



Minutes of the meeting of the MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL held on TUESDAY 12 DECEMBER 2006 at 7.30 pm

**Present:** Councillor Carstens (Mayor)  
Councillor Barry (Deputy Mayor)  
Councillors Box, Brock, Burke, Butler-Ellis, Campbell, Carruthers, Sandra Clark Stephen, Clark, Crooks, Dransfield, Drewett, Eastman, Exon, Ferrans, Fraser, Geary, Gerrella, E Henderson, I Henderson, Holroyd, Hopkins, Hoyle, Irons, Jury, Latham, Legg, Lloyd, Long, D McCall, I McCall, McKenzie, Miles, Morris, Pendry, Pugh, Seymour, Snell, Tallack, Tamagnini-Barbosa, Tunney, Wharton, Williams and Wilson

Aldermen Bartlett, Connor and Howell were also present

**Apologies:** Councillors Bristow, Coventry, Eaton, Edwards, Mabbott and Morsley and Alderman Ellis

**Also Present:** 24 members of the public

**CL80 MINUTES**

RESOLVED -

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 14 November 2006, be approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record.

**CL81 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Mayor expressed the Council's congratulations to Team 28 at Milton Keynes College Princes Trust which was being considered for a National Award having won the South East Regional Community Impact Award.

The Team of eight unemployed young people had raised funds to refurbish the Tinkers Bridge Meeting Place and, in so doing, had developed skills such as budgeting, leadership, time management and tolerance.

All the team had since gone on to either further education, or employment.

The Mayor also drew the attention of the Council to banners around the room, which were the product of the work of children from Middleton and Broughton Fields Primary Schools.

## CL82

### DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Councillor Sandra Clark declared a prejudicial interest in Item 5(b)(ii), as an employee of Milton Keynes Hospital.

Councillor Gerrella declared a prejudicial interest in Item 5(b)(ii), as his spouse was an employee of Milton Keynes Hospital.

Councillor Tamagnini-Barbosa declared a prejudicial interest in Item 5(b)(ii), as his partner was an employee of Milton Keynes Hospital.

Councillor E Henderson declared a personal interest in Item 5(b)(ii), as an Non-Executive Director of the Milton Keynes Primary Care Trust.

Councillor Hoyle declared a prejudicial interest in Item 5(b)(iv), as his spouse was a supply teacher employed at one of the schools concerned.

Councillors Ferrans, Holroyd, Hoyle, Irons, Legg, Lloyd, McKenzie and Wilson declared personal interests in Item 6, as members of parish and town councils.

## CL83

### PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- (a) Question from Mr Paul Bartlett to Councillor Jury (Leader of the Conservative Group):

“I asked you a question at the last meeting of the Council, to which you gave me a written reply, but which, from the answer given, I think that you may have misunderstood.

Could you please tell me if you support the policy of the Conservative Party to 'oppose residential infilling in gardens', and if so do you oppose the infilling of garden land in London Road, Loughton, which is within your ward?”

Answer from Councillor Jury:

“I hasten to add that I certainly did not misunderstand your question. I was certainly concerned because you seem to think that the Conservative policy is against individuals infilling. What we oppose is compulsory infilling, which is imposed by the Government. We are certainly not opposed to individuals requesting, through the correct channels of planning through this Council, as I believe that particular property to which you are referring, went through, to infill. Individuals requesting to infill is different to being told to infill by the Labour Government.”

Mr Bartlett asked a supplementary question which was answered by Councillor Jury.

- (b) Question from Ms S Bran to Councillor Sandra Clark (Cabinet Member Responsible for Schools):

“Why have we never seen you talking to parents at our school, is it because you are too scared of the reception you will receive?”

- (c) Question from Ms K Barnes to Councillor Sandra Clark (Cabinet Member Responsible for Schools):

“When the schools review was unveiled you and the Council’s Group Director (School Improvement and Planning) were on a trip to China. Is this an indication of the contempt that you have shown the parents of West Bletchley?”

- (d) Question from Ms J Newbury to Councillor Sandra Clark (Cabinet Member Responsible for Schools):

“What wider community uses for our school did you explore?”

