

Minutes of the MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL held on WEDNESDAY 21 OCTOBER 2015 at 7.30 pm

**Present:** Councillor McLean (Mayor)  
Councillors Alexander, Baume, Betteley, Bint, Brackenbury, Bradburn, Bramall, Buckley, M Burke, Cannon, Clancy, Coventry, Crooks, Eastman, Ferrans, Ganatra, Geaney, A Geary, P Geary, E Gifford, R Gifford, Gowans, Green, D Hopkins, V Hopkins, Hosking, Khan, Legg, Lewis, Long, Marland, I McCall, McDonald, McKenzie, McPake, Middleton, Miles, Morris, O'Neill, Patey-Smith, Small, Walker, Wallis, Webb, White, C Williams, P Williams and Wilson

Alderman Connor and Alderwomen Irons and Saunders

**Apologies:** Councillors Bald, Brunning, Clifton, Dransfield, Exon, D McCall, Morla and Nolan and Aldermen Bartlett, Beeley, Bristow E Henderson and Howell and Alderwomen I Henderson and Lloyd

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

#### **CL61 MINUTES**

That the Minutes of the meetings of the Council held on 15 July 2015 and 16 September 2015 be approved and signed by the Mayor as correct records.

#### **CL62 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

Councillors Marland and White declared personal interests in Item 5(b)(iii) (New West Ashland Fire Service and Police Station Facility) as members of Milton Keynes Development Partnership Board.

Councillors Gowans and C Williams declared personal interests in Item 5(b)(iii) (New West Ashland Fire Service and Police Station Facility) as members of the UNISON Trades Union which had expressed a view on the proposal to consolidate services at the West Ashland Site.

Councillor I McCall declared an interest in Item 4(b) (National Health Service – Working with Health) as a Local Government Association Peer Reviewer.

#### **CL63 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

##### **1. Rugby World Cup**

The Mayor paid tribute to all of those involved in the organisation and delivery of the Rugby World Cup in Milton Keynes, both the three games of rugby at Stadium MK and the Fan Zone in Campbell Park which had showcased Milton Keynes to a world-wide audience.

The Mayor displayed to the Council a memento presented to the Council by the Rugby World Cup organisers to mark the Council's role and contribution as a host 'city'.

2. Mayor's Cadet

The Mayor introduced to the Council Jack Holmes who would be serving as his Cadet for the remainder of his term of office and would be accompanying him at a number of events.

3. Remembrance Sunday

The Mayor announced that the Council would be represented at services throughout the borough on Remembrance Day, Sunday, 8 November. He would be attending the Service at Newport Pagnell, Past Mayor Norman Miles would attend services at Wolverton and New Bradwell and the Deputy Mayor was attending services at Bletchley and Stony Stratford. The Mayor encouraged all councillors to attend their local events.

4. Armistice Day Programme

The Mayor invited all councillors to attend the Armistice Day event at the MK Rose on 11 November at 10:50 am, where he, together with the Deputy Lord Lieutenant, the High Sherriff and representatives of the Cenotaph Trust would be laying wreaths.

**CL64**

**PETITIONS**

The Council received petitions in respect of

- (a) road safety and a pedestrian crossing across Green Park Drive, Newport Pagnell to increase road safety for children attending Green Park and Ousedale schools;
- (b) the representation on the Regeneration MK Project Board; from Bradville and
- (c) the potential closure of the Buszy.

The Council noted that the petitions would be referred to the next meeting of the Cabinet:

**CL65**

**QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

- (a) Question from Mr R Oates to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Mr Oates asked Councillor Marland if he would guarantee to investigate the actual intentions of Milton Keynes Development Partnership with regard to the car park at 401 Eldergate and ensure that the building remained in public use.

Councillor Marland indicated that both he and Milton Keynes Development Partnership were clear that 401 Eldergate would continue to have a community use. Councillor Marland undertook to champion the continued community use of the building at meetings of the development Partnership's Board meetings. Councillor Marland also indicated that there were no plans to sell off the building to the private sector or for the Development Partnership to dispose of the property.

As a supplementary question Mr Oates ask Councillor Marland and Milton Keynes Development Partnership to investigate the statements by the Development Partnership as there is confusion amongst the public as to the current position.

