

Minutes of the MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL held on WEDNESDAY 22 NOVEMBER 2017 at 7.30 pm

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

Apologies: Councillors Betteley, Burke, Hosking, Legg and Miles and Aldermen Bartlett, Beeley, Bristow, E Henderson and Howell and Alderwomen Irons, I Henderson, Lloyd and Saunders

Also Present: 27 members of the public

CL65 MINUTES

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 18 October 2017 be approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record.

CL66 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

No disclosures were made.

CL67 ANNOUNCEMENTS

(a) Councillor Sarah Betteley

The Mayor announced the birth of Councillor Sarah Betteley's daughter, Matilda. The Mayor extended the Council's good wishes to Councillor Betteley and her family.

(b) Councillor Jeanette Green

The Mayor announced with great sadness the death of Councillor Jeanette Green. Councillor Green had represented the Newport Pagnell North and Hanslope Ward from 2014 and had also been an active member of Hanslope Parish Council and Walton Parish Council before that.

The Council heard from a number of councillors before standing in silence as a mark of respect.

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

- (a) Question from Mr R Adams to Councillor Gowans (Cabinet member for Public Realm)

Mr R Adams, referring to the missing road signs at Redbourne Court and Clailey Court Galley Hill asked Councillor Gowans when the signs would be replaced as a number of packages had failed to be delivered as a result of the missing signs and it could lead to emergency services having difficulties in finding addresses in a timely manner.

Councillor Gowans indicated that the current road sign budget was not sufficient to meet demand and those signs required to meet health and safety requirements had to be prioritised. However, ways to improve the situation were being investigated.

Mr Adams, as a supplementary question, asked Councillor Gowans for a definitive time line for the signs to be replaced, preferably before Christmas this year.

Councillor Gowans indicated that as the sign for Clailey Court had been recovered it was programmed to be reinstalled before Christmas, but at present there was no date for the replacement of the sign for Redbourne Court.

- (b) Questions from Mr M Blomley to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Mr Blomley asked Councillor Marland why, after 30 years, is the Council still failing to recognise Passmore as an estate in its publically issued documents. Mr Blomley referred to the recently issued crime statistics as an example.

Councillor Marland, pointing out that crime statistics were issued by Thames Valley Police not the Council, indicated that the Council did recognise Passmore as an estate in its own right and undertook for the statistics compiled by the Council to be reviewed. However, Councillor Marland pointed out that statistics were often compiled on a ward or community basis.

Mr Blomley, as a supplementary question, asked Councillor Marland to ensure that Passmore was recognised in its own right and not included together with Tinkers Bridge.

Councillor Marland stated that communities across Milton Keynes frequently linked up for various purposes and it was often a matter for the community itself to create its identity.

- (c) Question from Mr T Baines to Councillor Gifford (Cabinet member for Place)

Mr Baines, referring to Plan:MK, specifically page 244 which showed a list of estates and their facilities, ask Councillor Gifford why Passmore, which had been an established estate since the 1970s, was missing.

Councillor Gifford indicated that page 244 referred to local centres, but she would ask officer colleagues to review whether Passmore should be included and advise Mr Baines.

- (d) Questions from Mr S Dunn to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Mr Dunn, expressing concerns that the Regeneration process was neither resident led, open, nor transparent and quoting a number of examples, asked Councillor Marland if he would agree to a meeting with members of the Fullers Slade Residents Association to discuss the concerns.

Councillor Marland, noting the views expressed, indicated that if the Residents' Association, or any other group was feeling excluded from the process it needed to be addressed.

Councillor Marland suggested that now might be an appropriate time for the Council and Your:MK to reflect on what was working well and what wasn't working as well with the aim of rebuilding trust between Your:MK and residents.

- (e) Questions from Mrs M Dunn to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Mrs Dunn, referring to the proposed referendum on the regeneration of Fullers Slade asked Councillor Marland if he could clarify the extent of the regeneration area and whether the referendum would include all the residents within the Fullers Slade grid square, bearing in mind that even residents whose properties were not to be redeveloped would still be impacted by the regeneration proposals.

