

SUMMONS TO THE MEETING of the MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL

WEDNESDAY 18 OCTOBER 2017
7.30 PM

COUNCIL CHAMBER

COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC OFFICES CENTRAL MILTON KEYNES



Sharon Bridglalsingh
Service Director (Legal and Democratic Services)

For more information about the meeting please contact Simon Heap on (01908) 252567 or by e-mail simon.heap@milton-keynes.gov.uk

Health and Safety

Please take a few moments to familiarise yourself with the nearest available fire exit, indicated by the fire evacuation signs. In the event of an alarm sounding during the meeting you must evacuate the building immediately and follow all instructions provided by the fire evacuation officer who will identify him/herself should the alarm sound. You will be assisted to the nearest designated assembly point until it is safe to return to the building.

Mobile Phones

Please ensure that your mobile phone is switched to silent or is switched off completely during the meeting.

Agenda

Agendas and reports for the majority of the Council's public meetings can be accessed via the Internet at: <http://milton-keynes.cmis.uk.com/milton-keynes/> Wi Fi access is available in all Council meeting rooms.

Users of Windows 7 and above can simply click the link to any documents you wish to see. Users of Windows XP will need to right click on the link and select 'open in browser'.

Recording of Meetings

The proceedings at this meeting may be recorded for the purpose of preparing the minutes of the meeting.

In accordance with the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, you can film, photograph, record or use social media at any Council meetings that are open to the public. If you are reporting the proceedings, please respect other members of the public at the meeting who do not want to be filmed. You should also not conduct the reporting so that it disrupts the good order and conduct of the meeting. While you do not need permission, you can contact the Council's staff in advance of the meeting to discuss facilities for reporting the proceedings and a contact is included on the front of the agenda, or you can liaise with staff at the meeting.

Guidance from the Department for Communities and Local Government can be viewed at the following link:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/343182/140812_Openness_Guide.pdf

Comments, Complaints and Compliments

Milton Keynes Council welcomes comments, complaints and compliments from members of the public in order to make its services as efficient and effective as possible. We would appreciate any suggestions regarding the usefulness of the paperwork for this meeting, or the conduct of the meeting you have attended. Please e-mail your comments to meetings@milton-keynes.gov.uk

If you require a response please leave contact details, ideally including an e-mail address. A formal complaints / compliments form is available online at <http://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/complaints/>

AGENDA

Item No:

1. Procedure

- (a) Apologies
- (b) Minutes

To approve, and the Mayor to sign as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 20 September 2017 (Item 1(b))
(Pages 14 to 34).

- (c) Disclosure of Interests

Councillors to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests, or personal interests (including other pecuniary interests), they may have in the business to be transacted, and officers to disclose any interests they may have in any contract to be considered.

- (d) Announcements

To receive any announcements.

2. Public Involvement

- (a) Deputations and Petitions

No deputations have been submitted for consideration at this meeting.

Any petitions received will be reported at the meeting.

- (b) Questions from Members of the Public

To receive questions and provide answers to questions from members of the public.

3. Business Remaining from Last Meeting

None.

4. Reports from Cabinet and Committees

Cabinet - 3 October 2017

- (a) Approval of Proposed Submission Version of Plan:MK

“That the Council be recommended to publish the Proposed Submission version of Plan:MK for six weeks’ consultation and then submit Plan:MK to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government under Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended)

A copy of the report considered by the Cabinet is attached at Item 4(a)
(Pages 35 to 38).

(b) Making of Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan

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

A copy of the report considered by the Cabinet is attached at Item 4(b) **(Pages 39 to 43)**.

(c) Making of Sherington Neighbourhood Plan

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

A copy of the report considered by the Cabinet is attached at Item 4(c) **(Pages 44 to 48)**.

(d) Proposed Housing and Regeneration Restructure

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

- (i) £751,000 in 2018/19; and
- (ii) £120,000 in 2019/205.”

A copy of the report considered by the Cabinet is attached at Item 4(d) **(Pages 49 to 57)**.

5. Councillors' Matters

(a) Councillors' Questions

Councillors to ask questions of the Leader, a Cabinet Member, the Chair of any Committee, or the Leader of a Political Group on the Council.

(b) Notices of Motions:

1. Urban Capacity Study

Councillor Walker - 20 September 2017

“That this Council:

- 1. notes with concern the recent Urban Capacity Study which unhelpfully raises again the concept of development on many green open spaces within the built up environment of Milton Keynes;
- 2. recalls the decision of Council and Delegated Decision on 25 March 2015 and 23 June 2015 to not include numerous sites of significant recreational and amenity value to local residents;

3. notes and reaffirms this Council's commitment to the values and principles of Milton Keynes including the preservation of green open spaces which were one of the original founding principles of the New City and which remains one of its Unique Selling Points;
4. calls upon the Cabinet as the Executive Arm of this Council to urgently confirm its commitment to the decision of Council as mentioned in point 2 above and for the Leader of the Council to reassure Council that the details of the Urban Capacity Study will not be taken forward in any form as an option for Strategic Development; and
5. asks Cabinet to voluntarily register, the two sites in Woolstone (UCS072 and UCS073), one site in Springfield (UCS074), one site in Stantonbury (UCS100) and one site in Bletchley (UCS107) as Village Greens under the Commons Act 2006 section 15(8) bearing in mind the re-assurance that the Leader gave at Full Council on 21 June 2017 in respect of the Woolstone and Springfield sites and previous Cabinet member assurances in respect of the sites in Bletchley and Stantonbury."

Urban Capacity Study - Amendment from Councillor Ferrans

Councillor Ferrans to move:

- "1. That in clause 1 of the motion the words 'both the content and process for' be added after the word 'concern', the words 'was published without any reference to the Plan:MK Working Group and assessed' replace the words 'unhelpfully raises again the concept of development' the words 'as developable, despite responses to the previous consultation and more recent use of the sites providing evidence to the contrary, and caused alarm by suggesting development on current sheltered housing sites such as Springfield Court' be added to the end of the clause and the clause renumbered 3.
2. That in clause 2 of the motion the words 'responses from residents to the previous consultations on some of these sites and the' be added after the word 'the' and the words 'not exclude numerous' be replaced by the words 'exclude the'.
3. That in clause 3 the words 'notes and' be deleted, the words 'in its 50th year be added after the word 'Keynes', the words 'supporting expansion in line with housing need and' be added after the word 'including', all of the words after the word 'spaces' be deleted and the clause renumbered 1.
4. That in clause 4 all of the words after 'the' in the second line be replaced by the words 'removal of all of these sites from development' and the clause renumbered 9.

5. That in clause 5 the word 'asks' be replaced by the words 'calls on the', the word voluntary be replaced by the words 'apply to', the words 'and the play area and buffer space of the Springfield Boulevard 1 Site (UCS075) be added after '(UCS107), all of the words after '15(8)' be deleted and the clause renumbered 11.
6. That the following clauses be added:
 - '4. Affirms the role of locally led consultation and decision-making on when sites should be considered for either development or additional protections, primarily through the neighbourhood planning process.
 5. Reaffirms its commitment to saving five of the spaces, and part of the sixth, namely the two sites in Woolstone (UCS072 and UCS073), one site in Springfield (UCS074), one site in Stantonbury (UCS100) and one site in Bletchley (UCS107) and the land incorporating the popular play area from the Springfield 1 site (UCS075).
 6. Welcomes the more accurate recent Strategic Housing Land Assessment that has graded four of the sites as unsuitable for development and one not to be developed at this time.
 7. Welcomes the reassurance that the Leader gave at Full Council on 21 June 2017 in respect of the Woolstone and two Springfield sites and previous Cabinet member assurances in respect of the remaining sites.
 8. Regrets the decision of Campbell Park Parish Council to propose the whole of the Springfield Boulevard 1 site for development, contradicting both their own proposed Neighbourhood Plan policies and those of Milton Keynes Council.
 10. Calls upon Campbell Park Parish Council to modify the boundaries of the proposed developable area at Springfield Boulevard 1 (UCS075) to exclude the play area and its surrounding buffer space'."

The motion if amended would read:

"That this Council:

1. notes and reaffirms this Council's commitment to the values and principles of Milton Keynes in its 50th year including supporting expansion in line with housing need and the preservation of green open spaces which were one of the original founding principles of the New City and which remains one of its Unique Selling Points;

2. recalls the responses from residents to the previous consultations on some of these sites and the decision of Council and Delegated Decision on 25 March 2015 and 23 June 2015 to not include numerous exclude the sites of significant recreational and amenity value to local residents;
3. notes with concern both the content and process for the recent Urban Capacity Study which was published without any reference to the Plan:MK Working Group and assessed on many green open spaces within the built up environment of Milton Keynes as developable, despite responses to the previous consultation and more recent use of the sites providing evidence to the contrary, and caused alarm by suggesting development on current sheltered housing sites such as Springfield Court;
4. affirms the role of locally led consultation and decision-making on when sites should be considered for either development or additional protections, primarily through the neighbourhood planning process;
5. reaffirms its commitment to saving five of the spaces, and part of the sixth, namely the two sites in Woolstone (UCS072 and UCS073), one site in Springfield (UCS074), one site in Stantonbury (UCS100) and one site in Bletchley (UCS107) and the land incorporating the popular play area from the Springfield 1 site (UCS075);
6. welcomes the more accurate recent Strategic Housing Land Assessment that has graded four of the sites as unsuitable for development and one not to be developed at this time;
7. welcomes the reassurance that the Leader gave at Full Council on 21 June 2017 in respect of the Woolstone and two Springfield sites and previous Cabinet member assurances in respect of the remaining sites;
8. regrets the decision of Campbell Park Parish Council to propose the whole of the Springfield Boulevard 1 site for development, contradicting both their own proposed Neighbourhood Plan policies and those of Milton Keynes Council;
9. calls upon the Cabinet as the Executive Arm of this Council to urgently confirm its commitment to the ~~decision of Council as mentioned in point 2 above and for the Leader of the Council to reassure Council that the details of the Urban Capacity Study will not be taken forward in any form as an option for Strategic Development;~~ and removal of all of these sites from development;

10. calls upon Campbell Park Parish Council to modify the boundaries of the proposed developable area at Springfield Boulevard 1 (UCS075) to exclude the play area and its surrounding buffer space; and
11. ~~asks~~ calls on the Cabinet to ~~voluntarily~~ apply to register, the two sites in Woolstone (UCS072 and UCS073), one site in Springfield (UCS074), one site in Stantonbury (UCS100) and one site in Bletchley (UCS107) and the play area and buffer space of the Springfield Boulevard 1 Site (UCS075) as Village Greens under the Commons Act 2006 section 15(8) ~~bearing in mind the re-assurance that the Leader gave at Full Council on 21 June 2017 in respect of the Woolstone and Springfield sites and previous Cabinet member assurances in respect of the sites in Bletchley and Stantonbury.~~

2. Regeneration:MK

Councillor C Wilson - 3 October 2017

- “1. That this Council notes that:
 - (a) The seven priority Regeneration:MK estates, and the existing residents, are important to the social, economic and cultural fabric of Milton Keynes.
 - (b) Long lead times and speculation around the Regeneration:MK could result in uncertainty and concern for local residents.
 - (c) The Regeneration:MK scheme has cross-party support of MK Council.
 - (d) Regeneration:MK is about more than the built environment, and any each regeneration scheme must include social and cultural benefits to each community and current residents in conjunction any possible physical regeneration;
2. That this Council further notes that:
 - (a) A commitment has been given in the Council Plan 2016 to ensure each scheme is community-led.
 - (b) It is essential to the success of Regeneration:MK that the views and wishes of residents are central to how each area will develop its regeneration proposals.
 - (c) It is MK Council policy to hold a binding referendum on any final proposals on each estate.
 - (d) The content and options of any referendum will be for each community to determine as they see fit.

3. That this Council therefore:
 - (a) Reaffirms the commitment to a binding referendum for each area on any final proposals.
 - (b) Reaffirms the commitment that no existing resident will be required to accept any offer of accommodation type that is not at least equal to their current circumstances, such as a property with fewer rooms, unless they explicitly wish to do so.
 - (c) Asks Cabinet to require Your:MK to publish clearer indicative timelines and milestones for each estate at an appropriate time to reduce uncertainty for residents.
 - (d) Asks Cabinet to consider ways of improving communication of the activity taking place on regeneration estates to ward members, other councillors and the general public.
 - (e) Asks Cabinet to consider the current engagement with local residents and if improvements can be made;
 - (f) Asks Cabinet to consider ways to that the social and cultural elements of regeneration are given equal importance when developing community-led proposals.”

3. Street Homelessness

Councillor Marland - 3 October 2017

- “1. That this Council notes that:
 - (a) Homelessness of all types is a significant problem in Milton Keynes.
 - (b) That MK Council believes it is a basic human right to have a safe place to sleep at night.
 - (c) That austerity cuts to welfare, reductions to funding for services that support people, and a lack of social housing supply has increased the problem of homelessness locally and nationally.
2. This Council further note the statement given to Cabinet on Tuesday 3 October by the Leader of the Council regarding the provision of services to street homeless people in Milton Keynes (Item 5(b)) (**Pages 58 to 59**).
3. That this Council therefore:
 - (a) Supports the wish to provide at least 30 emergency accommodation places this winter from one-off funds, and the ongoing Roughsleeping Strategy consultation

and Budget Scrutiny which will identify if a base pressure provision in future years is required.

- (b) Supports the expansion of the Outreach service, but notes that the money provided by Central Government for the service is not ongoing after 2019.
- (c) Supports working with partners to establish a service provision specification for street homeless people with high needs, and to submit a funding request to Central Government.
- (d) Supports MK Council undertaking work to offer street homeless people training or employment, and encouraging businesses and partners to do so.
- (e) Supports in principle establishing an easy way for the public to donate to homeless charities and end cash begging in Milton Keynes.
- (f) Calls on the Cabinet to implement the outlined street homelessness services as quickly as possible.
- (g) Calls on our Members of Parliament to support the submission to Central Government for the High Needs Street Homeless Support Services.
- (h) Calls on the Government to properly fund homelessness services, lift the Housing Revenue Account limit to allow social housing to be built at the levels required, and fund all public services properly ending austerity policies that are the root cause of homelessness.”

4. Plan:MK

Councillor Walker - 5 October 2017

“1. That this Council notes that:

- (a) The development of Plan:MK is the single most important document currently being prepared by this Authority.
- (b) Government is placing pressure on local authorities to produce local plans that are robust, deliverable and have the evidence base to support their content and recommendations.
- (c) That areas of land have been included in the latest version of the draft Plan MK in the south east of Milton Keynes as future housing expansion areas despite the Cabinet of MK Council publically declaring the need to retain such areas as reserve corridors for much needed future infrastructure, specifically the Oxford – MK – Cambridge Expressway.