Councillor Marland indicated that something had clearly gone wrong with how things had been communicated when over one hundred people turn up to express their concern on an issue, so both the Council and the Development Partnership, amongst others, needed to reflect on how things had been handled.

Councillor Marland reiterated that, as far as he was concerned, the 401 Eldergate would continue to operate and that in his view the wider public engagement could have been handled better

- (b) Question from Mr J Fishwick to Councillor Legg (Cabinet member for Public Realm)

Mr Fishwick asked Councillor Legg what public evidence was there that the consultation responses had been appropriately reviewed by the officers in the process of drafting the Minerals Local Plan.

Councillor Legg indicated that the council has conducted consultations on the Minerals Local Plan in accordance with its published Statement of Community Involvement. Each response from the consultation on the Minerals Local Plan has been logged and reviewed. All consultation responses would be published the on the Council's website.

- (c) Question from Mr S Crowther to Councillor Legg (Cabinet member for Public Realm)

Mr Crowther asked Councillor Legg, with regard to the Minerals Local Plan, how the Council was going to find the necessary resources to monitor and manage the sites in Lathbury to ensure full compliance with Regulations and conditions throughout the 15 to 20 years of gravel extraction and restoration, particularly as the Council did not currently have any "Minerals" expertise and further significant cuts in staff were expected over the next five years.

Councillor Legg indicated that as the minerals authority it would fulfil its statutory duties. The Council currently had both the resources and the necessary expertise to make decisions on minerals applications. Where the Council did not hold the necessary expertise in-house, such as preparing the Minerals Local Plan, expertise was bought in.

Councillor Legg also indicated that in terms of monitoring mineral permissions, up to eight site visits per year could be undertaken, either by Council officers, or by officers of another Minerals Authority acting on behalf of the Council. The Council charged the site operator a fee for each monitoring visit to recover costs. It was also an expectation that Local Liaison Groups would be established for each site from the granting of permission to the completion of restoration, with the operator, the planning authority and parish council(s) represented.

(d) Question from Mr K Vickers to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Mr Vickers asked Councillor Marland, as a member of Milton Keynes Development Partnership Board, if he would arrange for a meeting between members of the Board and a delegation of users of the Buszy, and until that time the current arrangements remain in place. Mr Vickers also ask that a detailed impact assessment of the Development Partnership's proposals be undertaken.

Councillor Marland indicated that he was of the view that Milton Keynes Development Partnership could have communicated its plans more clearly and worked better with, and met with, the organisations concerned. However, he did not necessarily believe that the decision was wrong and it was not for the Council to override the decision of the Development Partnership.

Councillor Marland stated that it was never the intention that that the Buszy would close and this had been adopted as a political cause which had upset a lot of people unnecessarily.

Councillor Marland reported that he would take the opportunity when the petition was considered by the Cabinet to make the situation clear that the Buszy would not close as the result of any actions by the Development Partnership or the Council.

Councillor Marland believed that the Council had a duty to the users of the Buszy and the organisations involved and, with regard to the Development Partnership, both he and Councillor Ferrans, had and would continue to push for the Development Partnership to help where it could.

As a supplementary question Mr Vickers ask Councillor Marland why, if using parking income to fund the Buszy was good enough last year and the year before, why wasn't it good enough for this year and next. Mr Vickers also asked, whether Councillor Marland, as a member of the Milton Keynes Development Partnership Board, would guarantee that the parking revenue would continue to be used to fund the vital community work supporting service users that accessed the Buszy.

Councillor Marland indicated that the parking income was a matter for Milton Keynes Development Partnership Board, and was retained by the Development Partnership. The Council did not receive any of the income.

- (e) Question from Mr M Galloway to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Mr Galloway, referring to the limited opportunity for members of the public to speak during meetings of some nearby councils, asked Councillor Marland if he agreed that the arrangements offered by Milton Keynes Council were an excellent example for others to follow and should remain in place.

Councillor Marland indicated that the rules around public participation were the responsibility of the whole Council, rather than the Executive. However, he agreed that the Council did have a system that provided members of the public good opportunity to make their views known on particular issues, but it was not perfect and the Council needed to develop the system to allow greater interaction and engagement via social media, and any other new means of communication, if the Council wanted to continue to be at the forefront of methods of public engagement.

