behind properties in estates surrounding Central Milton Keynes, are consistent with the Core Strategy as adopted by Council in July 2013, in particular proposals to develop on amenity land in established estates conflict with policies CS17 and CS19,
- (e) recognises the widespread opposition to a number of the proposed sites being consulted on, and regrets that many of those objecting feel that they have not been listened to and the lack of co-operation and that this is only heightened by the knowledge that it is the Council proposing these sites for development and no third party requests have been made;
- (f) wholly rejects the further proposal to use this consultation on individual sites as a mechanism for a wider policy change for additional development within estates surrounding Central Milton Keynes;
- (g) regrets that councillors were not involved in the process of considering and selecting Council-owned land to put into this consultation and expects this to become standard practice in future;
- (h) refers the matter back to the Cabinet member and, given the many issues raised, asks the Cabinet member to withdraw the consultation paper and to gain approval from the Plan:MK Cabinet Advisory Group before taking a revised proposal out to consultation.
- (i) asks the Cabinet member for Resources and Commercialism formally to review the entire list of Council-owned sites that have been put forward by officers for inclusion in the site allocation process, with a view to withdrawing all those sites that are already serving a valued purpose for local residents and ensuring that they remain protected as open space covered by policy L2 of the 2005 Local Plan.”

The Council heard from 14 members of the public during consideration of this item.

The voting was as follows:

FOR: Councillors Alexander, Bald, Bint, Brackenbury, Bramall, Brunning, M Burke, S Burke, Cannon, Clancy, Clifton, Coventry, Crooks, Dransfield, Eastman, Exon, Ferrans, A Geary, E Gifford, R Gifford, Gowans, Green, Hosking, Khan, Legg, Lewis, Long, Marland, D McCall, I McCall, McDonald, McKenzie, McLean, McPake, Middleton, Miles, Morris, Nolan, O'Neill, Pallett, Patey-Smith, Petchey, Priestley, Small, Wallis, Webb, White, C Williams, P Williams and Wilson (50)

AGAINST: (0)

ABSTENTIONS (0)

RESOLVED –

That the Council:

- (a) thanks the Executive Scrutiny Panel members for their detailed scrutiny of the proposed Site Allocations Plan consultation, and welcomes their unanimous recommendation to Full Council;
- (b) acknowledges the foresight of the early planners of Milton Keynes in recognising the benefit of communal green spaces to local communities;
- (c) recognises that the sites in the consultation, amounting to 8000 dwellings, and those sites already consulted on, amounting to 3000 dwellings, would together deliver in the order of 11,000 dwellings, against an urban land requirement of 1,100 to ensure a 5-year land supply, and therefore believes that the integrity of the consultation would not be damaged by removing a number of inappropriate sites as the initial sites deliver a 15 year supply;
- (d) in recognising its policy-setting role, does not believe that a number of sites, particularly, but not exclusively, on land behind properties in estates surrounding Central Milton Keynes, are consistent with the Core Strategy as adopted by Council in July 2013, in particular proposals to develop on amenity land in established estates conflict with policies CS17 and CS19,
- (e) recognises the widespread opposition to a number of the proposed sites being consulted on, and regrets that many of those objecting feel that they have not been listened to and the lack of co-operation and that this is only heightened by the knowledge that it is the Council proposing these sites for development and no third party requests have been made;

- (f) wholly rejects the further proposal to use this consultation on individual sites as a mechanism for a wider policy change for additional development within estates surrounding Central Milton Keynes;
- (g) regrets that councillors were not involved in the process of considering and selecting Council-owned land to put into this consultation and expects this to become standard practice in future;
- (h) refers the matter back to the Cabinet member and, given the many issues raised, asks the Cabinet member to withdraw the consultation paper and to gain approval from the Plan:MK Cabinet Advisory Group before taking a revised proposal out to consultation.
- (i) asks the Cabinet member for Resources and Commercialism formally to review the entire list of Council-owned sites that have been put forward by officers for inclusion in the site allocation process, with a view to withdrawing all those sites that are already serving a valued purpose for local residents and ensuring that they remain protected as open space covered by policy L2 of the 2005 Local Plan.