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

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

5. The Ability of Councillors to Scrutinise Officer Decisions

Councillor C Williams - 5 October 2017

- “1. That this Council recognises the legitimate concerns expressed by many Ward Councillors and Town & Parish Councils with regard to the recent Officer decision of the awarding of a contract to an Organisation that is currently under investigation by the Audit department of this Council.
- 2. That this Council also recognises that there is a clear Constitutional mechanism in place to enable Councillors to scrutinise decisions made by the Cabinet and individual Members thereof. This mechanism is expressed as the ‘Call-In’ procedure.
- 3. That this Council further recognises that no such Constitutional mechanism exists for Councillors to scrutinise decisions made by Officers.
- 4. That this Council, therefore, agrees the following:
 - (a) That the Constitution Commission of Milton Keynes Council shall present to Full Council at its meeting scheduled for 17 January 2018, a discussion paper for the possible introduction in May 2018 of a Constitutional mechanism by which Councillor may scrutinise decisions taken by Officers. This mechanism should include an equivalent of the ‘call-in’ procedure.

- (b) That the Constitution Commission of Milton Keynes Council shall present to Full Council at its meeting scheduled for 17 January 2018, a discussion paper for the possible introduction in May 2018 of the relevant / necessary changes needed to the Constitution of Milton Keynes Council to ensure that no Organisation / Outside Body may be awarded any contract whilst it is under investigation by Milton Keynes Council.”

6. Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee Proposal

To consider Item 6 (**Pages 60 to 67**)

7. Membership of Committees - Health and Adult Social Care Committee

The Council is asked to note the resignation of Councillor McDonald from the Health and Adult Social Care Committee and confirm Councillor Morris as his replacement.

8. Ward Based Budgets 2017/18

All Councillors have a budget of £1,000 to spend on Ward based issues, giving them the ability to make contributions to projects carried out in their local communities by local organisations.

For the period 1 April 2017 to 30 September 2017, applications totalling £7,095 have been approved. Details of the applications are attached at Item 8 (**Pages 68 to 69**).

Contact Officer: Simon Heap (Committee Services and Scrutiny Manager)
- 01908 252567

Background Papers: Ward Based Budget Applications

ITEM 1(b)



Minutes of the MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL held on WEDNESDAY 20 SEPTEMBER 2017 at 7.30 pm

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

Alderman Bartlett and Alderwomen Irons and Saunders

Apologies: Councillors Brunning, Buckley, Exon, Green, Legg, Marland, McDonald and Morla and Aldermen, Beeley, Bristow, E Henderson and Howell and Alderwomen I Henderson and Lloyd

Also Present: c200 members of the public

CL36 MINUTES

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 19 July 2017 be approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record, subject to Minute CL34(o) being amended to record that the response was provided by Councillor Gifford.

CL37 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Councillor Petchey disclosed a personal interest in item 5(b) 3 (Urban Capacity Study) as a member of Campbell Park Parish Council, as the Amendment to the Motion reference to Springfield which was within the Campbell Park Parish area.

Councillors Gowans, McLean, Middleton, Nolan, Small, Walker and P Williams disclosed personal interests in item 5(b) 2 (Public Sector Pay) as public sector employees.

CL38 ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Alderwomen Janet Irons

The Mayor announced that Alderwoman Janet Irons would be moving to live in Shrewsbury to be closer to her daughter. Janet served on Milton Keynes Council and currently served on New Bradwell Parish Council and Wolverton Town Council.

The Council joined with the Mayor in thanking Janet for her years of dedicated service to Milton Keynes and her community in particular her beloved New Bradwell and Wolverton.

The Council heard from Alderwomen Irons and Saunders.

2. Former Councillor and Mayor Joan Butterworth

The Mayor announced the death on 17 July 2017 of former Councillor and Mayor Joan Butterworth aged 90. Joan was a councillor from 1979 to 1986 and Milton Keynes' first female Mayor in 1982/83.

The Council heard from Councillor Dransfield.

3. Michael Murray – Former Chief Executive

The Mayor also announced It is also with great sadness that I announce the death on 22 July of Michael Murray the Council's former Chief Executive. Michael was Chief Executive between 1984 and 1996.

The Council heard from Councillors Crooks, Dransfield and Saunders.

The Council stood for a minutes silence as a mark of respect for former Councillor and Mayor Joan Butterworth and former Chief Executive Michael Murray.

CL39

PETITIONS

(a) Road Safety Issues - St Ledger Drive, Great Linford

The Council received a petition in connection with road safety issues in St Ledger Drive, Great Linford, which was presented by Councillor Walker.

The Council noted that the petition would be referred to the Cabinet for consideration.

(b) Urban Capacity Study - Land in Campbell Park and Old Woughton Ward

The Council received a petition in connection with land in Campbell Park and Old Woughton Ward identified in the Urban Capacity Study which was presented by Mr T Baines.

The Council noted that the petition would be referred to the Cabinet for consideration.

(c) Change of Use of Part of the Co-op Shop on Grange Farm to a Funeral Parlour

The Council received a petition in connection with the change of use of part of the Co-op Shop on Grange Farm to a Funeral Parlour which was presented by Mrs Susan Galloni.

The Council noted that the petition would be referred to the Cabinet for consideration.

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

- (a) Question from Mr Peter Rothery to Councillor Gifford (Cabinet member for Place)

Mr Rothery, referring to a meeting of Loughton and Great Holme Parish Council at which Councillor Gifford, when answering question from local residents, had suggested that residents could raise a petition about the residents parking charge, asked Councillor why, after presenting the Petition at the last Council meeting, he had received such a dismissive response from Council officers, stating that they were only applying the Council's policy, which suggested that the petition had not been given due consideration, particularly as Councillor Gifford had suggested submitting the petition in the first place.

Councillor Gifford indicated that she believed that residents had a right to air their concerns, one way being to submit a petition.

Councillor Gifford, in respect of the response sent to Mr Rothery, indicated that the Council's policy had been agreed by councillors as part of the Council's Budget. The Council would monitor the impact of the residents' parking scheme and could review its operation in the light of evidence.

Councillor Gifford thanked Mr Rothery for agreeing to attend a site visit with the Council's officers.

Mr Rothery, indicating that Councillors A Geary and Dransfield had undertaken to overturn the charges for the residents' parking permits if the Conservative Group was to form the Council's Administration next May and bearing in mind the high level of opposition to the charges amongst residents, asked Councillor Gifford, as a supplementary question, what she recommended residents to do to overturn the charges.

Councillor Gifford indicated that residents should work with the Council's officers to ensure the scheme worked as well as it could.

- (b) Questions from Ms Mirosława Bilinska, Mrs Susan Galloni, Mr Steve Weller, Mr Aaron Miller and Ms Tina Harvey to Councillor Legg (Cabinet member for Customer Service)

The questions to Councillor Legg were as follows:

Ms Mirosława Bilinska asked whether Councillor Legg would like to have a view from his house which looked out on dead bodies and whether he recognised the stress that would cause to her and her family.

Mrs Susan Galloni, outlining the impact of the Funeral Parlour on local residents, asked how a food shop in a small community could suddenly be turned into a funeral parlour without any neighbourhood consultation.

Mr Steve Weller asked what had been done about the concerns expressed about the Funeral Parlour to Milton Keynes Council by the Parish Council and Ward Councillors.

Mr Aaron Miller asked how many objections to this development were necessary to start an appeal process and whether the stress caused to residents was recognised.

Ms Tina Harvey asked what action the Council would take to alleviate the additional traffic problems which would be caused by the Funeral Parlour.

In the absence of Councillor Legg, Councillor O'Neil (Deputy Leader of the Council) indicated that she would arrange for Councillor Legg to provide a written response on his return.

(c) Question from Mr Anand Asopa to Councillor A Geary (Leader of the Conservative Group)

Mr Asopa, referring to increasing Council Tax and declining performance by the Police, asked Councillor A Geary how could citizens of Milton Keynes be supported by the Conservative Group in opposition.

Councillor A Geary indicated that while the Police and Crime Commission's precept was not set by the Council it was increasing. Also there was now an additional eleven police officers in Milton Keynes since 2010.

Councillor A Geary also referred to a number of initiatives being undertaken by the Conservative Ward Councillor for Tattenhoe Ward, which included a Community Crime Forum, regular liaison with the Police, regular briefings with the local MPs and an antisocial behaviour initiative in Westcroft.

Councillor Geary recognised the importance of community action and a willingness to be involved as having a significant impact on reducing crime.

(d) Questions from Mr Surinder Jassal, Mr Venu Bharadwaj, Mr Naveen H Krishnamurthy, Mr Anil Kumar Kondebettu and Mr Jagam Gudupati to Councillor O'Neil (Deputy Leader of the Council and Chair of SaferMK)

The questions to Councillor O'Neil were as follows:

Mr Surinder Jassal referring to the increase in daylight burglaries across Milton Keynes, particularly affecting the Indian Community, asked what the Police were doing to address the problem.

Mr Venu Bharadwaj asked for statistics giving the total number of burglaries in Milton Keynes, broken down by neighbourhood and the ethnicity of the victim, and Police response times.

Mr Naveen H Krishnamurthy asked what measures the Council and Police were considering to address the increasing number of burglaries across Milton Keynes and keep residents safe.

Mr Anil Kumar Kondebettu asked what measures the Police were considering to improve their response to burglaries.

Mr Jagam Gudupati asked what measure the Police could be expected to take after a burglary had been reported.

Councillor O'Neill indicated that as the Chair of the SaferMK Community Safety Partnership, which included the Police, she was aware of the growing problem of burglaries and that it appeared that the burglaries were particularly aimed at the Asian community and the theft of gold. Councillor O'Neill recognised that this was an important issue for the Partnership which was being taken very seriously.

Councillor O'Neill offered to meet with concerned residents to discuss the issue and hoped to be able to include the Council's Head of Community Safety and if possible a representative from the Police.

Messrs Bharadwaj and Krishnamurthy asked Councillor O'Neil the following supplementary questions:

Mr Venu Bharadwaj asked when would the statistics requested be available and how soon could Councillor O'Neill hold a meeting.

Councillor O'Neill indicated that the statistics would have to come from the Police, but she would aim to hold the meeting as soon as possible.

Mr Naveen H Krishnamurthy asked if the Chair of Scrutiny would consider the concerns expressed at the Committee's next meeting.

Councillor O'Neill undertook to try and get it on the agenda for the next meeting.

- (e) Question from Mr Kevin Vickers to Councillor Long (Cabinet member for Adult Care and Housing)

Mr Vickers asked Councillor Long why the Council had failed to implement additional measures to provide additional emergency accommodation and outreach support for homeless people.

Councillor Long indicated that the Council was now providing a significant amount of temporary accommodation, currently accommodating 743 persons and by so doing the Council had reduced the use of bed and breakfast accommodation by 95%. With regard to the provision of emergency accommodation for Rough Sleepers, the Council supported the Winter Night Shelter which had doubled the number of

emergency beds available this winter. In addition the Council had eighteen hostel beds, had secured funding for 23 beds to be provided by the YMCA and was supporting outreach work for Rough Sleepers, particularly those with mental health problems. The Council had also identified funding for the One-Stop-Shop which would be opening shortly.

However, Councillor Long emphasised that until it was possible to increase the availability of affordable housing there was little prospect of permanent accommodation for those currently in temporary accommodation or those rough sleeping.

Mr Vickers, as a supplementary question, asked Councillor Long to commit to having a hostel providing additional emergency accommodation up and running before the cold weather set in.

Councillor Long indicated that he could not give that assurance. However, the Council was trying to help Rough Sleepers, who the Council did not have a statutory responsibility for, by offering outreach support to help the range of problems suffered by many Rough Sleepers.

(f) Question from Mr Mike Galloway to Councillor Gifford (Cabinet member for Place)

Mr Galloway referring to the Council's new Multi-Modal Model being used to develop Plan:MK; the apparent reluctance to make information provided by the Model publicly available; the accuracy of the Model; and delays to issue the Highways Design Guide, asked Councillor Gifford why the publication of the Highways Design Guide had not happened yet and what arrangements, if any, had been made for member scrutiny of the Multi-Modal Model.

Councillor Gifford indicated that the new Multi-Modal Model was being used to establish that the transport interventions to support the supplementary housing that had to be provided through Plan:MK, in addition with existing planning permissions, would be possible, so ensuring Plan:MK was sound. The Councillor Working Group on Plan:MK would review the proposed transport interventions before the final submission version of the Plan after the second consultation which was still to come.

Councillor Gifford also indicated that the new Multi-Modal Model will be used for development of the Mobility Strategy which was part of the 2050 ambition.

With regard to the Highways Design Guide, Councillor Gowans was currently unaware of the position, but if the Design Guide was used for planning applications it would fall within the Customer Service Portfolio held by Councillor Legg. Accordingly a written response would be provided.

Mr Galloway, referring to the 2009 Modal Model, suggested that the new Modal Model should be used to inform current planning applications as well as Plan:MK and as such should be made more publically available and open to public scrutiny.

Councillor Gifford indicated that she would check with transport colleague and provide a reply.

CL41

REPORT FROM THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Councillor Brackenbury (Chair of the Standards Committee) moved that the report in relation to a breach of the Councillors Code of Conduct by Councillor C Williams be noted. The recommendation was seconded by Councillor Miles.

The Council noted that the Standards Sub-Committee found that Councillor C Williams had breached Paragraphs 2 and 6 of the Code of Conduct, namely that Milton Keynes Councillors should:

- “(2) Respect others and not bully any person
- (6) Not conduct themselves in a manner which could reasonably be regarded as bringing their office or the Authority into disrepute.”

The Council also noted that the Sub-Committee had decided that the following sanctions should be applied to Councillor C Williams in respect of the breach:

- Councillor C Williams be censured;
- The Sub-Committee’s findings in respect of his conduct be published;
- The findings be reported to Council for information; and
- The Monitoring Officer be instructed to arrange tailored training in respect of the Code of Conduct for Councillor C Williams.

The Council heard from one member of the public.

RESOLVED –

That the report from the Standards Committee be noted.

CL42

COUNCILLORS’ QUESTIONS

- (a) Question from Councillor Bald to Councillor Middleton (Cabinet member for Resources and Innovation)

Councillor Bald, stating that regular budget monitoring was key to sound financial management, asked Councillor Middleton why he had agreed that the Cabinet should receive quarterly rather than monthly reports.