Councillor Marland recognised the importance for the public to be able to engage and hold the Council to account.

Councillor Marland also referred to a recent motion passed by the Council regarding proper consultation and engagement with members of the public.

**CL66**

**MINERALS LOCAL PLAN – DRAFT PLAN FOR PUBLICATION AND SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE**

Councillor Legg moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 8 June 2015, which was seconded by Councillor Marland:

“That the Minerals Local Plan: Final Draft Plan be approved for publication in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and subsequently to submit the plan in accordance with Regulation 22.”

The Mayor moved the following procedural motion which was seconded by the Deputy Mayor:

“That, on a wholly exceptional basis, Council Procedure Rule 13.6(a) be waived to allow amendments to be moved to this recommendation from the Cabinet so as not to delay the Minerals Local Plan moving to the next stage.”

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

Councillor Hosking moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Morris and accepted by Councillor Legg, the mover of the motion:

“That the following words be added to the end of the recommendation:

“subject to Appendix 1 - Site Profiles, of the Plan being amended to read:

“A3: Northampton Road, Lathbury

Specific development requirements

- Due to the proximity to the settlements of Lathbury and Sherington villages, the site management plan (see Policy 12) should include satisfactory stand-off and suitable bunding/buffering from extraction and processing operations particularly in that part along Northampton Road nearest to the settlement of Lathbury and this should be at least 100m from the nearest property if bunding of at least 5m high is used, or at least 200m if bunding is not used, and the bunding should be in the working part of the site.
- The processing plant should be located in an area that minimises visual intrusion and is away from the settlement of Lathbury and other dwellings and should be separated by at least 400m from any dwellings. The processing plant is to be linked to mineral extraction on the site and will not be used to process mineral from other sites.

A4: Lavendon and Mill Farm

Specific development requirements

Due to the proximity to the settlement of Lavendon and Mill Farm the site management plan (see Policy 12) should include satisfactory stand-off and suitable bunding/buffering from extraction and processing operations.”

Councillor P Geary moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Morris and accepted by Councillor Legg, the mover of the motion:

- “1. That the following words be added to the end of the first bullet point of Appendix 1 - Site Profiles, of the Plan:

‘and this should be at least 100m from the nearest property if bunding of at least 5m high is used, or at least 200m if bunding is not used, and the bunding should be in the working part of the site.’

2. That the following words be added to the end of the first sentence of the second bullet point of Appendix 1 - Site Profiles, of the Plan:

‘and should be separated by at least 400m from any dwellings’.”

The Council heard from five members of the public during consideration of this matter.

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

“That the debate be adjourned until the January 2016 meeting of the Council to allow external legal advice to be obtained in light of the issues raised by members of the public in attendance, and meetings to be held with those members of the public in order that officers can properly address their issues.”

On being put to the vote the procedural motion was declared lost with 18 councillors voting in favour, 30 councillors voting against and 0 councillors abstaining from voting

On being put to the vote the motion was declared carried with 21 councillors voting in favour, 18 councillors voting against and 10 councillors abstaining from voting.

The Council heard from five members of the public during consideration of this matter.

**RESOLVED –**

That the Minerals Local Plan: Final Draft Plan be approved for publication in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and subsequently to submit the plan in accordance with Regulation 22, subject to Appendix 1 - Site Profiles, of the Plan being amended to read:

**“A3: Northampton Road, Lathbury**

**Specific development requirements**

- Due to the proximity to the settlements of Lathbury and Sherington villages, the site management plan (see Policy 12) should include satisfactory stand-off and suitable bunding/buffering from extraction and processing operations particularly in that part along Northampton Road nearest to the settlement of Lathbury and this should be at least 100m from the nearest property if bunding of at least 5m high is used, or at least 200m if bunding is not used, and the bunding should be in the working part of the site.

- The processing plant should be located in an area that minimises visual intrusion and is away from the settlement of Lathbury and other dwellings and should be separated by at least 400m from any dwellings. The processing plant is to be linked to mineral extraction on the site and will not be used to process mineral from other sites.