- (e) Question from Ms J Tomlin to Councillor Sandra Clark (Cabinet Member Responsible for Schools):

“When village schools are threatened with closure everybody talks about them as part of the community and more than just a school, why have you not done this for West Bletchley?”

Response from Councillor Sandra Clark:

“I am delighted to see some parents and Governors here tonight. As with the current review going on around Sir Frank Markham, which is also looking at a closure notice, I will attend public meetings. The process, so far, has been officer led. It has not been appropriate for any Cabinet Member involvement at all. As we go out to consultation, I will be at the public meetings to hear those concerns.

I was only in China for two days and that was prior to the paper coming to Cabinet.

Part of the consultation process will be to listen to what the community’s wishes are. We are already proposing a nursery and a new children’s centre for the area. We are listening to the wishes of the community. The whole point of going to consultation is for you to have your say and to feed that back to Cabinet, and to other elected Members. That is the stage we are now at.

Village schools are as much part of our community as any other school. However, we have worked with many of our village schools, some of which are federated, in other words they share Headteachers. They came to us saying that they are not sustainable and what can we do to support them. We have worked with them and they now share Headteachers. I am sure there are elected Members here tonight that would say that works extremely well.

We have amalgamated two schools in Newport Pagnell recently, which are very similar to those in West Bletchley, and we found that that has been very successful. The community had wanted that.”

Ms Bran, Ms Barnes, Ms Newbury and Ms Tomlin each asked a supplementary question which was answered by Councillor Sandra Clark.

- (f) Question from Ms S Radnage to Councillor Sandra Clark (Cabinet Member Responsible for Schools):

“If there are surplus places in West Bletchley Schools then why are you proposing to build new schools in Tattenhoe and Newton Leys, both of which are less than a mile away?

- (g) Question from Ms A Fisher to Councillor Sandra Clark (Cabinet Member Responsible for Schools):

“Why are you not closing down schools on the Lakes Estate when they are only half full and why are you only looking at two schools?

- (h) Question from Ms G Burdett to Councillor Sandra Clark (Cabinet Member Responsible for Schools):

“Can you guarantee that if you close the schools then you won’t be selling the land off to developers to make some fast money?

- (i) Question from Ms D Garrety to Councillor Sandra Clark (Cabinet Member Responsible for Schools):

“How will you compensate for the children’s education and well-being for those who will be forced to go to a different school in their final year at middle school, who will have to deal with moving school and then a move to a secondary school?

Response from Councillor Sandra Clark:

“We are looking at building new schools in Tattenhoe and Newton Leys, because they are growth areas and new communities. The first port of call for anyone in a new community is a school.

We are having a different approach with regard to the situation on the Lakes Estate. Water Hall Primary School is being rebuilt and will be at a lower capacity than it is now, so that will take away a number of surplus places in that area.

With regard to us selling land to developers after school closures, the land will come under Learning and Development and we will look at other options as to what can be done with the premises. It may well be that there are other Council services that could use those premises, but, again, that will be discussed at the consultation.

In terms of the children's education, we have every faith in the professionals that educate our children. The Headteachers tell us this is what they want. They tell us the schools are not sustainable at the moment and we think children can deal with a change in their education."

Ms Radnage and Ms Fisher each asked a supplementary question which was answered by Councillor Clark.

- (j) Question from Ms S McVeigh to Councillor Sandra Clark (Cabinet Member Responsible for Schools):

"Is it the Council's intention to make all schools primary?"

Answer from Councillor Sandra Clark:

"Yes, because we would only send primary age children to primary schools."

- (k) Question from Mr G Black, asked by the Mayor on his behalf, to Councillor Sandra Clark (Cabinet Member Responsible for Schools):

"This process has been rolling out over the last twelve months, why is it you have only met the Chairs of Governors and Headteachers once?"

- (l) Question from Ms S Merrick, asked by the Mayor on her behalf, to Councillor Sandra Clark (Cabinet Member Responsible for Schools):

"Can you tell me at what stage standards are going to be considered?"