Councillor Middleton indicated that as the Council’s back office functions, such as finance, continued to contract it was necessary to update governance and reporting practices. He

believed the new arrangements which would see the budget monitoring report presented to Cabinet on a quarterly basis were adequate and in line with the practice in most other large unitary authorities and many private sector companies.

Councillor Middleton undertook to meet with Councillor Bald to review the budget position in between formal monitoring reports if she wished.

Councillor Middleton suggested that Councillor Bald was failing to acknowledge that the austerity measures were having an impact on back office services and the need for the Council to review and update how it did things.

Councillor Bald, as a supplementary question asked Councillor Middleton if he agreed that openness, transparency and regular reporting were key to good financial management and that by making the change to reporting cycles he was running from the truth.

Councillor Bald also indicated that she would accept the offer of monthly briefings and take the opportunity to report to the Council if she believed the quarterly reporting was not working.

Councillor Middleton indicated that the Leader and Cabinet members would continue to be briefed regularly by the Corporate Leadership Team and by officer colleagues in the individual services.

Councillor Middleton reiterated that he believed that Councillor Bald was failing to recognise the full extent of the challenges facing the Council and the difficult decisions being taken to reduce back office services by a further 25%, which included the Finance Team.

Councillor Middleton suggested that perhaps Councillor Bald should, instead of keep raising the frequency of financial monitoring at Cabinet meetings, focus on the bigger challenges facing the Council such as the continued under funding by Government in many key areas, such as housing.

(b) Question from Councillor McPake to Councillor Gowans (Cabinet member for Public Realm)

Councillor McPake referred to a number of instances where it appeared that Highways and Transport colleagues were failing to liaise, specifically with regard to Manor Road in Bletchley, which had been closed and opened on a number of times recently, and the Highways Department had not told colleagues in Transport in sufficient time to reroute buses and give public notice. Also, during one closure of Manor Road, Highways intended to also close the diversion route. Councillor McPake accordingly asked Councillor Gowans if he could intervene and improve the situation.

Councillor Gowans indicated that he was aware of the specific problem and had raised it with officer colleagues, but would raise it again and ask them to work harder to improve their communication.

- (c) Question from Councillor Wales to Councillor Middleton (Cabinet member for Resources and Innovation)

Councillor Wales asked Councillor Middleton if he could update the Council on recent developments with the Revenues and Benefits Service.

Councillor Middleton informed the Council that the Council's Revenue and Benefits Team was finalist in the IRRV Team of the Year awards. He considered this a considerable achievement as the service had faced a significant loss of funding and had managed to maintain the service to such a standard that it had been shortlisted for the award.

The Council joined Councillor Middleton in congratulating the Team on its achievement.

- (d) Question from Councillor P Geary to Councillor Middleton (Cabinet member for Resources and Innovation)

Councillor P Geary asked Councillor Middleton if the refurbishments at the Civic Offices were being carried out with full agreement and compliance with Building Control requirements.

Councillor Middleton indicated that as far as he was aware this was the case, but he would confirm with officer colleagues and provide a written answer.

- (e) Question from Councillor D McCall to Councillor Gowans (Cabinet member for Public Realm)

Councillor D McCall, referring to the current peak time closure of H3 Monks Way, the road works with temporary traffic lights in Tickford Street, Newport Pagnell, and the chaos which had resulted with traffic this evening backed up on all surrounding roads, including back beyond M1 Junction 14, asked Councillor Gowans if Highways officer colleagues should have listened to advice from local Ward councillors that having road works on two roads which were alternative routes for each other should be avoided.

Councillor Gowans agreed with Councillor McCall that it was important for officer colleagues to listen to the advice of local Ward councillors in such circumstances and to aid awareness of Ward councillors of up and coming road schemes a list setting out the annual programme of highway works had been circulated all councillors.

Councillor D McCall welcomed the advance notice and the positive response from Councillor Gowans. Councillor McCall reiterated the importance of officers having heed of local advice.

Councillor Gowans noted Councillor McCall's comments.

- (f) Question from Councillor C Wilson to Councillor Middleton (Cabinet member for Resources and Innovation)

Councillor C Wilson asked Councillor Middleton to outline Milton Keynes Development Partnerships stance in respect of providing affordable housing.

Councillor Middleton indicated that following the recent review of the Development Partnership, the Partnership was now required to deliver 36% affordable housing on all sites sold for housing development, which would provide a significant increase in the availability of affordable housing.

Councillor Middleton stressed the importance of the Council being seen to do all that it could to address the shortage of affordable housing.

- (g) Question from Councillor Geaney to Councillor O'Neill (Deputy Leader of the Council)

Councillor Geaney asked Councillor O'Neill if she thought it was right that a Committee having invited a person to attend its meeting, officer colleagues could then subsequently decide that the person should not attend without reference to the Chair or the Committee.

Councillor Geaney, as a supplementary question asked Councillor O'Neill for an assurance that in future a similar situation did not occur, so that committee meetings were run by councillors and not officers.

Councillor O'Neill indicated that she would ask the Leader of the Council to look into the specifics of the situation and respond in writing.

- (h) Question from Councillor Eastman to Councillor Gowans (Cabinet member for Public Realm)

Councillor Eastman, referring to four roads in Newport Pagnell which had been resurfaced only a matter of a few months ago and had been resurfaced again last weekend asked Councillor Gowans why.

Councillor Gowans indicated that he would investigate and respond in writing.

Councillor Eastman as a supplementary question asked Councillor Gowans if the costs of the works could be included in his reply.

Councillor Gowans indicated that that he would include details of the costs of the works.

- (i) Question from Councillor McLean to Councillor Gowans
(Cabinet member for Public Realm)

Councillor McLean, referring to a question he asked at the July meeting of the Council about making representations to Central Bedfordshire Council requesting that the weight restriction on the road between Fen Street and Salford be removed so that lorries might be able to take a shorter route avoiding the villages, asked Councillor Gowans when he would be able to give a definitive response.

Councillor Gowans apologised for the delay in replying and indicated that he would provide a written response as soon as possible.

Councillor McLean as a supplementary question asked Councillor Gowans how long was as soon as possible.

Councillor Gowans noted the question.

- (j) Question from Councillor Bald to Councillor Middleton
(Cabinet member for Resources and Innovation)

Councillor Bald, noting that vulnerable people were having to wait for up to 60 days for a new Housing Benefit claim to be processed, putting them at risk of being made homeless, asked Councillor Middleton why he had allowed a £330,000 budget surplus in the Revenue and Benefits Service last year.

Councillor Middleton stressed that nobody had been made homeless as a result of the increased waiting times to process new Housing Benefit applications. The Council provided a number of safety net funds and there would always be a pot of hardship money available to help those experiencing difficulties.

Councillor Middleton recognised that waiting times had been longer than expected for new Housing Benefit applications to be processed and this had been as a result of the increasing demand for help from the Council from vulnerable people and those on the poverty line.

Councillor Middleton indicated that extra money had been provided for the service to engage temporary resources and it was planned to clear the backlog by October.

Councillor Middleton reported that the Revenues and Benefits service had faced a £1m cut in its funding from Government, so it was inevitable that there were fewer people on the front line and the service was facing some difficulty. The service would continue to face cuts of 31% in Government funding by 2020, unless the Government relented and agreed to provide the resources the Council needed for the service.

Councillor Bald, referring to the £330,000 budget surplus in 2016/17, as a supplementary question asked Councillor Middleton if he was happy that by not using the surplus to help fund the Revenues and Benefits Service he had put unnecessary pressure on officer colleagues working in the service.

Councillor Middleton indicated that money was not being held back from the Revenues and Benefits Service and funds had been provided in order to address the current unprecedented demand. And would continue to be provided as long as the need was there.

CL43

LOCAL AUTHORITY FUNDING

Councillor Middleton moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor C Wilson:

- “1. That this Council notes that:
 - (a) local government has faced the most severe austerity spending cuts from Central Government imposed on any sector;
 - (b) the Revenue Support Grant received by Milton Keynes Council has been cut by £74m since 2010, and by 2020 Milton Keynes Council will receive no revenue funding from Central Government;
 - (c) in the same period since 2010 demand for services in Milton Keynes has risen by at least £89m;
 - (d) the total level of cuts after revenue received from extra Council Tax, income and Business Rates has been over £130m; and
 - (e) the longer austerity continues the harder it is to maintain services to a level the public and this Council would like, and that the impact on services has been real and consequential.
2. That this Council further notes that:
 - (a) Central Government had promised by 2020 Local Government would be able to retain 100% of the Business Rates it raises in their local areas;
 - (b) the Local Government Association was working with the Department of Local Government to implement such a scheme and pilots had been established;
 - (c) the Local Government Finance White Paper was withdrawn without consultation from the Queen’s Speech, which covers two legislative years, and replaced with a vague proposal to consult on future finance;

- (d) the Conservative Chair of the Local Government Association, Lord Porter, has stated publicly that abandoning the Local Government Finance White Paper without an alternative in place before the end of Revenue Support Grant in 2020 places Local Government “on a financial cliff edge;”
 - (e) the promise in the Conservative Manifesto to implement a “Dementia Tax,” was a misguided attempt to address the growing underfunding of adult social care, and disappeared without a trace, like much of the Conservative Manifesto;
 - (f) New Home Bonus, which replaced Growth Area Funding, has been substantially reduced; and
 - (g) the £1.5billion found to fund the Conservative Government’s deal with the Democratic Unionist Party would be enough to fund Milton Keynes Council Public Realm services for 40 years, and shows that the Government imposition for austerity for 7 years and into the future is a political choice.
3. That the Council therefore calls on:
- (a) the Government to abandon austerity and properly fund public services;
 - (b) Milton Keynes’ two MPs to call for more funding for Milton Keynes Council and to call on the Prime Minister to reinstate the Local Government Finance Bill;
 - (c) on Cabinet to highlight the impact of cuts on services in Milton Keynes; and
 - (d) on Cabinet to ensure that the cuts and savings required to ensure a balanced budget are brought forward openly at the earliest opportunity for Budget Scrutiny Committee to analyse and comment on.”

Councillor R Bradburn moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor McPake and accepted by the mover of the motion:

- “1. That a new paragraph (h) be added to clause 2 of the motion as follows:
- ‘(h) despite a growing acceptance and belief by a majority of the public that they are willing to pay more through taxation to protect all front line services and particularly look after the most vulnerable in society this Conservative Government has ignored such a growing view.’

2. That a new paragraph (c) be added to clause 3 of the motion as follows, with the original paragraphs (c) and (d) becoming paragraphs (d) and (e):
 - ‘(c) the Government, as a matter of urgency, review all rates of Income Tax and Corporation Tax so that all revenue possibilities are examined with the aim to provide the very funding that Local Government is being starved of in the attempt to provide and protect vital front line services;’
3. That a new paragraph (f) be added to clause 3 of the motion as follows;
 - ‘(f) on Cabinet actively to promote further discussions with parishes with a view to assisting these statutory bodies to complement MKC services where doing so would add value to their residents' well-being, particularly the vulnerable and least well off.’”

The Council heard from one member of the public.

On being put to the vote the motion, as amended was declared carried with 32 councillors voting in favour, 17 councillors voting against and 0 councillors abstaining from voting.

RESOLVED –

1. That this Council notes that:
 - (a) local government has faced the most severe austerity spending cuts from Central Government imposed on any sector;
 - (b) the Revenue Support Grant received by Milton Keynes Council has been cut by £74m since 2010, and by 2020 Milton Keynes Council will receive no revenue funding from Central Government;
 - (c) in the same period since 2010 demand for services in Milton Keynes has risen by at least £89m;
 - (d) the total level of cuts after revenue received from extra Council Tax, income and Business Rates has been over £130m; and
 - (e) the longer austerity continues the harder it is to maintain services to a level the public and this Council would like, and that the impact on services has been real and consequential.

2. That this Council further notes that:
 - (a) Central Government had promised by 2020 Local Government would be able to retain 100% of the Business Rates it raises in their local areas;
 - (b) the Local Government Association was working with the Department of Local Government to implement such a scheme and pilots had been established;
 - (c) the Local Government Finance White Paper was withdrawn without consultation from the Queen's Speech, which covers two legislative years, and replaced with a vague proposal to consult on future finance;
 - (d) the Conservative Chair of the Local Government Association, Lord Porter, has stated publicly that abandoning the Local Government Finance White Paper without an alternative in place before the end of Revenue Support Grant in 2020 places Local Government 'on a financial cliff edge';
 - (e) the promise in the Conservative Manifesto to implement a "Dementia Tax," was a misguided attempt to address the growing underfunding of adult social care, and disappeared without a trace, like much of the Conservative Manifesto;
 - (f) New Home Bonus, which replaced Growth Area Funding, has been substantially reduced;
 - (g) the £1.5billion found to fund the Conservative Government's deal with the Democratic Unionist Party would be enough to fund Milton Keynes Council Public Realm services for 40 years, and shows that the Government imposition for austerity for 7 years and into the future is a political choice and
 - (h) despite a growing acceptance and belief by a majority of the public that they are willing to pay more through taxation to protect all front line services and particularly look after the most vulnerable in society this Conservative Government has ignored such a growing view.
3. That the Council therefore calls on:
 - (a) the Government to abandon austerity and properly fund public services;
 - (b) Milton Keynes' two MPs to call for more funding for Milton Keynes Council and to call on the Prime Minister to reinstate the Local Government Finance Bill;

- (c) the Government, as a matter of urgency, review all rates of Income Tax and Corporation Tax so that all revenue possibilities are examined with the aim to provide the very funding that Local Government is being starved of in the attempt to provide and protect vital front line services;
- (d) on Cabinet to highlight the impact of cuts on services in Milton Keynes;
- (e) on Cabinet to ensure that the cuts and savings required to ensure a balanced budget are brought forward openly at the earliest opportunity for Budget Scrutiny Committee to analyse and comment on; and
- (f) on Cabinet actively to promote further discussions with parishes with a view to assisting these statutory bodies to complement the Council's services where doing so would add value to their residents' well-being, particularly the vulnerable and least well off.

CL44

PUBLIC SECTOR PAY

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

"1. That this Council notes that:

- (a) pay squeezes in the public sector have now been in force for almost a decade, with the real-terms impact on workers running into thousands of pounds of cuts;
- (b) there is no democratic mandate for this scale of cuts: the policy has gone further than any proposals at the 2010 general election, and it was not presented as part of the Conservative 2015 manifesto;
- (c) the squeeze on pay has had a disproportionate impact on women, with women making up two thirds of the public sector workforce;
- (d) increasing evidence shows support for end to the pay squeeze and independent polling carried out by Survation has found that 75% of all voters support above-inflation increases in public sector pay, including 69% of Conservative voters;
- (e) the pay squeeze has put pressure on staff recruitment and retention, particularly in areas in competition for staff with the private sector, leading to increased levels of payment for agency staff; and
- (f) by reversing its cuts to Corporation Tax rates, the Government could meet the £8.5 billion needed in this Parliament to end the pay squeeze across the whole public sector.