#### **A4: Lavendon and Mill Farm**

##### **Specific development requirements**

- Due to the proximity to the settlement of Lavendon and Mill Farm the site management plan (see Policy 12) should include satisfactory stand-off and suitable bunding/buffering from extraction and processing operations.”

#### **CL67 NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE**

Further to minute CL29 of the Council meeting held on 10 June 2015, the Council received the Leader’s report on improvements to health and social care services in Milton Keynes.

#### **CL68 HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUSINESS PLAN – AN INTRODUCTION**

Councillor Brackenbury moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Budget Scrutiny Committee held on 24 September 2015, which was seconded by Councillor Hosking:

- “1. That the Council be recommended to write to the local MPs and the Housing Minister to express its concern about the implications for the funding of the Housing Revenue Account of the 1% cut in council housing rents over the next 4 years.
2. That the Council be recommended to engage with the Local Government Association in order to seek the views of other local authorities as to the implications of the 1% reduction to council house rents and whether any united course of action is possible.”

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

RESOLVED –

1. That the local MPs and the Housing Minister be informed of the Council’s concern about the implications for the funding of the Housing Revenue Account as a result of the 1% cut in council housing rents over the next 4 years.
2. That the Council engage with the Local Government Association in order to seek the views of other local authorities as to the implications of the 1% reduction to council house rents and whether any united course of action is possible.



**CL69**

**COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 15.6**

Councillor Brackenbury moved the following motion from the meeting of the Constitution Commission held on 7 October 2015, which was seconded by Councillor Marland:

“That the recommended change to Council Procedure Rule 15.6 be referred back to the Constitution Commission for further consideration as to the legality of the change in respect of Licensing and Regulatory decisions.”

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

RESOLVED –

That the recommended change to Council Procedure Rule 15.6 be referred back to the Constitution Commission for further consideration as to the legality of the change in respect of Licensing and Regulatory decisions.

**CL70**

**LAKES ESTATE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2015-2026**

Councillor Legg moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 12 October 2015, which was seconded by Councillor Baume:

“That the Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan 2015 – 2026 be ‘made’ 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 was declared carried unanimously.

RESOLVED –

That the Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan 2015 – 2026 be ‘made’ pursuant to the provisions of Section 38(A)(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

**CL71**

**INVESTMENT IN PROPERTY FUND FOR TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION**

The Mayor moved the following procedural motion which was seconded by the Deputy Mayor:

“That the public and press be excluded from the meeting by virtue of Paragraph 3 (Information Relating to the Financial or Business Affairs of the Authority) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, in order that the meeting may consider the following:

Annex A - Investment in Property Fund for Temporary Accommodation”

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

Councillor O'Neill moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 12 October 2015, which was seconded by Councillor Brackenbury:

- “1. That prudential borrowing of £5m to fund a £5m investment in the Real Lettings Property Fund be approved.
2. That an addition to the 2015/16 Capital Programme Resource Allocation and Spend Approval of £5m be approved.
3. That the Treasury Management Strategy be amended by inclusion of joint property investments within the class of permitted investments.”

The Mayor moved the following procedural motion which was seconded by the Deputy Mayor:

“That Council Procedure Rule 13.6(a) be waived to allow amendments to be moved to this recommendation from the Cabinet as a result of the additional information available in PWC Report.”

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

Councillor Ganatra moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Morris and accepted by Councillor O'Neill, the mover of the motion:

That the following additional clauses be added to the recommendation:

- “4. That the draft report from PwC which examines both the commercial and financial risk of investing £5m of taxpayers money into this fund be welcomed.
5. That it be noted that the first properties will be delivered under phase 1 and the error in the PwC report will be amended accordingly.
6. That the recommendations set out at the end of the PwC report be adopted in order to ensure both the delivery of housing for the most vulnerable and the safeguarding of the Council's investment.”

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

RESOLVED –

1. That prudential borrowing of £5m to fund a £5m investment in the Real Lettings Property Fund be approved.
2. That an addition to the 2015/16 Capital Programme Resource Allocation and Spend Approval of £5m be approved.
3. That the Treasury Management Strategy be amended by inclusion of joint property investments within the class of permitted investments.