**CL103**

**PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2015/16**

Councillor Middleton moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Joint Negotiating Committee (Employer's Side) held on 27 February 2015, which was seconded by Councillor Bald:

"That the Pay Policy Statement 2015/16 be adopted."

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

RESOLVED –

That the Pay Policy Statement 2015/16 be adopted.

**CL104**

**MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

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

Councillor Coventry, recognising that there was no regular bus service into Leadenhall and that there were severe parking issues and major congestion at the start and end of the school day, while also noting that there were plans to increase the size of the academy, college and for a large community centre, as well as potential plans to redevelop the leisure centre, asked Councillor Marland to commit to the Council creating a development strategy for Leadenhall over the next 18 months, in consultation with all stakeholders, which took into consideration a redesign of the road layout to create a route for an internal regular bus service, parking and traffic issues and also put in place a mechanism that ensured that all future developments on Leadenhall adhered to the strategy.

Councillor Marland indicated that he believed it was the role of Woughton Community Council as part of its neighbourhood plan to put a comprehensive strategy in place for the Leadenhall Estate. However, this Council did have a role in ensuring that there were proper transport links to the campus and the estate and undertook that this would be looked into including on demand transport services, in conjunction with the local community.

- (b) Question from Councillor P Geary to Councillor Legg (Cabinet member for Public Realm)

Councillor P Geary, referring to a statement by officer colleagues in Public Realm Department that it was now policy that there would be no infrastructure development which would require future maintenance, asked Councillor Legg if in fact this was the case.

Councillor Legg indicated that he would look into this matter and provide a written answer.

As a supplementary question Councillor P Geary asked Councillor Legg if he would ensure that the written answer was supplied to all councillors.

Councillor Legg indicated that he would.

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

Councillor Morris asked Councillor Marland if he thought the Council's relationship with the Parks Trust should be reviewed in light of the Trust's position with regard to the Moto-Cross site at Pineham which the Trust attempted to operate against the wishes of the Council and residents.

Councillor Marland indicated that it was important to remember that the Parks Trust was responsible for the majority of the green space in Milton Keynes and therefore its decisions needed to be for the good of the residents and perhaps the relationship needed to be renewed and the Trust reminded of its role.

As a supplementary question Councillor Morris asked Councillor Marland how this matter would be taken forward.

Councillor Marland indicated that discussions had already been held and the Council's Director of Strategy had recently been elected to the Trust's Board, so moves to renew the relationship were already taking place and he would update the Council when appropriate as this was taken forward.

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

Councillor Dransfield, referring to the withdrawal of the provision of black refuse sacks, asked Councillor Marland how many communications he and Cabinet colleagues had received on the issue.

Councillor Marland indicated that he had received three representations last week and one at a meeting today.

As a supplementary question Councillor Dransfield asked Councillor Marland how much of the £130,000 saving which was to be achieved would be needed to clear any increase in fly tipping.

Councillor Marland indicated that the black refuse sacks of the quality provided were available in the 'value' section of most supermarkets. Currently, the Council's refuse collection contractor only worked for 5 other councils which still relied on refuse bags and the contractor did not envisage a problem with the withdrawal of the black refuse sacks. The removal of black sack provision had not been identified as a particular issue at the budget roadshows by residents. Councillor Marland also stressed that while the Administration would have liked to retain the provision of black sacks, it was important to remember that the Council had to make savings.

- (e) Question from Councillor Bint to Councillor Legg (Cabinet member for Public Realm)

Councillor Bint asked Councillor Legg if there had been any recent decisions to change the design code for street name signs and direction signs.

Councillor Legg indicated that he was not aware of any changes, but would look into this and provide a written answer.

As a supplementary question Councillor Bint, noting that in his view that officer colleagues did not appear to be aware of any design code, asked Councillor Legg, in his reply, to indicate what measures would be put in place to replace any signs which did not conform and ensure that officer colleagues were aware of the code.