- (m) Question from Ms F Christison, asked by the Mayor on her behalf, to Councillor Sandra Clark (Cabinet Member Responsible for Schools):

"Is this all about removing parental choice?"

Response from Councillor Sandra Clark:

"The process has been rolling out over the twelve months. Officers may have only met with the Chairs of Governors once, because they are now part of the consultation process and will be fully consulted. However, officers have met with Headteachers on numerous occasions, and there are minutes of those meetings available.

With regard to at which stage are the standard to be considered, I have to say again we have to have confidence in the professionals who deal with our children. They are the priority concern for our Headteachers. We will listen to the wishes and views of the Headteachers."

**CL84 PROCEDURAL ANNOUNCEMENT**

The Mayor announced that he would be bring forward the following Items:

- (a) West Bletchley Schools Review; and
- (b) Wolverton Area Action Plan.

**CL85 WEST BLETCHLEY SCHOOLS REVIEW**

Councillor Campbell moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Long:

"That this Council:

- 1. notes with concern that the West Bletchley Schools review does not command local support and that the review is based on inaccurate information and short sighted assumptions; and
- 2. asks the Cabinet to suspend the proposed review in favour of a long term project to retain all local schools and work with parents, the Parish Council and ward councillors to establish sustainable school provision and extended community use of schools."

Councillor Sandra Clark moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Drewett:

"That all the words after 'this Council' are deleted and replaced with:

- '1. notes that the headteachers of the West Bletchley primary schools have been fully involved in the conduct of the West Bletchley Schools Review so far and that the great majority are concerned that the remaining stages of the Review should not be delayed any further;
- 2 notes with concern that the West Bletchley Schools Review does not command the support of some local councillors; and
- 3 asks the Cabinet to continue to work with parents, the Parish Council and ward councillors to establish sustainable school provision and extended community use of schools.'"

On being put to the vote the amendment was declared carried with 34 Members voting in favour, 10 Members voting against and 0 Members abstaining from voting.

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

"That the following clause be added to the motion:

'regrets that Councillor Long, as a representative of a West Bletchley Ward, does not appear to have expressed concerns during the consultation process with schools, did not attend the Learning and Development Policy Development Committee that discussed officer

proposals, did not attend the Cabinet meeting that accepted an amendment proposed by the Learning and Development Policy Development Committee, and did not 'call in' the decision of the Cabinet, thus bringing himself, the Labour Group and the Labour Party into disrepute'."

The Council heard from two members of the public on this item.

A recorded vote was requested on the substantive motion.

The voting was as follows:

FOR: Councillors Barry, Box, Brock, Burke, Butler-Ellis, Carruthers, Carstens, Sandra Clark, Stephen Clark, Crooks, Dransfield, Drewett, Eastman, Exon, Ferrans, Fraser, Geary, Gerrella, E Henderson, I Henderson, Hopkins, Jury, Latham, D McCall, I McCall, Morris, Pugh, Seymour, Snell, Tallack, Tamagnini-Barbosa, Tunney, Wharton and Williams (34).

AGAINST: Councillors Campbell, Holroyd, Legg, Long, Miles, Pendry and Wilson (7)

ABSTENTIONS: Councillors Irons, Lloyd and McKenzie (3)

The substantive motion was declared carried.

RESOLVED -

That this Council:

1. notes that the headteachers of the West Bletchley primary schools have been fully involved in the conduct of the West Bletchley Schools Review so far and that the great majority are concerned that the remaining stages of the Review should not be delayed any further;
2. notes with concern that the West Bletchley Schools Review does not command the support of some local councillors; and
3. asks the Cabinet to continue to work with parents, the Parish Council and ward councillors to establish sustainable school provision and extended community use of schools.
4. regrets that Councillor Long, as a representative of a West Bletchley Ward, does not appear to have expressed concerns during the consultation process with schools, did not attend the Learning and Development Policy Development Committee that discussed officer proposals, did not attend the Cabinet meeting that accepted an amendment proposed by the Learning and Development Policy Development Committee, and did not 'call in' the decision of the Cabinet, thus bringing himself, the Labour Group and the Labour Party into disrepute.