4. That the draft report from PwC which examines both the commercial and financial risk of investing £5m of taxpayers money into this fund be welcomed.
5. That it be noted that the first properties will be delivered under phase 1 and the error in the PwC report will be amended accordingly.
6. That the recommendations set out at the end of the PwC report be adopted in order to ensure both the delivery of housing for the most vulnerable and the safeguarding of the Council's investment.

**CL72 MEMBERS QUESTIONS**

Due the wish of the Council to debate the motions submitted, the Leader of the Council indicated that any questions which would have been asked at the meeting would be answered in writing and the responses published in Councillors Weekly News.

**CL73 COUNCILLOR COMUNICATION**

Councillor P Geary moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Bint:

"That the Council:

1. confirms that for councillors to undertake their roles effectively they need to have access to information;
2. understands that in some cases officers omit to let councillors know of issues in their wards that are important;
3. acknowledges that there is a lack of an effective protocol for officers to clearly understand what issues should be notified to all councillors, those that should be notified to ward councillors and those that should be notified to specific groups of councillors; and
4. asks the Constitution Commission to develop an addendum to the Officer / Member protocol that makes a clear definition for officers about when they should inform councillors of issues in their Ward or across the borough and when councillors can elect to be informed."

On being put to the vote the motion was declared carried with 28 councillors voting in favour, 0 councillors voting against and 21 councillor abstaining from voting.

**RESOLVED -**

That the Council:

1. confirms that for councillors to undertake their roles effectively they need to have access to information;

2. understands that in some cases officers omit to let councillors know of issues in their wards that are important;
3. acknowledges that there is a lack of an effective protocol for officers to clearly understand what issues should be notified to all councillors, those that should be notified to ward councillors and those that should be notified to specific groups of councillors; and
4. asks the Constitution Commission to develop an addendum to the Officer / Member protocol that makes a clear definition for officers about when they should inform councillors of issues in their Ward or across the borough and when councillors can elect to be informed.

**CL74 FREE SCHOOL MEALS**

With the consent of the Council the motion was withdrawn.

**CL75 HOUSING IN MILTON KEYNES**

With the consent of the Council the motion was withdrawn.

**CL76 NEW WEST ASHLAND FIRE SERVICE AND POLICE STATION FACILITY**

Councillor Gowans moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Lewis:

- “1. That the Council notes the proposal to build a new co-located police and fire service facility in West Ashland which is currently under consultation and that the proposal will merge the current fire station located in Bletchley, the current fire station located at Great Holm and the police facility located in Bletchley into one single facility.
2. That the Council notes the benefits a new facility would have, in particular upgrading the current Bletchley Fire Station, and the cost savings that a new single facility would bring. The Council also notes that due to excellent preventative work and better regulation, call-out demand on the Fire Service has reduced considerably over recent years, and that increasing joint working between public services has the potential to greatly improve service delivery and reduce cost in the future, if done correctly.
3. That the Council, however, notes a number of concerns about the current proposal including:
  - (a) that the closure of Great Holm Fire Station will have a significant impact on fire cover in the North, West and CMK areas of Milton Keynes;
  - (b) the impact of the closure of Great Holm Fire Station on Milton Keynes as it grows, in particular the Western Expansion Area with several thousand new

households planned, and concerns the proposals do not take into account the future growth of Milton Keynes;

- (c) the impact of the closure of Great Holm Fire Station on the area of Stony Stratford and in particular the historic timber framed buildings in the town;
  - (d) Fire Service response times from a facility in West Ashland to the areas of Wolverton, Stony Stratford, Two Mile Ash and Loughton, noting the reliance on the A5 of such a facility to reach those areas quickly;
  - (e) the future use of the land currently occupied by all three facilities if they close, in particular Great Holm;
  - (f) that the proposal to close Bletchley Police Station would leave the area of Bletchley with no visible police facility;
  - (g) that little or no public consultation has been evident on the closure of Bletchley Police Station; and
  - (h) that concerns have been raised that a joint location for the police and fire services will impact the ability of the fire service to maintain its highly regarded status with the public as independent of law enforcement, and would therefore have possible implications for the Fire Service's ability to carry out their duties.
4. That the Council therefore resolves to:
- (a) oppose the closure of Great Holm Fire Station;
  - (b) call on all Milton Keynes Council representatives on the Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Fire Authority to oppose any proposed closure of Great Holm Fire Station;
  - (c) ask the Chief Executive to make representations to the current ongoing consultation on behalf of Milton Keynes Council noting the opposition of the Council to the possible closure of Great Holm Fire Station and highlighting other concerns noted within this motion;
  - (d) ask the Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Fire Authority and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Thames Valley to advise Milton Keynes Council of their future plans for the land currently occupied by their services if the proposals were to go ahead;
  - (e) to work with Thames Valley Police to establish a community facility in central Bletchley, highlighting possible links with the Community and Cultural Services Review; and