2. That this Council believes that:
 - (a) public services and the people who deliver them are important;
 - (b) pay for public sector workers should not be set by arbitrary Government caps, but by working with Pay Review Bodies, Trade Unions, employers and employees, who can better address the complexity of pay decisions across the sector and services; and
 - (c) increases in public sector pay should be met by Central Government funding as the public sector, including local authorities, has faced huge budget cuts, and pay increases should not mean additional budget pressures on frontline services.
3. That this Council supports requests by the general public and trade unions, including the GMB and UNISON, to end the public sector pay pinch and calls on Government to:
 - (a) end public sector pay cuts;
 - (b) properly fund all public services;
 - (c) restore the independence for the Pay Review Bodies; and
 - (d) implement a REAL living wage for public sector workers.”

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

- “1. That clause 2(b) of the motion be amended by the addition of the word ‘initially’ before the word ‘working’ and the addition of the words ‘until a better system is in place that will have public confidence’ after the word ‘Bodies’;
2. That a new paragraph (d) be added to clause 2 of the motion as follows:

‘the Government stating they intend increases in the pay of some Public Sector workers such as the Police and Prison Officers while leaving other vital Public Sector workers such as Carers and Nurses within the pay cap is divisive and not equitable and further that funding for such an increase is not "new money" but will cause other cuts elsewhere in public services.’
3. That paragraphs (a) to (d) of clause 3 be deleted and replaced with:
 - ‘(a) end the current public sector pay cap altogether and up rate wages in line with inflation;

- (b) meet these increased costs from new money rather than by cuts from elsewhere within existing departmental and other organisational budgets;
- (c) implement a REAL living wage both within the public and private sector;
- (d) end the abuses associated with zero hours contracts; and
- (e) create a formal right to request a fixed contract.”

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

“1. That the following new clause 3 be added and the existing clause 3 renumbered as 4:

‘3. That Council welcomes:

- (a) recent confirmation by the Government that, on the recommendation of the Public Sector Pay review bodies, ministers will have the flexibility to increase public sector pay by more than 1%;
- (b) the announcement of awards for police and prison officers for 2017/18 and looks forward to seeing the detail of 2018/19 pay remits for other specific Pay Review Bodies at the autumn Budget; and
- (c) fully accepts that the Government must take a balanced approach to public spending, dealing with our debts to keep our economy strong, while also making sure we invest in our public services.’

2. That in new clause 4 the word ‘supports’ be replaced by the words ‘takes seriously’, the words ‘carefully consider’ be added after the word ‘to’, the word ‘end’ be amended to ‘ending’ in paragraph (a), the word ‘fund’ be amended to ‘funding’ in paragraph (b), the word ‘restore’ be amended to ‘restoring’ in paragraph (c) and the word ‘implement’ be amended to ‘implementing’ in paragraph (d).”

On being put to the vote the amendment was declared lost with 16 councillors voting for, 28 councillors voting against and 0 councillors abstaining from voting.

The Council heard from one member of the public.

On being put to the vote the motion as amended was declared carried with 28 councillors voting in favour, 16 councillors voting against and 0 councillors abstaining from voting.

RESOLVED –

1. That this Council notes that:
 - (a) pay squeezes in the public sector have now been in force for almost a decade, with the real-terms impact on workers running into thousands of pounds of cuts;
 - (b) there is no democratic mandate for this scale of cuts: the policy has gone further than any proposals at the 2010 general election, and it was not presented as part of the Conservative 2015 manifesto;
 - (c) the squeeze on pay has had a disproportionate impact on women, with women making up two thirds of the public sector workforce;
 - (d) increasing evidence shows support for end to the pay squeeze and independent polling carried out by Survation has found that 75% of all voters support above-inflation increases in public sector pay, including 69% of Conservative voters;
 - (e) the pay squeeze has put pressure on staff recruitment and retention, particularly in areas in competition for staff with the private sector, leading to increased levels of payment for agency staff; and
 - (f) by reversing its cuts to Corporation Tax rates, the Government could meet the £8.5 billion needed in this Parliament to end the pay squeeze across the whole public sector.
2. That this Council believes that:
 - (a) public services and the people who deliver them are important;
 - (b) pay for public sector workers should not be set by arbitrary Government caps, but by initially working with Pay Review Bodies until a better system is in place that will have public confidence, Trade Unions, employers and employees, who can better address the complexity of pay decisions across the sector and services;
 - (c) increases in public sector pay should be met by Central Government funding as the public sector, including local authorities, has faced huge budget cuts, and pay increases should not mean additional budget pressures on frontline services; and
 - (d) the Government stating they intend increases in the pay of some Public Sector workers such as the Police and Prison Officers while leaving other vital Public Sector workers such as Carers and Nurses within the

pay cap is divisive and not equitable and further that funding for such an increase is not 'new money' but will cause other cuts elsewhere in public services.

3. That this Council supports requests by the general public and trade unions, including the GMB and UNISON, to end the public sector pay pinch and calls on Government to:
 - (a) end the current public sector pay cap altogether and up rate wages in line with inflation;
 - (b) meet these increased costs from new money rather than by cuts from elsewhere within existing departmental and other organisational budgets;
 - (c) implement a REAL living wage both within the public and private sector;
 - (d) end the abuses associated with zero hours contracts; and
 - (e) create a formal right to request a fixed contract.

CL43 URBAN CAPACITY STUDY

With the consent of the Council, Councillor Walker withdrew his motion in respect of the Urban Capacity Study.

CL46 APPOINTMENT OF STATUTORY OFFICER - OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF FINANCIAL AFFAIRS

The Mayor moved and the Deputy Mayor seconded:

- “1. That the designation of Don McLure as the Council’s officer responsible for the administration of financial affairs (Section 151 Officer) be confirmed.
2. That, with sadness, the ill health of Nicole Jones be noted and the Council’s good wishes be sent to her.”

The Council noted that Section 151 of the Local Government Act 1972 required every local authority to make arrangements for the proper administration of their financial affairs and secure that one of their officers has responsibility for the administration of those affairs.

The Council also noted that Nicole Jones had been appointed as the statutory Council’s Chief Finance Officer by the Council at a meeting on 28 November 2016, when the Council had also authorised the Chief Executive to nominate an appropriate officer to act as the statutory Chief Finance Officer until the point at which a meeting of the Council could take place to formally consider an appointment, if the existing Chief Finance Officer was unable to fulfil the role for any reason.

It was reported that, unfortunately, Ms Jones has been diagnosed with a serious illness and was unable to fulfil all the significant duties associated with the role. Therefore, it has been necessary to secure the services of an interim Chief Finance Officer and reallocate most of the post's responsibilities to that person and to other colleagues. Don McLure had been appointed by the Chief Executive on an interim basis pending a permanent appointment.

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

RESOLVED –

1. That the designation of Don McLure as the Council's officer responsible for the administration of financial affairs (Section 151 Officer) be confirmed.
2. That the designation of Don McLure as the Council's officer responsible for the administration of financial affairs (Section 151 Officer) be confirmed.

CL47

QUARTERLY REPORT ON SPECIAL URGENCY DECISIONS

In accordance with Access to Information Procedure Rule 17.4, the Council noted that the Provisions for Special Urgency, as set out in Access to Information Procedure Rule 16, and Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16(j) were not used during the period 1 June 2017 to 31 August 2017.

THE MAYOR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 10:45 PM

Wards Affected:

All Wards

ITEM 4(a)**MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL****18 OCTOBER 2017****Report considered by Cabinet - 3 October 2017****APPROVAL OF PROPOSED SUBMISSION VERSION OF PLAN:MK**

Responsible Cabinet Member: Councillor Gifford (Cabinet Member for Place)

Report Sponsor: Brett Leahy (Head of Planning) - 01908 252609

Author and contact: John Cheston (Development Plans Team Leader) -
01908 252480**Executive Summary:**

This report requests Council to approve the publication of the Proposed Submission version of Plan:MK for a six-week public consultation on whether it is 'sound' (fit for purpose) and complies with the legislation governing the preparation of local development plans.

This intended final version of Plan:MK before its submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for examination has been prepared using the outputs from previous rounds of consultation, a range of background evidence work and input from a cross-party Councillor Working Group.

1. Recommendation(s)

- (a) That the Proposed Submission version of Plan:MK at Annex A be published for six weeks' consultation and then submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government under Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended);
- (b) That the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Place, be authorised to make any necessary minor amendments to Plan:MK and its supporting documents following the consultation; and
- (c) That the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Place, be authorised to suggest any necessary modifications to Plan:MK during the examination process to secure its soundness, in accordance with the findings of the Planning Inspector and subject to any necessary public consultation.

2. Issues

- 2.1 Once it has been adopted, Plan:MK will be the new local development plan for Milton Keynes Borough until 2031. It will set out a vision and development strategy for the future of the Borough, and include development management policies and site allocations for all sizes and types of development to help

deliver that vision. Plan:MK will replace the existing Core Strategy (adopted in 2013) and the 'saved' policies from the Local Plan (adopted in 2005).

- 2.2 The Proposed Submission version of Plan:MK is the intended final iteration of the document before it is submitted to Government for examination. It sets out the Council's preferred strategy for meeting the Borough's needs until 2031. A 15-year time horizon for the plan has been chosen as it is anticipated that the plan will need to be reviewed prior to that end date in order to be able to respond to a number of emerging strategies and infrastructure developments, notably the MK Futures 2050 work, progress on East-West Rail and on the Cambridge-Milton Keynes-Oxford growth corridor. This would also be consistent with national planning policy which states that local plans should be drawn up over an appropriate timescale, preferably a 15-year time horizon, should take account of longer term requirements and be kept up to date.
- 2.3 This Proposed Submission version of Plan:MK is based on the evidence currently available and has taken account of the previous consultations in 2014, 2016 and 2017. The consultation undertaken between March and June this year elicited over 1,500 comments from about 380 groups, organisations and individuals. A summary of the main issues raised by these representations is set out in a Consultation Statement. The preparation of the Plan has also been guided by a cross-party Councillor Working Group.
- 2.4 The principal changes which have been made to the plan compared with the previous Preferred Options draft are as follows:
- the removal of the 1,000-homes target for the rural areas of the Borough;
 - the incorporation of a windfall allowance of 1,330 homes over the plan period;
 - allowance for the strategic reserve site to the east of the M1 motorway to be delivered before 2031 if Government funding for infrastructure improvements is obtained;
 - the inclusion of a buffer in the housing land supply of approximately 10% above the objectively assessed need figure of 26,500 homes to serve as a contingency in case of non-delivery and to enable the target for affordable homes to be met in full;
 - the housing supply proposed from within the existing urban area of Milton Keynes has been reduced from 5,000 homes to 2,900 in response to the findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment; and
 - the affordable housing target has been reduced from 33% to 31% as a result of the findings of the whole-plan viability assessment.

3. Options

- 3.1 The recommended option is to approve the Proposed Submission version of Plan:MK appended in **Annex A** for a six-week consultation period on 'soundness' and legal compliance.
- 3.2 An alternative option would be to wait for further progress to be made on the emerging strategies and infrastructure developments, referred to in paragraph 2.2 above. However, this would cause an unacceptable and unnecessary delay to the Plan:MK process which, if not progressed as planned by 2017/18, would carry a risk that the Government would intervene. Furthermore, the Government has indicated that local plans which are submitted by 31 March

2018 will not be required to adopt the new national standardised methodology for calculating housing need (upon which consultation is currently taking place).

3.3 Whilst the implications of this proposed Government methodology for Milton Keynes are not so significant as they appear to be for neighbouring local authorities, it is unclear what changes may be made following the consultation and when it may be brought into effect. Nevertheless, as explained in Section 2 above, it is anticipated that the plan will require an early review in order to take account of these significant strategies and infrastructure projects. The recommended option in paragraph 3.1 above therefore allows for momentum in the preparation of Plan:MK to be maintained.

4. Implications

4.1 Policy

Plan:MK, when adopted, will replace the Core Strategy and the 'saved' policies in the existing Local Plan. It will form the key component of the Development Plan for Milton Keynes and will be used in the determination of planning applications and appeals.

Plan:MK will also be a key corporate document and will help to inform decisions on investment and service provision for the Council and its partners.

4.2 Resources and Risk

The Core Strategy adopted in 2013 put in place a requirement for an early review of that document, including an aim to have Plan:MK in place by 2015. While this has not been achieved, good progress is being made and this document is intended to be the final version of the plan before it is submitted to Government for examination.

The timetable to prepare Plan:MK is challenging, in part due to the Government intervention mentioned in paragraph 3.2 and put in place by the Productivity Plan. The Housing White Paper, published on 7 February 2017, strengthens the importance of all local authorities having up to date local plans in place.

Cost of Plan:MK

This will be mainly resourced by staff time for most of the production of the plan but some specialist consultancy services and evidence studies have been required for which additional funds have been obtained.

N	Capital	Y	Revenue	N	Accommodation
N	IT	N	Medium Term Plan	N	Asset Management

4.3 Carbon and Energy Management

Whilst Plan:MK includes planning policies relating to sustainability and carbon and energy management, the decision will not have a direct impact on this issue.

4.4 Legal

Plan:MK is being prepared in accordance with the amended Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

This consultation stage is under Regulation 19 (publication of a local plan) of these regulations and is the final stage in the plan preparation process before it is submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for a Planning Inspector to be appointed to conduct an independent examination of the plan.

There is a risk that the Plan will be found not to be 'sound' or legally compliant through the public examination process. It could also be challenged in the courts. Officers have taken steps, however, to minimise these risks through ensuring, for example, that the policies and proposals in the plan are based on proportionate evidence and that the legislation governing the preparation of local plans has been complied with.

4.5 Other Implications

The consultation on the Proposed Submission version of Plan:MK will be carried out in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (March 2014). Because this final consultation is only concerned with whether or not the plan meets the tests of soundness set out in national planning policy and is legally compliant, there is only limited ability for stakeholders to influence the shape of our strategies and policies. There is therefore no merit in seeking to encourage engagement in the process from a wide range of stakeholders or to extend the consultation beyond the statutory minimum period of six weeks.