(Councillor Hoyle declared a prejudicial interest in this item and left the meeting, taking no part in the vote.)

**CL86**

## **WOLVERTON AREA ACTION PLAN**

Councillor Irons moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Holroyd:

"That this Council:

1. notes the importance of regeneration for Wolverton and its residents;
2. notes the publication of the Wolverton Area Action Plan in October 2006; and
3. agrees to ask the Leader to use all the influence she has on Milton Keynes Partnership Committee and the Council to ensure that the final plan takes into consideration all the views of the different sectors of the Wolverton Community."

The Council heard from one member of the public on this item.

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

**RESOLVED -**

That this Council:

1. notes the importance of regeneration for Wolverton and its residents;
2. notes the publication of the Wolverton Area Action Plan in October 2006; and
3. agrees to ask the Leader to use all the influence she has on Milton Keynes Partnership Committee and the Council to ensure that the final plan takes into consideration all the views of the different sectors of the Wolverton Community.

**CL87**

## **REPORTS FROM CABINET AND COMMITTEES**

Licensing Committee - 15 November 2006

Gambling Act 2005 - Statement of Principles

Councillor Carruthers moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 15 November 2006, which was seconded by Councillor Burke:

1. That the Statement of Principles under the Gambling Act 2005 be adopted, subject to any minor amendments required as a result of further guidance issued by the Government or the Gambling Commission.
2. That the Chief Environmental Health Officer be authorised to make any minor amendments to the Council's Statement of Principles if required by any further guidance issued by the Government or Gambling Commission following consultation with the Head of Legal Services."

On being put to the vote the recommendation was declared carried with 38 Members voting in favour, 0 Members voting against and 3 Members abstaining from voting.

**RESOLVED -**

1. That the Statement of Principles under the Gambling Act 2005 be adopted, subject to any minor amendments required as a result of further guidance issued by the Government or the Gambling Commission.
2. That the Chief Environmental Health Officer be authorised to make any minor amendments to the Council's Statement of Principles if required by any further guidance issued by the Government or Gambling Commission following consultation with the Head of Legal Services.

**CL88**

**MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

- (a) Question from Councillor Burke to Councillor Long:

"Given comments tonight about you missing meetings, I know you missed the last meeting of the parish council to have a meeting with a certain gentleman that lives at 10 Downing Street or 11, I'm not sure. At your recent meeting with Tony Blair, were you able to obtain more money for Milton Keynes?"

Answer from Councillor Long:

"Mr Blair was extremely interested in Milton Keynes and is a great fan of the city. What the Head of Policy at No. 10 did point out and remind me of, is what massive investment has been in the city compared to other cities. More importantly, I had a very interesting and a long conversation with Patricia Hewitt about health services. She was absolutely on top of the funding of health services in Milton Keynes and issues around it. So the answer to your question is that, in their view, Milton Keynes has done very well, as has the whole country. That's what comes from having a stable economic situation and a well run Labour Government."

Councillor Burke asked a supplementary question, which was answered by Councillor Long.

- (b) Question from Councillor Crooks to Councillor Long:

"The end of the year is always a time for the fading away of old friends, traditions and memories. Given your increasing difficulty in getting Labour Party Members to attend Committees, and given that there are more Conservatives here tonight than Labour, I was wondering if you are planning to cede your position to Councillor Jury, and ride gracefully towards your personal sunset with Councillor Wilson?"

Answer from Councillor Long:

"I can think of two women who would be absolutely delighted if Kevin and I rode into the sunset for some period of time."

(c) Question from Councillor E Henderson to Councillor Long:

"Could you repeat what I believe you said in the earlier debate this evening, that Christine Burnett wanted to close her own school five years ago?"

Answer from Councillor Long:

"My recollection of the debate was that Christine Burnett was very much in favour of closing the school."

(d) Question from Councillor Wilson to Councillor Sandra Clark:

"In the debate earlier tonight, a lot of references were made by you to e-mail correspondence with either Headteachers or officers. Are you prepared to release into the public domain all the e-mails and other correspondences that you wrote in relation to the West Bletchley schools review?"