- (f) advise all Parish and Town Councils of this motion and ask them to make representations to the consultation supporting the Council's agreed position."

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

On being put to the vote the motion was declared carried with 25 councillors voting in favour, 8 councillors voting against and 15 councillors abstaining from voting.

RESOLVED -

1. That the Council notes the proposal to build a new co-located police and fire service facility in West Ashland which is currently under consultation and that the proposal will merge the current fire station located in Bletchley, the current fire station located at Great Holm and the police facility located in Bletchley into one single facility.
2. That the Council notes the benefits a new facility would have, in particular upgrading the current Bletchley Fire Station, and the cost savings that a new single facility would bring. The Council also notes that due to excellent preventative work and better regulation, call-out demand on the Fire Service has reduced considerably over recent years, and that increasing joint working between public services has the potential to greatly improve service delivery and reduce cost in the future, if done correctly.
3. That the Council, however, notes a number of concerns about the current proposal including:
  - (a) that the closure of Great Holm Fire Station will have a significant impact on fire cover in the North, West and CMK areas of Milton Keynes;
  - (b) the impact of the closure of Great Holm Fire Station on Milton Keynes as it grows, in particular the Western Expansion Area with several thousand new households planned, and concerns the proposals do not take into account the future growth of Milton Keynes;
  - (c) the impact of the closure of Great Holm Fire Station on the area of Stony Stratford and in particular the historic timber framed buildings in the town;
  - (d) Fire Service response times from a facility in West Ashland to the areas of Wolverton, Stony Stratford, Two Mile Ash and Loughton, noting the reliance on the A5 of such a facility to reach those areas quickly;

- (e) the future use of the land currently occupied by all three facilities if they close, in particular Great Holm;
  - (f) that the proposal to close Bletchley Police Station would leave the area of Bletchley with no visible police facility;
  - (g) that little or no public consultation has been evident on the closure of Bletchley Police Station; and
  - (h) that concerns have been raised that a joint location for the police and fire services will impact the ability of the fire service to maintain its highly regarded status with the public as independent of law enforcement, and would therefore have possible implications for the Fire Service's ability to carry out their duties.
4. That the Council therefore resolves to:
- (a) oppose the closure of Great Holm Fire Station;
  - (b) call on all Milton Keynes Council representatives on the Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Fire Authority to oppose any proposed closure of Great Holm Fire Station;
  - (c) ask the Chief Executive to make representations to the current ongoing consultation on behalf of Milton Keynes Council noting the opposition of the Council to the possible closure of Great Holm Fire Station and highlighting other concerns noted within this motion;
  - (d) ask the Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Fire Authority and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Thames Valley to advise Milton Keynes Council of their future plans for the land currently occupied by their services if the proposals were to go ahead;
  - (e) to work with Thames Valley Police to establish a community facility in central Bletchley, highlighting possible links with the Community and Cultural Services Review; and
  - (f) advise all Parish and Town Councils of this motion and ask them to make representations to the consultation supporting the Council's agreed position.

**CL77**

**WARD BASED BUDGETS - 1 APRIL 2015 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2015**

The Council noted that for the period 1 April 2015 to 30 September 2015, 14 Ward Based Budget applications totalling £4,220 had been approved.

**CL78**

**QUARTERLY REPORT ON SPECIAL URGENCY DECISIONS**

The Council noted that, in accordance with Access to Information Procedure Rule 17.4, the Provisions for Special Urgency, as set out in Access to Information Procedure Rule 16, was not used during the period 1 July 2015 and 30 September 2015.

THE MAYOR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 11:02 PM