N	Equalities/Diversity	N	Sustainability	N	Human Rights
N	E-Government	Y	Stakeholders	N	Crime and Disorder

Annexes: Proposed Submission version of Plan:MK for consultation

[Annex and Addendum to Approval of Proposed Submission Version of PlanMK](#)

Background Papers:

- Plan:MK Topic Papers, September-December 2014, available online at:
<https://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/plan-mk>
- Strategic Development Directions Consultation 2016, summary of consultation responses available online at:
<https://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/plan-mk>
- Draft Plan:MK consultation document, March 2017, available online at:
<https://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/plan-mk>
- Proposed Submission version of Plan:MK Sustainability Appraisal Report
- Draft Plan:MK Consultation Statement

Report considered by Cabinet - 3 October 2017

MAKING THE CASTLETHORPE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Responsible Cabinet Member: Councillor Gifford, Cabinet Member for Place

Report Sponsor: Brett Leahy, Head of Development Management, 01908 252605

Author and contact: Jon Wellstead, Senior Planning Officer, 01908 254761

Executive Summary:

In the event of a 'Yes' vote in the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan Referendum on 21 September, the report seeks Cabinet's agreement to recommend to Council that it makes (brings into legal force) the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan. The referendum will ask those voting whether they want Milton Keynes Council to use the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan when deciding planning applications in the neighbourhood area. If the vote is 'Yes', the Council would be obliged to make the Plan.

1. Recommendation(s)

1.1 Either:

Recommendation A.

That in the event of a 'Yes' vote in the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan Referendum, the Cabinet recommends to Council that it makes the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan pursuant to the provisions of Section 38(A)(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

That if the Council agrees the recommendation:

- (i) A decision document (Annex A) setting out the results of the referendum and the Council's decision to make the plan, and the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan (at Annex B) be published on the Council's website and in other means, to bring them to the attention of people who live, work or carry out business in the neighbourhood area; and
- (ii) the decision document and details on how to view the plan be sent to the qualifying body (Castlethorpe Parish Council) and any person who asked to be notified of the decision.

OR

Recommendation B.

That in the event of a 'No' vote in the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan Referendum, that:

- (i) A decision document (Annex A) setting out the results of the referendum and the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan (at Annex B) be

published on the Council's website and in other means, to bring them to the attention of people who live, work or carry out business in the neighbourhood area; and

- (ii) the decision document and details on how to view the plan be sent to the qualifying body (Castlethorpe Parish Council) and any person who asked to be notified of the decision.

2. **Issues**

- 2.1 The Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan was submitted to the Council for examination and was subsequently publicised for a six-week period, ending on 13th April, 2016. All comments received were then passed to the Examiner, Mr Peter Biggers, who submitted his report on the Plan in July 2016 which stated that the plan met relevant basic conditions and requirements, subject to modifications, and should proceed to referendum.
- 2.2 One of the modifications was the deletion of Gobbey's Field as a Local Green Space. The parish council did not agree with this and provided additional evidence of the value of the field to the village. A further round of consultation took place from 19 October to 30 November 2016, proposing to retain Gobbey's Field as a Local Green Space. A further examination was then held on the Local Green Space matter and the Examiner, Mrs Rosemary Kidd, submitted her report in June 2017 recommending that Gobbey's Field should not be designated a Local Green Space.
- 2.3 On 3 July 2017, the Service Director for Growth, Economy and Culture made the decision to accept the Examiner's report and the modifications that the examiner had recommended be made to the Neighbourhood Plan in order to ensure its compliance with the basic conditions. It was also agreed that the Plan, as modified, should proceed to a referendum of those residents eligible to vote within the neighbourhood plan area (being the Parish Council area) of Castlethorpe.
- 2.4 Under the requirements of the Neighbourhood Planning (Referendums) Regulations 2012 (as amended), the Council is obliged to hold a referendum on a neighbourhood plan within 56 days of issuing its decision on the Examiner's report and modifications. The referendum on the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan was therefore scheduled for 21 September 2017 to keep within the 56-day time limit.
- 2.5 In the event of a 'Yes' vote, the Council would be obliged under national legislation¹ to pass a resolution within eight weeks of the day after the referendum to 'make' the neighbourhood plan (i.e. by 16th November)..
- 2.6 Once a neighbourhood plan has successfully passed all the stages of preparation, including an Examination and Referendum, it is made by the local planning authority and forms part of that authority's Development Plan, meaning that it will be a material consideration when deciding development proposals within the area covered by the Plan.

¹ The Neighbourhood Planning (General) and Development Management Procedure (Amendment) Regulations 2016 and section 38(A)(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

2.7 As with any planning decision there is a risk of legal challenge, but that risk has and is being managed by ensuring that the regulations are followed and that the Council's decision making process is clear and transparent.

3. **Options**

3.1 In the event of a 'Yes' vote in the referendum, the Council is obliged to proceed to make the Plan as outlined above. Therefore, there are no options available other than for Cabinet to recommend to the Council to make the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan, and for Council to implement that recommendation, so that the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan becomes part of the Milton Keynes Development Plan. The only exception to this is where the Council considers the plan would breach, or otherwise be incompatible with, any EU obligation or any of the convention Rights. That is not the case here.

3.2 In the event of a 'No' vote in the referendum, then no further action is required of the Council in regards to the Neighbourhood Plan other than to publicise the result. Castlethorpe Town Council, as the qualifying body responsible for the preparing the plan, would then need to consider its next steps.

4. **Implications**

4.1 Policy

4.2 The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan. Neighbourhood Plans should reflect these policies, and neighbourhoods should plan positively to support them. Neighbourhood Plans and Development Orders should not promote less development than is set out in the Local Plan, or undermine its strategic policies. In Milton Keynes, the strategic policies are set out in the adopted Milton Keynes Local Plan and Core Strategy.

Once a Neighbourhood Plan has successfully passed all of the stages of preparation, including an examination and referendum, it is made by the local planning authority and forms part of the authority's Development Plan, meaning it will be a material consideration when considering development proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan area. In terms of the planning policy hierarchy, a Neighbourhood Plan, once adopted, carries more weight than a Supplementary Planning Document.

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) and Development Management Procedure (Amendment) Regulations 2016 which came into force on 1 October 2016 require local planning authorities to make a plan that has been supported at referendum within eight weeks of the day after the referendum. Should there be a 'Yes' vote in the Plan referendum, a decision to make the Plan by Council on 19 July 2017 would will meet that timescale.

4.3 Resources and Risk

4.4 The Localism Act 2011 and the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 ("the 2012 Regulations") placed new duties on local planning authorities in relation to Neighbourhood Planning. These new duties have considerable implications for Council resources. In recognition of the

additional burdens that these new duties place on local planning authorities, DCLG now makes extra burden funding of £20,000 available to local authorities, which can be claimed once a date for a referendum has been set following a successful examination. This is a reduction of £10,000 per plan from that which has been available in previous years. Further duties and deadlines for decisions have been imposed through the Neighbourhood Planning (General) and Development Management Procedure (Amendment) Regulations 2016, as a result of the 2016 Housing and Planning Act.

- 4.5 Publicity and officer support costs associated with making Neighbourhood Plans is met within the Development Plans budget and staff resources to implement the Plan come from the existing staff within the Development Plans and Development Management teams.
- 4.6 An internal audit of the Neighbourhood Plans service carried out in 2015 has shown that that the additional costs incurred delivering the service were only just covered by the extra burdens funding.

N	Capital	Y	Revenue	N	Accommodation
N	IT	N	Medium Term Plan	N	Asset Management

4.7 Carbon and Energy Management

4.8 The proposal does not impact on carbon and energy management.

4.9 Legal

4.10 Neighbourhood planning is part of the Government’s initiative to empower local communities to take forward planning proposals at a local level, as outlined in Section 116 of the Localism Act, 2011. The Act and the subsequent regulations confer specific functions on local planning authorities in relation to neighbourhood planning and lay down the steps that must be followed in relation to Neighbourhood Planning.

4.11 The Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan has been consulted on and subjected to a referendum in accordance with the 2012 Regulations (as amended).

4.12 As with any planning decision, there is a risk of legal challenge to the plan and/or judicial review of the Council’s decision to proceed with the referendum and the making of the Plan, if there is a ‘Yes’ vote in the referendum.

4.13 Risk has been managed by ensuring that the relevant regulations are followed and that the Council’s decision making process is clear and transparent. Once a Neighbourhood Plan is made it becomes part of the Statutory Development Plan the Local Planning Authority is obliged to consider proposals for development against the policies in the Plan.

4.14 In accordance with Section 61E(4) of the Town and Country Planning Act, as modified by the Localism Act 2011, the Council must, as soon as possible after deciding to make a neighbourhood development plan:

- a. publish on the website and in such other manner as is likely to bring the Plan to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area:
 - i. the decision document,
 - ii. details of where and when the decision document may be inspected;
- b. send a copy of the decision document to:
 - i. the qualifying body and
 - ii. any person who asked to be notified of the decision.

4.15 Other Implications

4.16 The Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan has been tested against and found to meet a number of basic conditions. Two of the basic conditions are the requirements for the plans to:

- Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development
- Not breach and otherwise be compatible with EU obligations (including Human Rights, the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive and the Habitats Directive)

4.17 The Examiner’s report has confirmed that the Plan meets those Basic Conditions and officers are satisfied that there are no conflicts with these aspects.

4.18 The consultations on the draft plan carried out by the Parish Council and then the publicity on the submitted plan carried out by Milton Keynes Council have helped to raise awareness of its preparation and have allowed community engagement and participation in the process. .

N	Equalities/Diversity	Y	Sustainability	Y	Human Rights
N	E-Government	N	Stakeholders	N	Crime and Disorder

Annex A Decision document for making the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan

[Making the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan Annex A](#)

Annex B Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan (<https://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/castlethorpe-neighbourhood-plan>)

Background Papers:

The Localism Act, 2011

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

The Housing and Planning Act, 2016

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) and Development Management Procedure (Amendment) Regulations 2016

Report considered by Cabinet - 3 October 2017

MAKING THE SHERINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Responsible Cabinet Member: Councillor Gifford, Cabinet Member for Place

Report Sponsor: Brett Leahy, Head of Development Management,
01908 252605

Author and contact: Jon Wellstead, Senior Planning Officer, 01908
254761

Executive Summary:

In the event of a 'Yes' vote in the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan Referendum on 21 September, the report seeks Cabinet's agreement to recommend to Council that it makes (brings into legal force) the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan. The referendum will ask those voting whether they want Milton Keynes Council to use the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan when deciding planning applications in the neighbourhood area. If the vote is 'Yes', the Council would be obliged to make the Plan.

1. Recommendation(s)

1.1 Either:

Recommendation A.

That in the event of a 'Yes' vote in the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan Referendum, the Cabinet recommends to Council that it makes the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan pursuant to the provisions of Section 38(A)(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

That if the Council agrees the recommendation:

- (a) a decision document (Annex A) setting out the results of the referendum and the Council's decision to make the plan, and the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan (at Annex B) be published on the Council's website and in other means, to bring them to the attention of people who live, work or carry out business in the neighbourhood area; and
- (b) the decision document and details on how to view the plan be sent to the qualifying body (Sherington Parish Council) and any person who asked to be notified of the decision.

OR

Recommendation B.

That in the event of a 'No' vote in the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan Referendum, that:

- (a) A decision document (Annex A) setting out the results of the referendum and the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan (at Annex B) be

published on the Council's website and in other means, to bring them to the attention of people who live, work or carry out business in the neighbourhood area; and

- (b) the decision document and details on how to view the plan be sent to the qualifying body (Sherington Parish Council) and any person who asked to be notified of the decision.

2. **Issues**

- 2.1 The Sherington Neighbourhood Plan was submitted to the Council for examination and was subsequently publicised for a six-week period, ending on 9 February, 2017. All comments received were then passed to the Examiner, Mr Andrew Ashcrot, who submitted his report on the Plan in May, 2017 which stated that the plan met relevant basic conditions and requirements, subject to modifications, and should proceed to referendum.
- 2.2 On 24 July 2017, the Service Director for Growth, Economy and Culture made the decision to accept the Examiner's report and the modifications that the examiner had recommended be made to the Neighbourhood Plan in order to ensure its compliance with the basic conditions. It was also agreed that the Plan, as modified, should proceed to a referendum of those residents eligible to vote within the neighbourhood plan area (being the Parish Council area) of Sherington.
- 2.3 Under the requirements of the Neighbourhood Planning (Referendums) Regulations 2012 (as amended), the Council is obliged to hold a referendum on a neighbourhood plan within 56 days of issuing its decision on the Examiner's report and modifications. The referendum on the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan was therefore scheduled for 21 September 2017 to keep within the 56-day time limit.
- 2.4 In the event of a 'Yes' vote, the Council would be obliged under national legislation¹ to pass a resolution within eight weeks of the day after the referendum to 'make' the neighbourhood plan (i.e. by 16th November)..
- 2.5 Once a neighbourhood plan has successfully passed all the stages of preparation, including an Examination and Referendum, it is made by the local planning authority and forms part of that authority's Development Plan, meaning that it will be a material consideration when deciding development proposals within the area covered by the Plan.
- 2.6 As with any planning decision there is a risk of legal challenge, but that risk has and is being managed by ensuring that the regulations are followed and that the Council's decision making process is clear and transparent.

3. **Options**

- 3.1 In the event of a 'Yes' vote in the referendum, the Council is obliged to proceed to make the Plan as outlined above. Therefore, there are no options

¹ The Neighbourhood Planning (General) and Development Management Procedure (Amendment) Regulations 2016 and section 38(A)(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

available other than for Cabinet to recommend to the Council to make the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan, and for Council to implement that recommendation, so that the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan becomes part of the Milton Keynes Development Plan. The only exception to this is where the Council considers the plan would breach, or otherwise be incompatible with, any EU obligation or any of the convention Rights. That is not the case here.

- 3.2 In the event of a 'No' vote in the referendum, then no further action is required of the Council in regards to the Neighbourhood Plan other than to publicise the result. Sherington Parish Council, as the qualifying body responsible for the preparing the plan, would then need to consider its next steps.

4. **Implications**

4.1 Policy

- 4.2 The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan. Neighbourhood Plans should reflect these policies, and neighbourhoods should plan positively to support them. Neighbourhood Plans and Development Orders should not promote less development than is set out in the Local Plan, or undermine its strategic policies. In Milton Keynes, the strategic policies are set out in the adopted Milton Keynes Local Plan and Core Strategy.

Once a Neighbourhood Plan has successfully passed all of the stages of preparation, including an examination and referendum, it is made by the local planning authority and forms part of the authority's Development Plan, meaning it will be a material consideration when considering development proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan area. In terms of the planning policy hierarchy, a Neighbourhood Plan, once adopted, carries more weight than a Supplementary Planning Document.