- (f) Question from Councillor D Hopkins to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Councillor D Hopkins asked Councillor Marland if he thought that the sacrifice made by the men and women of the country during the World Wars was worthy of recognition.

Councillor Marland indicated that he did and as the Council's Armed Forces Champion he was honoured to represent the armed forces at events across Milton Keynes and had

represented the Council at the 100 year commemoration of the First World War in France last year. More locally Councillor Marland indicated the he was currently seeking the refurbishment of the New Bradwell War Memorial.

As a supplementary question Councillor D Hopkins asked Councillor Marland if he supported the policy of Wavendon Parish Council in naming new streets after husbands and sons of the village who had given their lives in wars.

Councillor Marland indicated that he did.

- (g) Question from Councillor A Geary to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Councillor A Geary asked Councillor Marland if he considered it a good use of the Council's resources to pursue a complaint against the press through the Independent Press Standards Organisation and whether this had been done on his authority.

Councillor Marland indicated that he believed that the press should publish a retraction if they reported inaccurately. In respect of the story published by the Milton Keynes Citizen last week, he had contacted the newspaper direct to make a complaint, it was the Council's Head of Communications that had decided independently to contact the Press Standards Organisation.

As a supplementary question Councillor A Geary asked Councillor Marland again if making such a complaint was a good use of the Council's resources

Councillor Marland indicated that he believed the Council should challenge inaccuracies in the press where appropriate, but he did not support pursuing this particular issue through the courts. However, as a result of his personal letter to the newspaper, he believed the appropriate restorative action had been taken.

- (h) Question from Councillor S Burke to Councillor Clifton (Cabinet member for Economic Growth and Inward Investment)

Councillor S Burke, referring to two road schemes which had been identified for funding in his Ward, asked Councillor Clifton what was the point of identifying such schemes if officer colleagues did not then have the time to design the schemes.

Councillor Clifton indicated that he would look into this matter and provide a written answer.

- (i) Question from Councillor I McCall to Councillor Middleton (Cabinet member for Resources and Commercialism)

Councillor I McCall, referring to a statement in an 'In Touch' leaflet, asked Councillor Middleton if there were plans to build on the green space at Pattison Lane in Woolstone.

Councillor Middleton indicated that there were no such plans and this was misinformation. However, following on from the earlier debate concerning site allocations, there needed to be a wide debate amongst the community of Milton Keynes on how good homes, good jobs and a good environment were to be delivered, a key element of which would be neighbourhood planning.

Councillor I McCall, as a supplementary question, asked Councillor Middleton if the site was earmarked for consultation for development.

Councillor Middleton indicated that there was no truth in that.

- (j) Question from Councillor Ferrans to Councillor Legg (Cabinet member for Public Realm)

Councillor Ferrans, referring to signage for road works on grid roads, asked Councillor Legg if there had been a change in policy as it did not appear that the works were now being signposted at least two roundabouts in advance, which allowed road users to take alternative routes

Councillor Legg indicated that he was not aware of any change, and asked Councillor Ferrans to provide examples so that he could discuss with officer colleagues.

As a supplementary question Councillor Ferrans asked Councillor Legg if he could arrange for new officer colleagues to be advised of the policy as they did not appear to be aware.

Councillor Legg indicated that he would.

- (k) Question from Councillor Webb to Councillor Legg (Cabinet member for Public Realm)

Councillor Webb asked Councillor Legg how it was possible to report street lights which were not working if there was not identification number on the post.

Councillor Legg indicated that if Councillor Webb provided specific details he would look into the matter.