Councillor Marland indicated that the motion on regeneration to be debated later in the meeting was only advisory on the Cabinet, but the Cabinet would consider very carefully both what residents and councillors said and take those views into account.

Councillor Marland explained that he thought it was important that the Council made it clear who could vote in the referendum and stressed the importance of getting 'buy-in' from all residents.

Councillor Marland undertook to inform residents in the regeneration areas of the outcomes from the Cabinet's consideration of the issues arising from the motion to be debated by the Council.

- (f) Questions from Mr B Wilde to Councillor Marland (Leader of the Council)

Mr Wilde, stating that Fullers Slade Residents Association had been endeavouring, without success, to receive all Stock, Structural and Building Services Survey reports and detailed costs for the estate's 278 social housing units so that it could evaluate the four Regeneration Options presented by YourMK, asked Councillor Marland to seek a deferment to any Referendum/Ballot until all information was made available. Mr Wilde also asked that the Cabinet member act as an arbiter to what constitutes 'all information'.

Councillor Marland advised that the information on the stock condition survey had now been published on the YourMK website.

Councillor Marland emphasised the importance of good communication if there was to be trust between the various parties and indicated that the comments regarding pausing the process would be considered.

CL69

THE ABILITY OF COUNCILLORS TO SCRUTINISE OFFICER DECISIONS

Councillor C Williams moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Eastman:

- “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 councillors 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.”

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

“That sections (a) and (b) of clause 4 be deleted and the following new sections insert after ‘This Council, therefore, agrees the following:’

- ‘(a) That the Constitution Commission of Milton Keynes Council be asked to look into mechanisms for ensuring that ward councillors can scrutinise decisions taken by officers, and to consider possible thresholds for such considerations.
- (b) That the Constitution Commission be asked to consider mechanisms to ensure that those making decisions, whether to tender or to award, and those scrutinising them, are notified when a previous contract of this type has come under investigation, and the reasons for the concern, so that appropriate measures can be included in any new specification or contract.”

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

RESOLVED –

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 be asked to look into mechanisms for ensuring that ward councillors can scrutinise decisions taken by officers, and to consider possible thresholds for such considerations.
 - (b) That the Constitution Commission be asked to consider mechanisms to ensure that those making decisions, whether to tender or to award, and those scrutinising them, are notified when a previous contract of this type has come under investigation, and the reasons for the concern, so that appropriate measures can be included in any new specification or contract.

CL70

DEALING WITH AMENDMENTS TO RECOMMENDATIONS AND MOTIONS

Councillor R Bradburn moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Constitution Commission held on 4 October 2017, which was seconded by Councillor Marland:

“That the Council be recommended to adopt the revised approach to dealing with Amendments to Recommendations and Motions as set out in the revised Council Procedure Rule 13.”

Councillor Brackenbury moved the following amendment, which was seconded by Councillor McPake:

“That clause 13.8 (b)(ii) of Council Procedure Rules not be deleted.”

Councillor Dransfield moved the following amendment, which was seconded by Councillor Marland:

- “1. That the words ‘to move or second a motion’ be deleted from the first line of clause 13.5 of Council Procedure Rules.
- 2. That a comma be added after the word ‘moved’ in the first line of clause 13.6(c) of Council Procedure Rules and the letters ‘es’ removed from the word ‘speeches’ in the second line.”

The Council noted that In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 21.2 the recommendation and amendments would stand adjourned without discussion to the next ordinary meeting of the Council.

CL71

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES FOLLOWING CORPORATE PROCUREMENT PEER REVIEW

Councillor R Bradburn moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Constitution Commission held on 4 October 2017, which was seconded by Councillor Marland:

“That the Council be recommended to amend the sum of £100,000 to £500,000 in the Note to the Key Decision Definition in Article 4 of the Constitution.”