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) and Development Management Procedure (Amendment) Regulations 2016 which came into force on 1 October 2016 require local planning authorities to make a plan that has been supported at referendum within eight weeks of the day after the referendum. Should there be a 'Yes' vote in the Plan referendum, a decision to make the Plan by Council on 19 July 2017 would will meet that timescale.

4.3 Resources and Risk

- 4.4 The Localism Act 2011 and the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 ("the 2012 Regulations") placed new duties on local planning authorities in relation to Neighbourhood Planning. These new duties have considerable implications for Council resources. In recognition of the additional burdens that these new duties place on local planning authorities, DCLG now makes extra burden funding of £20,000 available to local authorities, which can be claimed once a date for a referendum has been set following a successful examination. This is a reduction of £10,000 per plan from that which has been available in previous years. Further duties and deadlines for decisions have been imposed through the Neighbourhood Planning (General) and Development Management Procedure (Amendment) Regulations 2016, as a result of the 2016 Housing and Planning Act.

- 4.5 Publicity and officer support costs associated with making Neighbourhood Plans is met within the Development Plans budget and staff resources to implement the Plan come from the existing staff within the Development Plans and Development Management teams.
- 4.6 An internal audit of the Neighbourhood Plans service carried out in 2015 has shown that that the additional costs incurred delivering the service were only just covered by the extra burdens funding.

N	Capital	Y	Revenue	N	Accommodation
N	IT	N	Medium Term Plan	N	Asset Management

4.7 Carbon and Energy Management

4.8 The proposal does not impact on carbon and energy management.

4.9 Legal

4.10 Neighbourhood planning is part of the Government’s initiative to empower local communities to take forward planning proposals at a local level, as outlined in Section 116 of the Localism Act, 2011. The Act and the subsequent regulations confer specific functions on local planning authorities in relation to neighbourhood planning and lay down the steps that must be followed in relation to Neighbourhood Planning.

4.11 The Sherington Neighbourhood Plan has been consulted on and subjected to a referendum in accordance with the 2012 Regulations (as amended).

4.12 As with any planning decision, there is a risk of legal challenge to the plan and/or judicial review of the Council’s decision to proceed with the referendum and the making of the Plan, if there is a ‘Yes’ vote in the referendum.

4.13 Risk has been managed by ensuring that the relevant regulations are followed and that the Council’s decision making process is clear and transparent. Once a Neighbourhood Plan is made it becomes part of the Statutory Development Plan the Local Planning Authority is obliged to consider proposals for development against the policies in the Plan.

4.14 In accordance with Section 61E(4) of the Town and Country Planning Act, as modified by the Localism Act 2011, the Council must, as soon as possible after deciding to make a neighbourhood development plan:

- a. publish on the website and in such other manner as is likely to bring the Plan to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area:
 - i. the decision document,
 - ii. details of where and when the decision document may be inspected;

- b. send a copy of the decision document to:
 - i. the qualifying body and
 - ii. any person who asked to be notified of the decision.

4.15 Other Implications

4.16 The Sherington Neighbourhood Plan has been tested against and found to meet a number of basic conditions. Two of the basic conditions are the requirements for the plans to:

- Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development
- Not breach and otherwise be compatible with EU obligations (including Human Rights, the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive and the Habitats Directive)

4.17 The Examiner’s report has confirmed that the Plan meets those Basic Conditions and officers are satisfied that there are no conflicts with these aspects.

4.18 The consultations on the draft plan carried out by the Parish Council and then the publicity on the submitted plan carried out by Milton Keynes Council have helped to raise awareness of its preparation and have allowed community engagement and participation in the process. .

N	Equalities/Diversity	Y	Sustainability	Y	Human Rights
N	E-Government	N	Stakeholders	N	Crime and Disorder

Annex A Decision document for making the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan

[Making the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan Annex A](#)

Annex B Sherington Neighbourhood Plan - <https://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/sherington-neighbourhood-plan>

Background Papers:

The Localism Act, 2011

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

The Housing and Planning Act, 2016

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) and Development Management Procedure (Amendment) Regulations 2016

Wards Affected:

All Wards

PROPOSED HOUSING AND REGENERATION RESTRUCTURE**Report considered by Cabinet - 3 October 2017**

Responsible Cabinet Member: Councillor Long (Cabinet Member for Adult Care and Housing)

Report Sponsor: Duncan Sharkey (Corporate Director Place)

Author and contact: Michael Kelleher (Service Director Housing and Regeneration) Tel: 01908 2524167

Executive Summary:

The Housing and Regeneration Service is facing increasing pressures. The Government's ongoing deficit reduction programme and welfare reform initiatives are having a significant impact both on the public and the Council's ability to respond.

Stagnating wages, cuts in benefits and rising inflation are making it harder for people to manage their finances. At the same time, rising house prices and escalating private sector rents are combining with a reduction in investment in truly affordable housing resulting in more and more people struggling to access good quality housing at a price they can afford. In addition, the Government's 1% rent reduction, which runs until March 2020, is reducing the Council's capacity to invest in both its existing and new housing stock.

Homelessness in Milton Keynes has increased significantly in recent years. At 31 March 2010 the number of people living in temporary accommodation in the borough was 84. By the end of March 2017 this number had risen to 754, an increase of 798%.

Over this same time, house prices have risen by 40%, private sector rents by 20% while the delivery of new affordable housing has fallen short of target by 1,382 in the seven years April 2010 and March 2017.

This is having a significant, detrimental impact on the Council's finances, which is currently projecting an in year overspend on the provision of temporary accommodation alone of c.£1.4m.

The new Homelessness Reduction Act, which is expected to be in force from 1 April 2018, will increase the support that councils are required to provide to those that are homeless or threatened with homelessness. Evidence from Wales, where similar legislation has been in force for a number of years, and the Government's own trail blazers, suggest that the new Act will lead to a further increase in the number of people presenting as homeless or threatened with homelessness. It is likely therefore that, without further investment in tackling the causes of homelessness across the borough, pressure on the General Fund will continue to increase.

The Council has already been proactive in this area and has developed a strategic approach to tackling the growing problem. Tackling homelessness is a key priority

as set out in the Council Plan 2016-20 and in 2016 the Council also approved a new Homelessness Strategy and Homelessness Partnership with organisations from the private and voluntary sector.

This report sets out proposals to restructure the Housing and Regeneration Service to ensure it has the right level of resource and skills to deliver the Council's priority of tackling homelessness. This means investing in the homelessness service to ensure decisions are made as quickly and robustly as possible and developing new areas in commissioning and enabling to ensure that the Council works closely with landlords, developers and registered providers to maximise the number of properties available. It also means strengthening the Council's housing management function to ensure that estates are better maintained and residents supported to maintain their tenancies.

Councillor Nigel Long

Cabinet Member for Adult Care and Housing

1. Recommendations

1.1 That Cabinet:

- (a) Notes the background and reasons for the proposed restructure of the Housing and Regeneration Service and requires the Corporate Director Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Adult Care and Housing, to make representation to Government over ongoing funding which is too low;
- (b) Recommends to Council funding for the proposed increase to the Housing Staffing establishment of £200k from the Invest to Save reserve in 2017/18 (one-off funding) and an addition to the base revenue budget of £871k from 2018/19 split over 2 financial years:
 - (i) £751,000 in 2018/19; and
 - (ii) £120,000 in 2019/20
- (c) Approves additional General Fund revenue investment of £200,000 in 2017/18 to enable the restructure to commence being implemented before 1 April 2018 in order to prepare for the impact of the Homelessness Reduction Act;
- (d) Note that the restructure will be cost neutral on the Housing Revenue Account; and
- (e) Note that the restructure will be implemented in line with the Council's Restructure, Redundancy and Redeployment Policy.

2. Issues

Background

- 2.1 In March 2010 the number of homeless households across England had reached an all-time low.

2.2 By March 2017, both the national and local picture had changed significantly. The table overleaf summarises this.

	England	Milton Keynes
Accepted as homeless in priority need - March 2010	40,020	84
Accepted as homeless in priority need - March 2017	59,090	710
Increase from March 2010 to March 2017	+ 48%	+ 745%
Living in temporary accommodation - March 2010	51,310	84
Living in temporary accommodation - March 2017	77,240	754
Increase from March 2010 to March 2017	+ 51%	+ 798%
Living in bed & breakfast hotels & annexes - March 2010	2,050	5
Living in bed & breakfast hotels & annexes - March 2017	6,590	132
Increase from March 2010 to March 2017	+ 221%	+ 2,540%

Source: DCLG

2.3 The increase in homelessness and use of temporary accommodation is placing a significant burden on the Council's General Fund revenue budget. In 2016/17 the council spent £4.1m on providing temporary accommodation against a budget before use of demand led reserves of £1.3m – an overspend of £2.8m. It is currently projecting to overspend £1.4m in 2017/18 against an original budget before use of demand led reserves of £2.1m.

2.4 If the situation remains as it is, and the use of temporary accommodation continues to rise, the Council could expect to overspend in the region of £4.2m in 2018/19.

2.5 Key factors contributing to the rise in homelessness and the use of temporary accommodation since 2009/10 include:

- (a) Welfare Reform – including a freeze on Housing Benefit and Local Housing Allowance, introduction of the benefit cap and universal credit, all of which have resulted in a cut in benefits to people in receipt of low income;
- (b) Wage growth below inflation – has seen a real terms cut in the standard of living of our working population;
- (c) Rising house prices (up 40% since 2010) and private sector rents (up 20% since 2010) – have moved many properties out of affordability reach of local residents.
- (d) The ending of private sector tenancies – is the biggest single driver of statutory homelessness in England and accounts for 74% of the growth in households who qualify for temporary accommodation since 2010. As of September 2017, 27% of applications received by the Council since April 2017 were made following the end of Assured Shorthold Tenancies;

- (e) Cuts in grant funding for affordable housing – has seen a reduction in the number of new homes available and being delivered for those who need them;
 - (f) 1% rent reduction for registered providers – has seen investment in new stock fall as providers safeguard existing stock; and
 - (g) Public sector deficit reduction programme – has seen the capacity of the Council to support those in greatest need, face a real term cut.
- 2.6 The Homelessness Reduction Act received Royal Assent in May 2017 and is expected to come into force from 1 April 2018. Evidence from Wales, where similar legislation has been in force since 2014, and the Government’s own trail blazers for the new Act suggest that the number of people presenting to councils as homeless or threatened with homelessness will rise significantly. Whilst the Council supports the new Act, it must be recognised that it is likely to generate increased demand, and cost, to the Council.
- 2.7 The Government has pledged financial support and has set aside £61m as transition funding in 2018/19. An announcement on how much the Council will receive is expected later in 2017 or early 2018. However, this funding will serve only to offset the anticipated losses of £0.9m in 2017/18 and £1.3m in 2018/19 from the replacement of the Temporary Accommodation Management Fee by the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant in April 2017.
- 2.8 In 2015 the Council deleted the post of Head of Housing Access by way of a saving for the 2016/17 budget, and amalgamated the role with the Head of Housing Management to create a new Head of Housing. This resulted in the post holder covering a broad portfolio including the Council’s landlord functions, shared ownership and leasehold management, homelessness and allocations, private sector housing and its strategic housing functions. Such a structure is no longer appropriate for a council with a growing population and with a significant stock holding and growing homelessness problem as Milton Keynes.
- 2.9 Staff numbers in the Service have not kept pace with the increasing demand. This has been as a direct result of the Government’s deficit reduction programme, which has focused on closing the gap between what it spends and raises in taxes and has led to cuts in public spending. The Council’s budget has reduced since 2010 and consequently it is dealing with a far greater number of homeless households and temporary accommodation placements with broadly the same structure and staff numbers as it had before the increase in demand began.
- 2.10 This has resulted in officers having a critically high caseload and the average time taken to reach a decision, exceeding 100 days. The Government’s expectation is that decisions should be reached in 33 days.

Proposals

- 2.11 It is proposed that the posts of the current Head of Housing and Head of Community Safety are deleted and replaced with three new head of service posts:
- (a) Head of Neighbourhood Operations;
 - (b) Head of Homelessness Prevention and Housing Access; and

- (c) Head of Communities.
- 2.12 These posts, together with a newly created Service Delivery Unit Manager, will report to the Service Director and form the new Housing and Regeneration Leadership Team.
- 2.13 Five of the six posts that report to the current Head of Housing will be deleted (Housing Options Manager, Income and Growth Manager, Housing Manager (Moving Home), Housing Manager (Estates) and Housing Manager (Anti-Social Behaviour)). The post of Partnership Manager, who currently reports to the Income and Growth Manager, will also be deleted.
- 2.14 The sixth post that reports to the current Head of Housing (Private Sector Housing Manager) and the Head of Regeneration (who is currently seconded to YourMK) are outside the scope of this restructure. It should be noted however, that the Private Sector Housing Team itself is within scope.
- 2.15 The Proposed Statement of Change is shown at the Annex to this report, and includes more detail of the proposals for the new leadership and management structure.
- 2.16 Individual teams below manager levels will also be restructured once the new leadership and management structure has been agreed. The four key principles underpinning this change are:
- (a) An increased resource to deliver an effective homelessness prevention service, both in terms of face to face contact with, and support for, homeless households and developing partnerships with landlords, developers, landowners and registered providers to maximise the number of new homes being provided;
 - (b) A reduced span of control of the heads of service to enable them to better support their teams whilst increasing their sphere of influence;
 - (c) That the impact on the Housing Revenue Account is cost neutral since the overall staffing resource will remain unchanged; and
 - (d) The proposal will help reduce costs and reduce the budget pressure on the General Fund in the medium to long term.
- 2.17 Consultation will begin with affected colleagues and trade unions in October 2017. The aim would be to recruit to head of service and manager levels as quickly as possible to enable them to lead on the implementation of the revised structure of their teams. It is anticipated that the new leadership and management structure will be in place by early 2018 with restructuring of the teams well advanced by 31 March 2018. However, it is likely that some posts will continue to be recruited to through the start of 2018/19 financial year; hence the phasing of the budget pressure over 2018/19 and 2019/20.
- 2.18 Given the introduction of the Homelessness Reduction Act in April 2018, it is likely that many authorities will be going through a similar exercise of recruiting additional staff and upskilling. It is, therefore, important that the Council is able to move quickly with this in order to limit competition for new staff.

Consequently, it is proposed that additional in year investment be made of £200,000 to enable recruitment to commence from October 2017.

- 2.19 The early investment of £200,000 will allow for the continued implementation of the Homelessness Recovery Plan, which is an internal management plan put in place since June 2017 to improve performance. The Plan aims to deliver savings in the current year, and ensure that demand from statutory homelessness is being managed effectively prior to the additional demand anticipated from the implementation of the Homelessness Reduction Act in April 2018.