Answer from Councillor Clark:

"I am not aware that there are any, other than the one I acknowledged tonight, so I do not see why not."

Councillor Wilson asked a supplementary question, which was answered by Councillor Clark.

(e) Question from Councillor Ferrans to Councillor Long:

"I was interested in your statement that you knew that one of your residents had voted for you. Does that imply illicit access to voting information?"

Answer from Councillor Long:

"I just know that Rosemary has me on her Christmas card list."

(f) Question from Councillor Dransfield to Councillor Williams:

"Aylesbury Vale District Council, in the spirit of Christmas, is offering free parking to the users of its shopping centre. Would you consider the same thing?"

Answer from Councillor Williams:

"You are perfectly aware of the plans that have been made for Christmas. There are some days in which there will be free parking in Milton Keynes. Those days will be advertised in the press. You will be able to read them along with everybody else."

(g) Question from Councillor Wilson to Councillor Williams:

"The Council's Capital Programme 2007/08 will shortly be in the public domain. You have received officers'

recommendations in relation to the Capital Programme that affect your Department. Have you made any alterations, deletions, omissions or additions to that Capital Programme, as recommended to you by officers?"

Answer from Councillor Williams:

"Yes."

Councillor Wilson asked a supplementary question, which was answered by Councillor Williams.

(h) Question from Councillor Miles to Councillor Williams:

"Can you tell me how many days free parking there will be in the City Centre, when and where you propose to advertise and how much revenue, do you estimate, this will lose the Council?"

Answer from Councillor Williams:

"The free days will be Christmas Day, Boxing Day and New Year's Day. I, therefore, anticipate to lose very little in the way of revenue. There will actually be a number of other days when there will be shorter charging periods; there are at least two days when we will only charge between 9.00 am and 4.00 pm, as opposed to the normal charging regime. We will be advertising those in the local press. We will also make sure that all the machines cannot accept money on the days when parking is free, and we will also ensure that the machines are hooded with a corresponding message."

Councillor Miles asked a supplementary question, which was answered by Councillor Williams.

**CL89**

## **QUESTIONS OF THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE POLICE AUTHORITY**

Question from Councillor Butler-Ellis:

"In relation to the Police Officer Strength data provided at the last Full Council, can the Police Authority tell us whether the respective figures are inclusive of Police Community Support Officers, Officers on 'Light Duties' and those who are on sick leave? if so, can the Authority give specific numbers for each group?"

The Police Authority also makes reference to increasing Police numbers, yet I am aware that within the last 2/3 years, officer numbers have dropped from 5 to 1 in Walton Park Ward. If officer numbers have increased, should I not see more, not less officers, for an area which has 9500 electors?"

Answer from Councillor Crooks (Representative of the Police Authority appointed to answer questions on its behalf):

"The data in relation to Police Officer strength provided at the last meeting did not include Police Community Support Officers as they

are 'Police Staff' not Police Officers. However the totals would have included those on 'Light Duties' and sick leave.

Clearly the number of officers on 'light duties' or sick leave can vary from day to day. The Force record sickness in terms of hours lost to the organisation, not the numbers of officers who have reported sick. Milton Keynes between April and October 2006 recorded 15,906 hours lost to sickness, a 0.2% increase on the same period last year.

The data on officers on 'light' or recuperative duties is not readily available.

The Walton Park Ward is one of three parishes which are currently covered by an establishment of 5 neighbourhood officers. The number of officers available on a daily basis is of course affected by abstractions arising from sickness, leave, attendance at court and wider Force operational commitments. The Basic Command Unit Commander is aware that the abstraction level in that area has been unusually high recently and is reviewing resourcing levels on a regular basis across the Basic Command Unit.

Through the ongoing roll-out of Neighbourhood Policing, the Force will be seeking to ensure that the resources applied to local policing, which includes Police Community Support Officers, are not abstracted for other operational commitments."