**SOUTH WEST MILTON KEYNES (SALDEN CHASE)  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

Councillor Long moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Khan:

- “1. That this Council notes that the South West Milton Keynes Consortium is consulting on new plans to develop housing on the Salden Chase area of Aylesbury Vale District Council, which is adjacent to Milton Keynes, and in particular Bletchley.
2. That this Council:
  - (a) expresses deep concern about the proposed development and its potential impact on Milton Keynes;
  - (b) believes the consortium and development name of “South West Milton Keynes” is fundamentally misleading and highlights that no part of the proposals fall within Milton Keynes Council’s administrative boundary and that this Council will not determine the planning application;
  - (c) believes the consortium and development name of “South West Milton Keynes” seeks to trade on the good name of Milton Keynes to the benefit of the developers and to the detriment of Milton Keynes;
  - (d) notes that as Salden Chase falls outside the administrative boundaries of Milton Keynes Council any income from the development such as Council Tax, business rates and infrastructure contributions would benefit Aylesbury Vale District Council, while the likely cost and impact would fall on the citizens, services and infrastructure of Milton Keynes;
  - (e) believes that the development will place unacceptable strain on the infrastructure and services in Milton Keynes;
  - (f) believes that the consortium is seeking to develop the proposal in stages in order to minimise contributions for the necessary mitigation and infrastructure requirements of the development;
  - (g) is concerned that any development will have an adverse impact on Milton Keynes roads and transport infrastructure, in particular the A421, adding to serious congestion;
  - (h) is concerned that the development will impact on GP services in Bletchley and on wider health services in Milton Keynes;

- (i) is concerned about the provision and impact on other services, such as school places, which would undoubtedly arise from the development and for which Milton Keynes Council would receive little funding;
  - (j) notes that the development proposals lack any conformity or integration with the surrounding and adjoining infrastructure of Milton Keynes;
  - (k) is concerned over the provision of affordable properties within the development;
  - (l) highlights that any development would likely be regarded informally and geographically as part of Milton Keynes but that this Authority would have no administrative role in the area;
  - (m) notes the absence of a Core Strategy for development by Aylesbury Vale District Council and that this places Milton Keynes at an unacceptable risk of speculative unplanned edge of town development applications such as Salden Chase; and
  - (n) notes the legal requirement of “Duty to Co-operate” between local authorities over planned development and that contact between Aylesbury Vale District Council and the developer with Milton Keynes Council over the impact of this proposal has been minimal.
3. That this Council therefore agrees:
- (a) to oppose the current development proposals;
  - (b) to highlight the negative impact of the proposals on Milton Keynes;
  - (c) to develop a close working relationship with the three Milton Keynes Parish Councils affected by the development (West Bletchley, Bletchley and Fenny. Shenley Brook End and Tattenhoe) to support the community in challenging the proposed development;
  - (d) to work with Aylesbury Vale parish councils who oppose the development;
  - (e) to recognise the work of parish councils and their opposition to the proposed development;
  - (f) to support Milton Keynes ward and parish councillors, through regular briefings, in representing their residents’ views to both the Aylesbury Vale planning authority and with respect to the application to Milton Keynes Council; and

- (g) that the Service Director (Planning and Transport) writes to the Chief Executive and Leader of Aylesbury Vale District Council and the Chief Executive of the South West Milton Keynes Consortium to outline this Council's opposition to the development plans."

Councillor Clancy moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Bald and accepted by the mover of the motion:

That the following new Clause be added:

- "4. That this Council notes, commends and supports the work and actions of the many local residents and action groups, local parish councillors, locally elected members of all political parties within the surrounding area and the serving Member of Parliament Iain Stewart MP, and recognises that it is essential for this united stand to continue if the campaign against this unjustified development is to succeed."

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

On being put to the vote the substantive motion was declared with 40 Councillors voting in favour, 0 Councillors voting against and 1 Councillor abstaining from voting.