Councillor Dransfield moved the following amendment, which with the consent of the Council he subsequently withdrew on receiving the Leader of the Council's undertaking that any decision on a contract which was not a Key Decision would be taken by the Cabinet or a Cabinet member if requested by another councillor, until such time as the Constitution Commission had the opportunity to review the call-in arrangements:

"That the words ' , but proposed decisions over £50K will be published in the Forward Plan and be capable of being called in' be added to the end of the recommendation."

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

CL72

DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Councillor R Bradburn moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Constitution Commission held on 4 October 2017, which was seconded by Councillor Marland:

"That the Council be recommended to amend:

- (a) Council Procedure Rule 19.5; and
- (b) Cabinet Procedure Rule 3

so that they clarify the actions to be taken by councillors when disclosing a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, a personal interests or other conflict of interest."

The Council noted that In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 21.2 the recommendation would stand adjourned without discussion to the next ordinary meeting of the Council.

CL73

MAKING OF WOUGHTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Councillor Gifford (Cabinet member for Place) moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 7 November 2017, which was seconded by Councillor K Wilson:

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

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

RESOLVED –

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



COUNCILLORS' QUESTIONS

- (a) Question from Councillor C Williams to Councillor Long
(Cabinet member for Housing and Adult Care)

Councillor C Williams, referring to the Leader's comments in response to the housing elements of the Chancellor's Budget, as far as they affected Milton Keynes, asked Councillor Long if he had any comments to make in support of the Leader.

Councillor Long indicated that he believed the comments from the Leader to be excellent and highlighted that he thought the Chancellor's Budget to be a farce and a lost opportunity.

Councillor Long indicated that in terms of the housing elements of the Budget, the reduction in Stamp Duty would have the effect of pushing up house prices and would do little to address the shortage of housing. Councillor Long also expressed his disappointment that the Chancellor, while removing the Housing Revenue Account Borrowing Cap for some councils had not done so for Milton Keynes, despite the Council persistently asking the local Members of Parliament to address the issue with Government.

Councillor Long emphasised the Council's determination to address the homelessness issue, which currently meant that there were 700 families with over a thousand children in temporary accommodation. If the homelessness issue was to be addressed it was necessary to increase the housing supply.

Councillor C Williams, referring to the Chancellor's statement that he was going to raise the Housing Revenue Account Borrowing Cap where housing was needed as a priority, asked Councillor Long as a supplementary question how much money would Milton Keynes be able to spend as a result.

Councillor Long indicated that Milton Keynes would receive nothing, but if the Borrowing Cap was removed the Council would be able to invest tens of thousands of pounds in housing. The Council needed to be free to invest, but he believed that the Council would be in a better position if it had not been let down by the local Members of Parliament.

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

Councillor P Geary, referring to the lack of a response to his question to Councillor Middleton ask at the September meeting of the Council (Minute CL42[d]) regarding whether the refurbishment of the Civic Offices was compliant with Building Control Regulations asked Councillor Middleton if he was now in a position to reply.

Councillor Middleton indicated that he believed that he had responded by email the following week and his response had confirmed that the works carried out were compliant with Building Control Permissions.

Councillor P Geary, clarifying that his question was about whether the Civic Offices was compliant with Building Control Regulations in respect of such matters as providing adequate fire exits to cope with the increased numbers of staff that would be accommodated, asked Councillor Middleton as a supplementary question, if the building complied.

Councillor Middleton indicated that he might have misunderstood the original question and agreed to seek further clarification and reply in writing. However, as far as he was aware all necessary permissions were in place.

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

Councillor Bint, referring to the recent cluster of accidents at the junction of Fen Street and Newport Road in Broughton, asked Councillor Marland if the concerns of residents about the design of the road could be looked into.

Councillor Marland indicated that the Administration took road safety issues very seriously and he would ensure that the quarterly report on highway issues in the Eastern Expansion Area addressed the road safety concerns at this junction.