## **CL90**

### **DECISION MAKING IN MILTON KEYNES**

Councillor Morris moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Hopkins:

"That this Council:

1. notes with concern the comments made by Sir Bob Reid to the External Scrutiny Committee on 31 October 2006 and whilst welcoming some of those initiatives, expresses regret at the implied 'ownership' of some initiatives and with the lack of communication and consultation with this Council;
2. calls upon the Members of Milton Keynes Partnership Committee, from this Council, to always ensure that the views of Milton Keynes residents are a priority when serving on Milton Keynes Partnership Committee;
3. welcomes the role of Invest MK, which has the major role of bringing investment to Milton Keynes, but calls for clarification on how far its remit extends; and
4. requests that the Leader of the Council, on behalf of its Members, write to the Chairman of Milton Keynes Partnership Committee, expressing concern at some of the initiatives which this Council believes are beyond Milton Keynes Partnership Committee's remit."

Councillor E Henderson moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Williams and accepted by the mover of the motion:

"That all the words after 'Partnership Committee' in clause 4 be deleted and replaced with the words:

'acknowledging the benefits of collaboration and support for projects, but emphasising the importance of being clear which organisation is taking the lead'."

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

**RESOLVED -**

That this Council:

1. notes with concern the comments made by Sir Bob Reid to the External Scrutiny Committee on 31 October 2006 and whilst welcoming some of those initiatives, expresses regret at the implied 'ownership' of some initiatives and with the lack of communication and consultation with this Council;
2. calls upon the Members of Milton Keynes Partnership Committee, from this Council, to always ensure that the views of Milton Keynes residents are a priority when serving on Milton Keynes Partnership Committee;
3. welcomes the role of Invest MK, which has the major role of bringing investment to Milton Keynes, but calls for clarification on how far its remit extends; and
4. requests that the Leader of the Council, on behalf of its Members, write to the Chairman of Milton Keynes Partnership Committee, acknowledging the benefits of collaboration and support for projects, but emphasising the importance of being clear which organisation is taking the lead.

**CL91**

### **FUNDING OF NHS SERVICES IN MILTON KEYNES**

With the consent of the Council the following motion submitted by Councillor I Henderson was withdrawn:

"That this Council:

1. notes that the Government is funding the NHS in Milton Keynes at only 95% of what the Government itself says is Milton Keynes' fair funding share;
2. deplores the cuts that are being forced on both hospital and community health services in Milton Keynes as a result of this unfair funding; and
3. resolves to convey to the Strategic Health Authority and to Government that Milton Keynes's growing population needs more health services, not less."

**THAMES VALLEY POLICE AUTHORITY - BUDGET ISSUES**

Councillor Crooks moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Fraser:

"That this Council:

1. Informed of the current financial outlook of the Thames Valley Police Authority, which includes:
  - (a) the need to increase current expenditure by 6.5% to deliver agreed key objectives;
  - (b) the requirement to cut expenditure by £6.74 million in order to keep Council Tax at 5% to avoid being capped;
  - (c) possible cuts including the civilianisation of 36 posts and the deletion of 74 support posts and 12 managerial posts; and
  - (d) no guarantee of Home Office reimbursement of the £7 million spent to date on Operation Overt in High Wycombe.
2. Deplores the effect that these cuts will have on the work of the Milton Keynes Basic Command Unit; and
3. Calls upon the city's MPs to lobby the Home Office so that special funding is provided for the city's needs."

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

**RESOLVED -**

That this Council:

1. Informed of the current financial outlook of the Thames Valley Police Authority, which includes:
  - (a) the need to increase current expenditure by 6.5% to deliver agreed key objectives;
  - (b) the requirement to cut expenditure by £6.74 million in order to keep Council Tax at 5% to avoid being capped;
  - (c) possible cuts including the civilianisation of 36 posts and the deletion of 74 support posts and 12 managerial posts; and
  - (d) no guarantee of Home Office reimbursement of the £7 million spent to date on Operation Overt in High Wycombe.
2. Deplores the effect that these cuts will have on the work of the Milton Keynes Basic Command Unit; and

3. Calls upon the city's MPs to lobby the Home Office so that special funding is provided for the city's needs.

### **CL93**

#### **COUNCILLOR DETAILS AND LIVEMK**

Councillor Wilson moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Lloyd:

"That this Council:

1. believes that the Council has a responsibility to ensure that the public know how, when and where they can contact their local councillors; and
2. notes that most local authorities regularly promote contact and surgery details of their local Councillors in their Council newspaper and magazine and thereby calls on the Executive to ensure that:
  - (a) details be published in Live MK at least four times a year; and
  - (b) other promotional and informational material is published such as posters to be displayed locally."