Outcomes

- 2.20 Local residents deserve the best possible services. Since 2009/10, levels of homelessness have increased, with more people living in temporary accommodation. Staff levels have not kept pace with rising demand over the same period. This has resulted in officers managing caseloads in excess of 80 at any one time and homeless applications taking more than 100 days to determine. Government guidelines state that applications should be determined within 33 days.
- 2.21 The additional investment set out in this report will improve this situation and ensure people receive the best possible service. The proposals represent investment in a cost reduction strategy that will:
- (a) Reduce the number of people moving into temporary accommodation;
 - (b) Reduce the length of time it takes to determine applications;
 - (c) Reduce the length of time people stay in temporary accommodation;
 - (d) Reduce the average cost of nightly rates of temporary accommodation; and
 - (e) Contribute to an increase in the supply of good quality affordable permanent housing across all tenures.
- 2.22 In addition, the extra investment is vital if the Council is to be fully prepared for the introduction of the Homelessness Reduction Act in April 2018.
- 2.23 Overall, the aim of this investment strategy is to reduce the cost pressure on the Council's General Fund. Without this investment, it can be reasonably assumed that the number of people living in temporary accommodation will continue to rise at the rate seen over the last seven years. At this rate, and without the additional investment proposed in this report, projections indicate a pressure of £4.189m on the General Fund by March 2019. The aim of this strategy is to reduce the pressure by £1.611m, which together with other planned savings of £0.503m will reduce the net pressure to £2.075m
- 2.24 The net financial benefit of the restructure will, therefore, be a budget reduction of £0.861m in 2018/19, and £0.740m in 2019/20 once the structure is fully recruited to.

3. Options

3.1 There are three broad options:

- (a) To undertake a full service restructure as set out in the report (recommended). This will ensure that the Council has the right skills in the right place and the right level of resource to tackle the problem of homelessness in a strategic way. This will also enable the council to develop its strategic capacity as well as operational capacity to ensure that a full range of options, including more permanent affordable housing, is available.
- (b) To undertake a partial restructure (not recommended). This would enable the Council to resource its homeless service adequately but would not give the Council the opportunity to influence the provision of more permanent affordable housing. This could lead to a situation where more people are housed in temporary accommodation (as the homeless service itself is processing cases more efficiently) with no realistic option of securing permanent accommodation. This would be unlikely to deliver a net financial benefit.
- (c) To not restructure and stay as we are (not recommended). This option is likely to lead to a backlog in applications, resulting in more households being placed in emergency accommodation (Bed and Breakfast) at significant expense, whilst applications are processed at a slower rate. Placements could increasingly have to be made in locations outside Milton Keynes and the surrounding area. This would provide little mitigation to the anticipated budget pressure of £4.2m.

4. Implications

Policy

4.1 The Council Plan 2016-20 was approved by Full Council on 13 July 2016 and has three key aims:

1. A city of opportunity;
2. An affordable city; and
3. A healthy city.

4.2 The proposals set out in this report support the Council's aims of developing an affordable and healthy city. A city that helps people to meet their aspirations to live in a home that they can afford, enabling them to live long, healthy and fulfilling lives. The proposed restructure will enable the housing and regeneration service to work more closely with partners to encourage aspiration, independence and resilience; and ensure children and vulnerable people are protected from harm and neglect.

4.3 The proposals will achieve this by supporting key priorities in the Plan.

Budget – it will help reduce the budget pressure on the General Fund by working to prevent homelessness and reduce the use of temporary accommodation, supporting the Council secure a balanced medium-term budget that mitigates as far as possible against impacting adversely on the most vulnerable.

Housing – a stronger Strategic Housing function will enable the Council to take a leadership role in setting the local housing agenda and responding to policy challenges.

Homelessness – a stronger emphasis on prevention and support will help households secure and maintain accommodation that they can afford, ensuring that the most vulnerable members of our society are safeguarded

Children – the service will support vulnerable children where their family is at risk of homelessness.

Regeneration – the service will have increased capacity to continue to work with YourMK to deliver community-led regeneration of its priority estates.

Partnerships – a well-developed enabling, commissioning and partnership function will ensure a good relationship and better integrated working with all partners and stakeholders.

Resources and Risk

4.4 The 2018/19 and subsequent budgetary consequences of the recommendations, if approved, will be included in the council’s budget and Medium Term Financial Plan for 2018/19 to 20121/22.

4.5 The current year budgetary consequences will be that the P06 projected overspend of c£1.4m will reduce as the work of the additional staffing resource delivers savings. The in-year costs [c£0.200m as per recommendation 1.1 (c)] against the Housing & Regeneration staffing budget will be covered by drawing down against the Value For Money/Invest To Save reserve.

4.6 There is a risk that the proposed additional expenditure may not deliver the target benefits – and that even if it does, external factors (principally homelessness demand, but also including changes in government policy, underfunding of new HRA duties, unanticipated adverse impacts of welfare reform) may result in continuing (or growing) Temporary Accommodation overspends. This risk can be mitigated by effective management of the additional staffing resource to ensure that optimum outcomes are achieved. However, more significantly, there is a larger risk (amounting almost to a certainty) that without the proposed increased staffing resource, costs of Temporary Accommodation will continue to increase at an unsupportable rate

N	Capital	Y	Revenue	Y	Accommodation
N	IT	Y	Medium Term Plan	N	Asset Management

Carbon and Energy Management

4.7 The proposals have a neutral impact on carbon and energy management.

Legal

4.8 Section 112 of the Local Government Act 1972 enables the Council to appoint such Officers as it thinks necessary for the discharge of its functions. Legal and Human Resource advice has been taken in the preparation of this report to ensure the proposals in the report are compliant with the Council's human resources policies and the law.

4.9 Legal advice has been taken in respect of the legislative references in the report.

Other Implications

4.10 An Equality Impact Assessment has been completed and is available on the website. The decision will significantly contribute to the Council's statutory equality objective on homelessness and advance equality of opportunity for a number of residents with various backgrounds; in particular those disadvantaged by age, people with different heritages and those with a disability. This objective will be achieved by focussing the attention of the service to address homelessness and the major issues faced by housing. It is therefore recommended to continue with the decision.

Y	Equalities/Diversity	N	Sustainability	N	Human Rights
N	E-Government	N	Stakeholders	N	Crime and Disorder

Background Papers: None

Annex(es): Annex – Proposed Statement of Change

[Annexes to Proposed Housing and Regeneration Restructure](#)

NOTICES OF MOTIONS - STREET HOMELESSNESS

STATEMENT TO CABINET ON 3 OCTOBER 2017

PROVISION OF EMERGENCY ACCOMMODATION FOR STREET HOMELESS

At the Cabinet meeting held on Tuesday 12 September, Cabinet approved a draft Roughsleeper Strategy for consultation.

The strategy aims to ensure that we have the right medium and long term policies in place to ensure we help people who have found themselves sleeping on the street, work with partners to provide help and support, and tackle increasing levels of anti-social behaviour reported by members of the public.

We have consistently stated that tackling all homelessness, including roughsleeping, is a priority for MK Council and the Labour Administration. Levels of roughsleeping and other forms of homelessness continue to place a huge strain on our resources as a local authority at a time of huge financial pressure and central government cuts.

Later in the Cabinet meeting we will discuss a re-structure of the Housing Department and extra resources to deal with extra responsibilities being placed on MK Council and to improve our housing service, including faster referrals and decision making which if agreed, will help to manage our housing duties better and provide a better service.

Over the past months we have made significant progress in establishing services and provision for roughsleepers in Milton Keynes. We have secured premises and provided funding for a One Stop Shop, the Winter Night Shelter is working to provide emergency accommodation all year round and extra beds in winter and I'm pleased to announce we have secured a temporary site, subject to planning, for The Bus Shelter MK. We are also working to improve the MK Homelessness Partnership.

Tomorrow evening the Budget Scrutiny Committee will start to review the pressures facing the 2018/19 budget. I am pleased to state that as part of those pressures we will be proposing to commit funding in the 2018/19 budget towards:

- Expanding the Outreach Worker service to enable more work to be done identifying and supporting those sleeping rough.
- Funding for the ongoing costs of the One Stop Shop based at the Old Bus Station.

However we are well aware that despite 46 new emergency accommodation beds for street homeless people being provided by partners this winter, the progress to ensure enough emergency provision for roughsleepers in Milton Keynes has not been as we would have liked. I am today announcing after discussions with officers:

- We will use one-off resources to fund at least 30 emergency placements over the coming winter. I have asked the Corporate Director of Place to bring forward this proposal for decision as quickly as possible. We will use the Roughsleeping Strategy consultation and the budget process to determine if we should include this as part of our permanent base budget.
- We believe that providing nearly at least 80 emergency placements and an expanded outreach service will help us move substantially towards our goal that all those who have a genuine housing need from Milton Keynes, and wish to take it, will be able to be offered a safe place to sleep at night.

Furthermore I have requested:

- That MK Council work with the MK Clinical Commissioning Group and partners to bring forward plans for a support service for those roughsleepers with a mental illness, drug or alcohol issue. We will then request funding for this service from Central Government in the first instance given our difficult budget position.
- That MK Council develop plans, both as an employer and facilitator with businesses, to provide offers of training or employment to people sleeping rough.
- That MK Council investigate ways to offer an alternative to cash begging to enable people to donate funds to those that help homeless people in the knowledge it will be used for the reason given.

The current consultation on the draft Roughsleepers Strategy will continue and it is very important to establish the policy this council works towards, however it is clear that until that consultation has taken place and we have a clear strategy for the future, more urgent action was required for this winter. I hope this announcement will be able to add to the responses and feed into the work we do moving forward as a baseline for services.

Wards Affected:

All Wards

ITEM 6**MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL****18 OCTOBER 2017****JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROPOSAL**

Responsible Cabinet Member: Councillor Peter Marland, Leader of the Cabinet

Report Sponsor: Carole Mills, Chief Executive

Author and contact: Paul Cummins, Head of Legal Services and Deputy Monitoring Officer Tel: 01908 254195
Dwight McKenzie, Scrutiny Review Officer
Tel: 01908 252177**Executive Summary:**

Councils must form a Joint Health Overview Scrutiny Committee (JHOSC) where a proposal amounts to a substantial development or variation of the provision of health services which affects more than one Council area and on which they will be consulted. This will happen with the NHS Sustainable and Transformation Partnership (STP) formerly known as the NHS Sustainable and Transformation Plan. Milton Keynes Council is therefore obliged to respond to the consultation via a JHOSC rather than as an individual Council.

This report provides background information on the proposed establishment of a JHOSC comprising Milton Keynes, Bedford, Luton and Central Bedfordshire Councils. It outlines the reasons for the establishment of a JHOSC, and recommends that Milton Keynes participates in the JHOSC and Council approves the JHOSC Terms of Reference (TOR).

1. Recommendation(s)**1.1 That Council:**

- a) Approve the establishment of a Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (discretionary JHOSC with statutory scrutiny powers) to scrutinise the Sustainable and Transformation Partnership (STP) for Bedford, Bedfordshire, Luton and Milton Keynes.
- b) Approve the model JHOSC *Terms of Reference* set out in the attached Annex.
- c) Delegate authority to the Chief Executive to approve any variations to the *Terms of Reference* following further discussion with the other constituent authorities, subject to consultation with the Group Leaders in respect of any proposed significant variations.
- d) To waive the requirement for the Joint Committee to be politically proportionate across the constituent authorities.
- e) Subject to recommendations (a) to (d) above, to nominate three non-executive Councillors (and substitutes) to serve on the JHOSC.

2. Issues

- 2.1 NHS England (NHSE) has established 44 Sustainability and Transformation Partnership (STP) areas – or footprints – each of which brings together all the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) in their area and populations of between 1 and 2 million people. In footprint areas local NHS commissioners, providers and local authorities are working together to develop a STP in relation to health and care services within the footprint area. These groups incorporate all health and care systems in their area.
- 2.2 Each area's STP is required to set out how the local system will improve health and wellbeing for its population, improve service quality and deliver financial sustainability. STPs are intended to help ensure that services are joined up and planned by place rather than around institutions. The plans must show how services will evolve and deliver the NHS's *Five Year Forward View*, published in October 2014 by NHSE, which sets out a vision for the future based on seven new models of care: multi-speciality community providers, primary and acute care systems; urgent and emergency care networks; acute care collaborations; specialised care; modern maternity services and enhanced health in care homes.
- 2.3 Milton Keynes is part of the Bedfordshire, Luton and Milton Keynes (BLMK) STP which has acquired "lead Accountable Care System" (ACS) status making it one of the benchmark STPs across the country. Twelve NHS organisations (i.e. three CCGs, three hospitals, two ambulance trusts, Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust and three other partners that work both within our area and in other STP areas) and four councils are working together to develop and implement the STP for our area. The JHOSC proposed comprising Milton Keynes, Bedford, Central Bedfordshire and Luton Councils reflect the footprint covered by the BLMK STP.
- 2.4 It is possible that as a result of the STP process there may be proposals for changes to health services which could be considered to be 'substantial' under the relevant legislation and therefore NHS Commissioners would be required to carry out a public consultation.
- 2.5 Where the NHS considers that a service change may be required, and that there may need to be a public consultation, there is a requirement on the NHS to consult with the health scrutiny functions of those councils where there are residents affected by those proposals. If two or more council's health scrutiny functions consider the proposals to be substantial and also wish to be formally consulted on those proposals then legislation requires those councils to establish a JHOSC for this purpose. This JHOSC would be the sole statutory health scrutiny consultee for the purposes of that consultation.
- 2.6 Council approval of the recommendations in this report will enable Milton Keynes Council to put in place appropriate arrangements for the scrutiny of the STP and any substantial proposals arising from the STP process.

3. Options

3.1 *Options for Models for a JHOSC for the STP*

There are three possible models for a standing JHOSC for the BLMK STP, taking into account that there is a statutory requirement to form a JHOSC where proposals for substantial service change affect the residents of more than one local authority area. The following options provide the opportunity for councillors to consider adding discretionary as well as statutory powers to a JHOSC.

3.2 *Option 1: Separate JHOSC arrangements*

Under Option 1 each Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) covered by the STP footprint would separately consider each service proposal as it came forward and set up a JHOSC for each one if more than one council considered it to be a substantial change.

Councillors should be aware that this option could lead to several JHOSCs being formed across the STP footprint comprising of two or more councils considering different elements of the priorities of the STP. It would encourage duplication and add delays into the process of arranging necessary shared meetings, such delays could impact on the ability of the authorities to effectively consider service proposals in fast moving environment of change in health provision.