Councillor Bint, as a supplementary question, asked Councillor Marland if the specific design of the right turn into the Old Newport Road could be addressed as there was not room to get a car into the central safety space.

Councillor Marland asked that Councillor Bint send details of his concerns to Councillor Gowans, the responsible Cabinet member, who was aware of the problem as he had recently been and inspected the junction.

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

Councillor McLean, referring to a question he had sent to Councillor Gowans on 16 October 2017 and again on 10 November 2017 regarding road safety at a junction which had been raised with him by a constituent who cycled each day from North Crawley to Walnut Tree, asked Councillor Marland if a prompt response could be arranged.

Councillor Marland indicated that the Corporate Director - Place, who was in attendance this evening, would ask the appropriate Head of Service to respond as soon as possible.



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

Councillor A Geary, referring to the statement sent out by the Corporate Director – Place regarding the Residual Waste Treatment Plant, suggested that if this had been at National level the Speaker of the House of Commons would have been summoning the Prime Minister to the House to make a statement. Councillor Geary asked Councillor Marland what had happened to the contracts signed with neighbouring authorities to use the Residual Waste Treatment Plant and, if they had fallen, what were the financial implications for this Council resulting from the ongoing delays.

Councillor Marland indicated that testing at the Plant had recommenced on 21 November 2017. Referring to the Longstop date of February 2018, which formed part of the Contract agreed by the previous Conservative Administration, and the contracts agreed with neighbouring authorities, Councillor Marland stated that he did not believe that any contracts had been lost so far, but he undertook to provide details of any financial implications in writing.

Councillor A Geary, referring to the Longstop date, asked Councillor Marland as a supplementary question, what was the period of the delay since the Plant was originally programmed to be up and running.

Councillor Marland, referring to the unproven and unknown nature of the technology being used, stated that the Longstop date was to ensure that there was enough time to test the technology. He believed the best officers were monitoring the testing and those with the most knowledge of the technology were undertaking the testing.

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

Councillor Bald, referring to the previous question from Councillor A Geary asked Councillor Middleton, bearing in mind that the Residual Waste Treatment Plant was using unproven technology, if it was appropriate to borrow £95m to fund the project.

Councillor Middleton, commenting that it was a Conservative Administration that entered into the contract, indicated that once the Plant was up and running it would save the Council Tax payers of Milton Keynes £50k over the course of 25 years. What the Council should be doing was pulling together and supporting the project.

Councillor Bald, as a supplementary question, asked Councillor Middleton to review his figures and referring to the costs of borrowing the £95m, which was currently estimated to be £10.8m, suggested that the cost of borrowing should be



set against the potential savings. Councillor Bald also suggested that the Loan was taken out at least three and a half years before it was needed,.

Councillor Middleton indicated that the decision to delegate authority to the S151 Officer to take out the loan was taken by the former Conservative Administration. However, he believed it was essential that councillors saw the bigger picture and the benefits the Plant would deliver in the future, including the significant reduction in landfill.

Councillor Middleton also indicated that he would be willing to discuss the issues with Councillor Bald if she wished.

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

Councillor Walker, referring to the significant amount of investment in the Oxford – Milton Keynes – Cambridge Corridor announced in today's Budget, asked Councillor Marland if he welcomed the potential investment in Milton Keynes.

Councillor Marland indicated that Oxfordshire had been successful in securing a Growth Deal to provide an additional 100,000 homes, but the other initiatives, such as the Express Way and East/West Rail were re-announcements. However, he did welcome any investment.

Councillor Marland stated that if capital projects were rescheduled, despite already having been announced, it had become the practice to re-announce the project each time it was rescheduled.

Councillor Walker, referring to the success of Oxfordshire to secure a Growth Deal, suggested that Milton Keynes would be similarly successful if Cabinet members spent more time lobbying Ministers to ensure they understood the needs of Milton Keynes. Councillor Walker, as a supplementary question, asked Councillor Marland what conversations he would be having with Ministers going forward.