On being put to the vote the motion was declared lost with 20 Members voting in favour, 24 Members against and 0 Members abstaining from voting.

### **CL94**

#### **REVIEW OF PARISH ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES**

Councillor D McCall moved the following recommendation, which was seconded by Councillor Burke:

1. That approval be given to a Parishes Review being conducted in accordance with Part II of the Local Government and Rating Act 1997.
2. That a Parish Review Working Group be established comprising 7 Members in the ratio 3:2:2, to monitor the conduct of the Review, receive reports and offer guidance to officers and parishes in relation to the Review, and to report back to the Council in due course on the outcomes of the Review.
3. That, as an interim measure, approval be given to the following changes in electoral arrangements in time for the Parish Council Elections scheduled for May 2007:
  - (a) Kents Hill and Monkston Parish Council
    - (i) Kents Hill Ward - an increase from 3 to 4 Members
    - (ii) Monkston Ward - an increase from 3 to 7 Members

- (b) Shenley Church End Parish Council (unwarded) - an increase from 7 to 12 Members
  - (c) Walton Parish Council (unwarded) - an increase from 7 to 8 Members
  - (d) Woughton Parish Council
    - (i) Netherfield Ward - an increase from 3 to 4 Members
    - (ii) Tinkers Bridge Ward - a reduction from 2 Members to 1 Member
    - (iii) Eaglestone Ward - an increase from 3 to 4 Members
    - (iv) Coffee Hall Ward - an increase from 3 to 4 Members
4. That officers be authorised to make the necessary Orders to give effect to these interim changes.”

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

RESOLVED -

- 1. That approval be given to a Parishes Review being conducted in accordance with Part II of the Local Government and Rating Act 1997.
- 2. That a Parish Review Working Group be established comprising 7 Members in the ratio 3:2:2, to monitor the conduct of the Review, receive reports and offer guidance to officers and parishes in relation to the Review, and to report back to the Council in due course on the outcomes of the Review.
- 3. That, as an interim measure, approval be given to the following changes in electoral arrangements in time for the Parish Council Elections scheduled for May 2007:
  - (a) Kents Hill and Monkston Parish Council
    - (i) Kents Hill Ward - an increase from 3 to 4 Members
    - (ii) Monkston Ward - an increase from 3 to 7 Members
  - (b) Shenley Church End Parish Council (unwarded) - an increase from 7 to 12 Members
  - (c) Walton Parish Council (unwarded) - an increase from 7 to 8 Members

- (d) Woughton Parish Council
  - (i) Netherfield Ward - an increase from 3 to 4 Members
  - (ii) Tinkers Bridge Ward - a reduction from 2 Members to 1 Member
  - (iii) Eaglestone Ward - an increase from 3 to 4 Members
  - (iv) Coffee Hall Ward - an increase from 3 to 4 Members

- 4. That officers be authorised to make the necessary Orders to give effect to these interim changes.

(Councillors Ferrans, Holroyd, Hoyle, Irons, Legg, Lloyd, McKenzie and Wilson declared personal interests in this Item 6 as members of parish and town councils.)

## **CL95**

### **QUARTERLY REPORTS ON SPECIAL URGENCY DECISIONS**

The Council noted that the special urgency provisions under Access to Information Procedure Rule 17.3 had been used once in the period September 2006 to November 2006, in respect of the Procurement of Temporary Buildings at Giles Brook School.

It was also noted that in accordance with Paragraph 16(i) (Call-In and Urgency) of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules, with the agreement the Chair of the Executive Scrutiny Panel, the decision had not been subject to the call in procedure on the grounds that the matter was urgent and the use of the call in process would have seriously prejudiced the Council's and public's interests.

THE MAYOR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 10.48 PM