3.3 *Option 2: Statutory JHOSC where councils separately consider if the matter is substantial*

Under Option 2 a standing JHOSC would be established only to be used when necessary. NHS commissioners would present a report to each of the relevant OSCs separately where the public may be affected. If the relevant OSCs/HASCs agree that the change is substantial it is referred to the standing JHOSC for formal consideration.

In order to minimise duplication the JHOSC could be given the role of considering whether or not a proposal was substantial, which would be a streamlined approach and allow for consistency between proposals, as opposed to that role sitting with each local authority's health OSC separately.

Where the proposal affected only one authority, it would be referred back to that authority's health OSC.

This option does not provide the JHOSC with discretionary powers in relation to the 'strategic' scrutiny of the STP, which would be left to the local authority health OSCs to carry out separately.

3.4 *Option 3: Discretionary JHOSC with statutory scrutiny powers*

Under Option 3 any proposed changes to services under the auspices of the STP would be presented to the JHOSC as soon as possible setting out the reasons for the review, a preliminary engagement plan and the timetable for the review. The JHOSC would decide whether the change was substantial and review the proposals at a JHOSC meeting.

In addition the HASCs/OSCs would agree to delegate the discretionary powers to consider the strategic issues associated with the STP and to look at the 'interconnected' issues between the priorities, and scrutinise those

elements, such as NHS digitisation or the development of an ACS/Organisation. This option allows councillors to link the strategic scrutiny of the STP to those proposals for change, and to consider the inter-dependencies of the workstreams across the STP.

One JHOSC will enable councillors to develop continuing familiarity with the STP and its workstreams, and would therefore strengthen their scrutiny of proposals. It could also compare service change proposals to ensure a consistent approach to what constituted substantial, and what good engagement looked like.

Option 3 provides a more timely process as the NHS would only need to take issues to one body rather than four. A JHOSC meeting would be able to consider several proposals at the same time. It would also be able to share the administrative requirements of this process.

4. Implications

4.1 Policy

Milton Keynes Council membership of JHOSC contribute to the Council's partnership goal of working with health and other public services to innovate, reform and improve outcomes. It would also contribute to the Council's objective of "A Healthy Place" ensuring lifelong wellbeing for all, with people living long and healthy lives.

Further beneficial implications for Milton Keynes Council of JHOSC are:

- Avoids the appearance of BLMK Councils (including Milton Keynes) being 'behind the curve' as JHOSCs have been or are being set up regionally across England;
- Ensures the Council is informed regarding current regional health service provision affecting the borough;
- Enables the Council to obtain greater information from the NHS and neighbouring Councils which could be of immense value in local health scrutiny;
- Provides a good opportunity to build effective working relationships across the footprint, build confidence and credibility and cement a good reputation for Milton Keynes Council;
- Enables the Council to influence in this important arena.

4.2 Resources and Risk

Any costs arising from the establishment of a JHOSC can be met from existing resources.

If the health scrutiny function considered a proposal on health services across two or more council areas to be substantial, but did not join a joint committee with other affected councils, then it would not be able to effectively exercise its statutory powers, including referral to the Secretary of State for Health, in respect of that proposal. There is a risk therefore that the Council may not be able to properly represent the impact of the proposal on its residents and services, for example, in areas, such as social care.

N	Capital	N	Revenue	N	Accommodation
N	IT	N	Medium Term Plan	N	Asset Management

4.3 Carbon and Energy Management

None

4.4 Legal

The Local Authority (Public Health, Health and Wellbeing Boards and Health Scrutiny) Regulation 2013 set out the health scrutiny powers of local authorities in relation to health services delivered to residents in their area. This includes a requirement that, where a council health scrutiny function wishes to be formally consulted on a change to health services and that the proposal affects other councils who also consider the proposal to be substantial, a joint health scrutiny committee is established. Without a joint committee, the health scrutiny functions cannot separately be consulted or exercised with regard to that proposal.

Councils may appoint a discretionary joint health scrutiny committee (Regulation 30) to carry out all or specified health scrutiny functions in relation to health issues that cross council boundaries. Establishing a JHOSC doesn't prevent each individual appointing council from separately scrutinising health issues and it's sensible that they continue to do so for local matters.

Milton Keynes Council appointments to JHOSC is governed by *Article 4.2* of the Constitution. Appointments should be politically balanced unless this is waived by full Council. Appointees may not be councillors who are on the Cabinet. Nothing in the Constitution compels the appointment of only current scrutiny councillors to an 'outside' scrutiny body, although appointed councillors should not have a conflict of interest; so councillors on the Health & Well Being Board are not eligible for such appointment.

A JHOSC does not have any additional decision making powers beyond a scrutiny body.

4.5 Other Implications

None

N	Equalities/Diversity	N	Sustainability	N	Human Rights
N	E-Government	N	Stakeholders	N	Crime and Disorder

Background Papers: BLMK Update on the Sustainability and Transformation Partnership (STP) and Accountable Care System for Bedfordshire, Luton and Milton Keynes (BLMK), 30th June 2017
Local Authority Health Scrutiny Guidance, Department of Health (2014)

Annex: JHOSC Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The below have been proposed following a meeting on 27 September 2017 of Councillors from Bedford Borough Council, Central Bedfordshire Council, Luton Borough Council and Milton Keynes Council.

JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: BEDFORDSHIRE, LUTON AND MILTON KEYNES SUSTAINABILITY AND TRANSFORMATION PARTNERSHIP (STP)

Terms of Reference

Membership

- 1.1. That the requirement for political proportionality is waived. Each council may apply proportionality in their own appointment process if they wish.
- 1.2. That the JHOSC is comprised of Members from Bedford Borough Council, Central Bedford Council, Luton Borough Council and Milton Keynes Council.
- 1.3. That each council appoints 3 members to the JHOSC as per their own arrangements. Substitutes will be permitted. (NB: these should be non-executive members of the local authority)
- 1.4. That the quorum will be at least one member from three of the four constituent councils.

Chairing, voting, standing orders and meeting schedule

- 1.5. The JHOSC will elect four Vice-Chairs (one from each member authority) each year. The meetings will be chaired by the Vice-Chair from the authority where the meeting is taking place. There will be no standing Chair.
- 1.6. The JHOSC will operate under the standing orders of the lead administrative local authority.
- 1.7. Each Member of the Committee will have one vote.
- 1.8. The JHOSC will agree the venues, dates and times of its meetings, noting that its work will be subject to the NHS timetable for consultation in some cases.

Support to the JHOSC

- 1.9. The lead administrative authority and other member authorities will provide administrative and scrutiny support to the JHOSC. The lead administrative authority will act as the co-ordinating body for the JHOSC and will provide a named officer for that purpose. Each authority will provide a named officer to act as scrutiny support and liaise with the lead administrative authority officer and the JHOSC officer support group as required.
- 1.10. The member authorities will share costs equally associated with hosting the JHOSC.

1.11. Each member authority will publish and distribute committee papers to its own members. The lead administrative authority will ensure that the JHOSC papers are published on the internet.

Scope of the JHOSC's Work

- 1.12. That the JHOSC will scrutinise the work done under the auspices of the local BLMK STP, across the 5 workstreams and the STP governance arrangements.
- 1.13. That the JHOSC, for the purposes of statutory consultation on service change proposals arising from the STP, will act as the statutory health scrutiny consultee for those local authorities affected by those proposals. Where only one authority is affected, the matter will be referred back by the JHOSC to the local authority's HOSC.
- 1.14. That the JHOSC will, in the course of its work, require attendance from appropriate representatives of NHS organisations and require evidence in writing.
- 1.15. That the JHOSC may, as part of its scrutiny of the STP and any statutory consultations arising from the STP, invite interested parties to attend and give evidence to the JHOSC, in person and in writing.

JHOSC Reports

- 1.16. At the conclusion of evidence gathering, Members will deliberate and agree in principle, their conclusions, comments and recommendations. The JHOSC will then delegate the responsibility for drafting its final report to the lead administrative council scrutiny officer, after consultation with the four Vice-Chairs.
- 1.17. The JHOSC will endeavour to reach consensus and avoid the need for any minority reports. If unavoidable, a minority report could be prepared by a dissenting JHOSC Member or Members and attached to the final report.
- 1.18. The scrutiny officers will collaborate to prepare the draft report, summarising the evidence, conclusions and any comments and recommendations agreed by the JHOSC. The draft report will be circulated to each Member of the JHOSC for comments.
- 1.19. Once the final version of the report has been agreed, after consultation with the four Vice-Chairs, the lead scrutiny officer will forward it directly to the NHS commissioners/responsible body, with a request for a written response within timescales set out in legislation.

Local Resolution and Referral Powers

- 1.20. The JHOSC will carry out the process of local resolution with the relevant NHS bodies where it is required under the statutory consultation process.

1.21. Powers of referral to the Secretary of State for Health are to be retained by each local authority to exercise separately at the conclusion of each statutory consultation, on receipt of the JHOSC report and any relevant minority report from a JHOSC Member or Members.

Press and Media

- 1.22. That the lead administrative authority will act as the initial contact point for any press queries arising from the work of the JHOSC and will liaise with the Communications Teams of each participating local authority in order to ensure that the four Vice-Chairs consider and approve any comments on press queries.
- 1.23. The JHOSC will approve press releases relating to its work, delegating the responsibility for drafting them to the supporting officer group in consultation with the four Vice-Chairs.

Changes to the Terms of Reference

- 1.24. Any changes to the ToR can only be made by express agreement of the member authorities.

Date	Councillor	Ward	Party	Details of Scheme	Amount £
01/08/17	Eastman, Derek	NP South	Liberal Democrat	Newport Pagnell Town Council - Contribution towards the cost of running the Horticultural Show for Newport Pagnell.	50
01/08/17	Eastman, Derek	NP South	Liberal Democrat	Newport Pagnell Christmas Lights - contribution to the Christmas Lights Committee for the erection of Christmas lights in Newport Pagnell.	100
01/08/17	Eastman, Derek	NP South	Liberal Democrat	The Food Bank - To provide funding for the provision of food parcels to those living in poverty within the Newport Pagnell South Ward area.	250
02/08/17	Eastman, Derek	NP South	Liberal Democrat	United Reformed Church Newport Pagnell - Contribution towards the cost of development of the community building, The Mead Centre, at the United Reformed Church in Newport Pagnell.	200
30/08/17	Eastman, Derek	NP South	Liberal Democrat	Newport Pagnell Baptist Church - Contribution towards the cost of providing a community defibrillator at Newport Pagnell Baptist Church.	100
30/08/17	Eastman, Derek	NP South	Liberal Democrat	The Brooklands Centre - Contribution towards the cost of printing a booklet covering some of the history of Newport Pagnell.	100
10/09/17	Eastman, Derek	NP South	Liberal Democrat	Great Linford Parish Council - Contribution towards the cost of community litter picking and tidy up in Blakelands and Giffard Park.	100
19/07/17	Hopkins, David	Danesborough & Walton	Conservative	Sands Singers - Donation to Sands Singers, a community choir based in Woburn Sands.	200
27/07/17	Hopkins, Victoria	Danesborough & Walton	Conservative	Walton Community Council - Parish Guardian; purchase of children's litter-picking kits and promotional items.	200
20/07/17	Hosking, David	Olney	Conservative	Olney Parochial Church Council - Donation towards a young churchgoers' life skills project at the church of St Peter and St Paul to take a group of young people to Canada during summer 2017 to develop their life skills by working with under-privileged people.	100
07/09/17	Jenkins, Alice	Danesborough & Walton	Conservative	Walton Community Council - Purchase and installation of a 70 litre green dog waste bin at Caldecotte Lake. This bin will replace the existing 45 litre dog waste bin.	275
25/07/17	Khan, Mohammed	Bletchley East	Labour	Marshalls Coaches - Coach trip for Milton Keynes Bangladeshi Association.	670
30/08/17	Khan, Mohammed	Bletchley East	Labour	Newton Leys Residents Association - Contribution towards Newton Leys Summer Fayre.	250
19/07/17	Marland, Peter	Wolverton	Labour	MK Christian Foundation Ltd - Urb Farm in Wolverton. To purchase and build a large traditional tipi and buy a secure lock up container for forest school sessions and community events year round.	500
13/09/17	Marland, Peter	Wolverton	Labour	New Bradwell Parish Council - Contribution towards community clean up and new planting at The Clock Tower & War Memorial in New Bradwell.	250
12/06/17	McCall, Douglas	NP South	Liberal Democrat	Newport Pagnell Baptist Church - Contribution to the purchase of a defibrillator for Lovat Hall Community Centre.	125
16/06/17	McCall, Douglas	NP South	Liberal Democrat	Tickford Meadow Children's Centre - Donation towards new play equipment for Tickford Meadow Children's Centre.	100
31/08/17	McCall, Douglas	NP South	Liberal Democrat	Newport Pagnell Fireworks - Contribution to the fireworks display at Newport Pagnell Fireworks Display and Fun Fair in November.	250

31/08/17	McCall, Douglas	NP South	Liberal Democrat	Newport Pagnell CoderDojo - Contribution to volunteer group CoderDojo who teach youth members computer programming in various languages.	250
26/06/17	McLean, Keith	Olney	Conservative	Olney Parochial Church Council - Donation towards a young churchgoers' life skills project at the church of St Peter and St Paul to take a group of young people to Canada during summer 2017 to develop their life skills by working with under-privileged people.	100
19/07/17	Middleton, Rob	Wolverton	Labour	MK Christian Foundation Ltd - Urb Farm in Wolverton. To purchase and build a large traditional tipi and buy a secure lock up container for forest school sessions and community events year round.	500
05/07/17	Morla, Geetha	Tattenhoe	Conservative	Shenley Church End Parish Council - New cooker for Oxley Park Community Centre.	500
06/09/17	Small, Gerald	Tattenhoe	Conservative	Little Owls Children's Centre - Funding for Friday support worker.	380
25/07/17	Walker, Alex	Stantonbury	Conservative	Stantonbury Parish Council - To support 4 free children's events for 'Football in the Park', during August 2017 in Cawarden Park Stantonbury.	100
12/06/17	Wallis, Pauline	Central Milton Keynes	Labour	Summerfield School - Towards the cost of fitting bike sheds at Summerfield School.	1000
13/06/17	Williams, Chris	Shenley Brook End	Liberal Democrat	Emerson Valley School - Provide several new chickens and fox-safe improvements/security to existing chicken coop and run on Emerson Valley School grounds.	250
16/06/17	Williams, Chris	Shenley Brook End	Liberal Democrat	Technical Support Team - Development Management - Milton Keynes Council - Variation of condition 16 (opening hours) attached to planning application 15/01063/FUL to provide overnight accommodation/shelter at Community Centre, Shenley Brook End.	195
Total					7095