Councillor Marland indicated that he had written to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in July last year requesting a conversation about housing delivery, but to date he had not received a response.

CL75

REGENERATION:MK – REASSURANCE TO RESIDENTS

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

- "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) Regeneration:MK is about more than the built environment, and each regeneration scheme must include social and cultural benefits to each community and current residents in conjunction with any possible physical regeneration;
- (c) Regeneration:MK will improve job opportunities, local amenities and public transport;
- (d) 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;
- (e) there is a commitment in the Council Plan 2016 to ensure that the scheme for each priority estate is community-led; and
- (f) Regeneration:MK is supported on a cross party basis by this Council.

2. That this Council further notes that:

- (a) regeneration in Fullers Slade began on 24 June 2017 and Your:MK has begun consulting residents to co-design regeneration options, and that other priority estates will follow;
- (b) Your:MK will ensure the final design option(s) brought forward will be financially sustainable and feasible to deliver;
- (c) despite this engagement and assurances, long lead times and uncertainty has led to anxiety and worry for local residents;
- (d) information has not always been as readily or easily available to residents or councillors as it could have been and this has caused unnecessary worry and mistrust;
- (e) some important information required for communities to build trust and confidence in the process is still outstanding; and
- (f) unless the regeneration process has the trust and confidence of residents it will not succeed, and that more effort is still needed to ensure this trust and confidence is established and maintained.

3. That this Council therefore:

- (a) reaffirms the commitment made in the Council Plan to a referendum of residents in each estate;
- (b) asks Cabinet to clarify policy, in particular ensuring that the referendum offers residents the final say on any proposals, and consider recommending to Council:

- (i) that the ballot contains a clear YES or NO option;
 - (ii) that Milton Keynes Council's Electoral Services should conduct the referendum;
 - (iii) that only those on the electoral roll in each regeneration area should be able to vote;
 - (iv) that every effort is made to ensure registration on affected estates is improved before any ballot;
- (c) calls on Your:MK to make a step change in communication and engagement with residents to improve trust and confidence in the process;
 - (d) asks Cabinet to reaffirm the commitment that existing Council tenants will be offered accommodation at least equal to their current circumstances (in room number), unless they explicitly wish otherwise;
 - (e) asks Cabinet to reaffirm the commitment that new social housing will meet Parker Morris space standards;
 - (f) asks Your:MK to ensure all information in the public domain is easily accessible and available to residents and that as much information as possible is placed into the public domain;
 - (g) asks Your:MK to engage and develop the role of ward councillors and parish councils in the regeneration process; and
 - (h) calls on Your:MK to complete the "detailed policy documents for residents, explaining the process for all tenures, including Compulsory Purchase Orders" at the earliest opportunity, to clarify the position for owner occupiers, social tenants and private tenants."

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

"1. That the following new clause 3(b)(iv) be added:

'that in conformity with the motion passed by Council on 15 July 2015 (Minute CL42 refers), the electoral franchise should include all young people aged 16 years and over;'

2. That the current clause 3(b)(iv) be renumbered as 3(b)(v)."

The Council heard from two members of the public.

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

RESOLVED –

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) Regeneration:MK is about more than the built environment, and each regeneration scheme must include social and cultural benefits to each community and current residents in conjunction with any possible physical regeneration;
 - (c) Regeneration:MK will improve job opportunities, local amenities and public transport;
 - (d) 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;
 - (e) there is a commitment in the Council Plan 2016 to ensure that the scheme for each priority estate is community-led; and
 - (f) Regeneration:MK is supported on a cross party basis by this Council.

2. That this Council further notes that:
 - (a) regeneration in Fullers Slade began on 24 June 2017 and Your:MK has begun consulting residents to co-design regeneration options, and that other priority estates will follow;
 - (b) Your:MK will ensure the final design option(s) brought forward will be financially sustainable and feasible to deliver;
 - (c) despite this engagement and assurances, long lead times and uncertainty has led to anxiety and worry for local residents;
 - (d) information has not always been as readily or easily available to residents or councillors as it could have been and this has caused unnecessary worry and mistrust;
 - (e) some important information required for communities to build trust and confidence in the process is still outstanding; and
 - (f) unless the regeneration process has the trust and confidence of residents it will not succeed, and that more effort is still needed to ensure this trust and confidence is established and maintained.