RESOLVED –

- 1. That this Council notes that the South West Milton Keynes Consortium is consulting on new plans to develop housing on the Salden Chase area of Aylesbury Vale District Council, which is adjacent to Milton Keynes, and in particular Bletchley.
- 2. That this Council:
  - (a) expresses deep concern about the proposed development and its potential impact on Milton Keynes;
  - (b) believes the consortium and development name of "South West Milton Keynes" is fundamentally misleading and highlights that no part of the proposals fall within Milton Keynes Council's administrative boundary and that this Council will not determine the planning application;
  - (c) believes the consortium and development name of "South West Milton Keynes" seeks to trade on the good name of Milton Keynes to the benefit of the developers and to the detriment of Milton Keynes;
  - (d) notes that as Salden Chase falls outside the administrative boundaries of Milton Keynes Council any income from the development such as Council

Tax, business rates and infrastructure contributions would benefit Aylesbury Vale District Council, while the likely cost and impact would fall on the citizens, services and infrastructure of Milton Keynes;

- (e) believes that the development will place unacceptable strain on the infrastructure and services in Milton Keynes;
- (f) believes that the consortium is seeking to develop the proposal in stages in order to minimise contributions for the necessary mitigation and infrastructure requirements of the development;
- (g) is concerned that any development will have an adverse impact on Milton Keynes roads and transport infrastructure, in particular the A421, adding to serious congestion;
- (h) is concerned that the development will impact on GP services in Bletchley and on wider health services in Milton Keynes;
- (i) is concerned about the provision and impact on other services, such as school places, which would undoubtedly arise from the development and for which Milton Keynes Council would receive little funding;
- (j) notes that the development proposals lack any conformity or integration with the surrounding and adjoining infrastructure of Milton Keynes;
- (k) is concerned over the provision of affordable properties within the development;
- (l) highlights that any development would likely be regarded informally and geographically as part of Milton Keynes but that this Authority would have no administrative role in the area;
- (m) notes the absence of a Core Strategy for development by Aylesbury Vale District Council and that this places Milton Keynes at an unacceptable risk of speculative unplanned edge of town development applications such as Salden Chase; and
- (n) notes the legal requirement of “Duty to Co-operate” between local authorities over planned development and that contact between Aylesbury Vale District Council and the developer with Milton Keynes Council over the impact of this proposal has been minimal.

3. That this Council therefore agrees:
  - (a) to oppose the current development proposals;
  - (b) to highlight the negative impact of the proposals on Milton Keynes;
  - (c) to develop a close working relationship with the three Milton Keynes Parish Councils affected by the development (West Bletchley, Bletchley and Fenny. Shenley Brook End and Tattenhoe) to support the community in challenging the proposed development;
  - (d) to work with Aylesbury Vale parish councils who oppose the development;
  - (e) to recognise the work of parish councils and their opposition to the proposed development;
  - (f) to support Milton Keynes ward and parish councillors, through regular briefings, in representing their residents' views to both the Aylesbury Vale planning authority and with respect to the application to Milton Keynes Council; and
  - (g) that the Service Director (Planning and Transport) writes to the Chief Executive and Leader of Aylesbury Vale District Council and the Chief Executive of the South West Milton Keynes Consortium to outline this Council's opposition to the development plans.
4. That this Council notes, commends and supports the work and actions of the many local residents and action groups, local parish councillors, locally elected members of all political parties within the surrounding area and the serving Member of Parliament Iain Stewart MP, and recognises that it is essential for this united stand to continue if the campaign against this unjustified development is to succeed.

#### **CL106**

#### **SCHEME OF COUNCILLORS' ALLOWANCES 2015/16**

The Council considered adopting a Scheme of Councillors' Allowances for 2015/16

Councillor D McCall moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Bald:

- "1. That bearing in mind the Council's current financial position and the need to constrain costs, the recommendations in the 2014 report of the Independent Remuneration Panel on Councillors' Allowances be not implemented.
2. That in order to ensure that there is no increase in the overall sum of money for Councillors' Allowances, the scheme of allowances for 2015-2016 should be the same as that for 2014-2015, subject to the Special Responsibility Allowances

for Overview and Scrutiny being amended, as follows, to reflect the decision of the Council on 14 January 2015 (Minute CL118 refers), as subsequently endorsed by the Independent Remuneration Panel on Councillors' Allowances:

- (a) Chair of the Scrutiny Management Group £7k
  - (b) Budget Scrutiny Committee Chair £4.5k
  - (c) Executive Scrutiny Committee Chair £4.5k
  - (d) Children and Young People Committee £4.5k
  - (e) Health and Adult Social Care Committee £4.5k
  - (f) Chairs of the Task and Finish Groups £4.5k (pro rata basis depending on the length of time the Group is in place).
3. That it be noted that the allowances for Overview and Scrutiny above are being funded from the reallocation of sums available for scrutiny committees that are ceasing to exist and that there is no increase in the budget for Councillors Allowances.
4. That furthermore that Council confirms the continuation of the custom and practice that has been in place since the introduction of the Cabinet system of government that there is a cap on the total allowances available for the Cabinet which is distributed between Cabinet Members (Leader excluded), as this has the benefit of enabling the Leader to determine the Cabinet structure without increasing the cost to tax payers.
5. That it be noted that historically the cap has been based on a 7 member Cabinet (currently with an allowance of £10,753 and a total of £74,529) and seeks assurance that this cap formula has been applied in 2014/15 and agrees its retention until Council decides otherwise."

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

"That no indexation be applied to Councillors' allowances whatsoever."

On being put to the vote the substantive motion was declared unanimously

RESOLVED –

- "1. That bearing in mind the Council's current financial position and the need to constrain costs, the recommendations in the 2014 report of the Independent Remuneration Panel on Councillors' Allowances be not implemented.

2. That in order to ensure that there is no increase in the overall sum of money for councillors' allowances, the scheme of allowances for 2015-2016 should be the same as that for 2014-2015, subject to the Special Responsibility Allowances for Overview and Scrutiny being amended, as follows, to reflect the decision of the Council on 14 January 2015 (Minute CL118 refers), as subsequently endorsed by the Independent Remuneration Panel on Councillors' Allowances:
  - (a) Chair of the Scrutiny Management Group £7k
  - (b) Budget Scrutiny Committee Chair £4.5k
  - (c) Executive Scrutiny Committee Chair £4.5k
  - (d) Children and Young People Committee £4.5k
  - (e) Health and Adult Social Care Committee £4.5k
  - (f) Chairs of the Task and Finish Groups £4.5k (pro rata basis depending on the length of time the Group is in place).
3. That it be noted that the allowances for Overview and Scrutiny above are being funded from the reallocation of sums available for scrutiny committees that are ceasing to exist and that there is no increase in the budget for councillors allowances.
4. That furthermore that Council confirms the continuation of the custom and practice that has been in place since the introduction of the Cabinet system of government that there is a cap on the total allowances available for the Cabinet which is distributed between Cabinet Members (Leader excluded), as this has the benefit of enabling the Leader to determine the Cabinet structure without increasing the cost to tax payers.
5. That it be noted that historically the cap has been based on a 7 member Cabinet (currently with an allowance of £10,753 and a total of £74,529) and seeks assurance that this cap formula has been applied in 2014/15 and agrees its retention until Council decides otherwise.
6. That no indexation be applied to Councillors' allowances whatsoever.

## **CL107**

### **RETURNING OFFICER'S FEES**

The Council considered the fees for the Council's Returning Officer for the Borough and Parish elections during 2015/16.

**RESOLVED –**

That the Buckinghamshire Scheme for Election fees be adopted for 2015/16.

**CL108 ANNUAL REPORTS**

The Council received the Annual Report of Overview and Scrutiny, from the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, together with reports from the Chair of the Licensing and Regulatory Committees.

**CL 109 LEADER'S EXECUTIVE SCHEME OF DELEGATION**

The Council, in accordance with Cabinet Procedure Rule 1.2, noted changes to the Leader's Executive Scheme of Delegation.

**CL110 WARD BASED BUDGETS - 1 APRIL 2014 TO 31 MARCH 2015**

The Council noted that for the period 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015, applications totalling £52,302.10 had been approved.

**CL111 APPOINTMENTS TO CHIEF OFFICER POSTS**

The Council noted the appointment of Mr Duncan Sharkey to the post of Corporate Director – Place and that Mr Sharkey would take up the post on 1 June 2015.

THE MAYOR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 11:04 PM