3. That this Council therefore:
- (a) reaffirms the commitment made in Council Plan to a referendum of residents in each estate;
 - (b) asks Cabinet to clarify policy, in particular ensuring that the referendum offers residents the final say on any proposals, and consider recommending to Council:
 - (i) that the ballot contains a clear YES or NO option;
 - (ii) that Milton Keynes Council's Electoral Services should conduct the referendum;
 - (iii) that only those on the electoral roll in each regeneration area should be able to vote;
 - (iv) that in conformity with the motion passed by Council on 15 July 2015 (Minute CL42 refers), the electoral franchise should include all young people aged 16 years and over;
 - (v) that every effort is made to ensure registration on affected estates is improved before any ballot;
 - (c) calls on Your:MK to make a step change in communication and engagement with residents to improve trust and confidence in the process;
 - (d) asks Cabinet to reaffirm the commitment that existing Council tenants will be offered accommodation at least equal to their current circumstances (in room number), unless they explicitly wish otherwise;
 - (e) asks Cabinet to reaffirms the commitment that new social housing will meet Parker Morris space standards;
 - (f) asks Your:MK to ensure all information in the public domain is easily accessible and available to residents and that as much information as possible is placed into the public domain;
 - (g) asks Your:MK to engage and develop the role of ward councillors and parish councils in the regeneration process; and
 - (h) calls on Your:MK to complete the "detailed policy documents for residents, explaining the process for all tenures, including Compulsory Purchase Orders" at the earliest opportunity, to clarify the position for owner occupiers, social tenants and private tenants.



CL76

MK2050 PROJECT THREE - LEARNING 2050

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

"That the Council:

1. notes the re-scoping of MK2050 Project Three - Learning 2050 reported in the Cabinet papers on 7 November 2017;
2. welcomes the exploration to be undertaken as to how Milton Keynes schools can give a greater focus to the STEM subjects - science, technology, engineering and maths - with a view to children and young people developing transferable skills and knowledge;
3. notes that a more detailed scope for this project is to be developed in due course in relation to the STEM subjects, higher education at MK:U and local business opportunities;
4. requests that consideration also be given to preparation for employment sectors in which Milton Keynes has person power shortages including teachers, social and care workers and the health professions; and
5. further requests that the project encompass provision at the further education level with particular regard to apprenticeships."

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

RESOLVED –

That the Council:

1. notes the re-scoping of MK2050 Project Three - Learning 2050 reported in the Cabinet papers on 7 November 2017;
2. welcomes the exploration to be undertaken as to how Milton Keynes schools can give a greater focus to the STEM subjects - science, technology, engineering and maths - with a view to children and young people developing transferable skills and knowledge;
3. notes that a more detailed scope for this project is to be developed in due course in relation to the STEM subjects, higher education at MK:U and local business opportunities;
4. requests that consideration also be given to preparation for employment sectors in which Milton Keynes has person power shortages including teachers, social and care workers and the health professions; and
5. further requests that the project encompass provision at the further education level with particular regard to apprenticeships.

CL77

**APPOINTMENT OF MILTON KEYNES DEVELOPMENT
PARTNERSHIP BOARD CHAIRMAN**

The Council considered confirming the appointment of Mr Bob Green to the post of Chairman of the Board for Milton Keynes Development Partnership for a 2 year term.

RESOLVED –

That the appointment of Mr Bob Green to the post of Chairman of the Board for Milton Keynes Development Partnership for a 2 year term be confirmed.

THE MAYOR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 10:30 PM

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of several overlapping loops and a long horizontal stroke at the bottom, positioned over the 'MAYOR'S INITIALS' text.