



Minutes of the meeting of the MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL held on TUESDAY
14 MARCH 2006 at 7.30 pm

Present: Councillor Gerrella (Mayor)
Councillor Carstens (Deputy Mayor)
Councillors Barry, Benning, Box, Bristow, Burke, Carruthers, Sandra Clark, Stephen Clark, Crooks, Dransfield, Drewett, Eastman, Eaton, Edwards, Exon, Geary, Gillingham, E Henderson, I Henderson, Holroyd, Hopkins, Hoyle, Irons, Jury, Legg, Lloyd, G Mabbutt, D McCall, I McCall, McKenzie, Miles, Monk, Morsley, Pendry, Pugh, Seymour, Snell, Tallack, Tamagnini-Barbosa, Wicker, Williams and Wilson

The following Honorary Alderman was also present:

Alderman Howell

Apologies: Councillors Bartlett, Campbell, Carrington, Coventry, Fraser, Long, and A Mabbott and Alderman Ellis

Also Present: 15 members of the public

CL119 MINUTES

RESOLVED -

That the Minutes of the meetings of the Council held on 14 and 28 February 2006, be approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record.

CL120 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Councillors Box and I McCall declared personal interests in Item 4(c)(ii) [Proposed Modifications to the Minerals Local Plan: Response to Objections] as Trustees and Directors of the Milton Keynes Parks Trust.

Councillor Miles declared a prejudicial interest in Item 4(c)(ii) [Proposed Modifications to the Minerals Local Plan: Response to Objections] as a Trustee and Director of the Milton Keynes Parks Trust.

Councillor G Mabbutt declared a personal interest in Item 5(b)(iv) [Renewable and Sustainable Energy in Milton Keynes] as a member of Bozeat and Lavendon Oppose Turbines.

Councillor Seymour declared a personal interest in Item 5(b)(iv) [Renewable and Sustainable Energy in Milton Keynes] as a member of Bucks Lacks Enough Wind.

Councillors Benning, Box, Stephen Clark, Gillingham, Holroyd, Hopkins, McKenzie and Pugh declared personal interests in Item 5(b)(iv) [Renewable and Sustainable Energy in Milton Keynes] as members of the Development Control Committee.

CL121 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor announced that the Council had won the Community Involvement Award, in the Local Government Chronicle Awards, for its work on the Station Plaza.

The Mayor also announced that the Council and HBS had been highly commended in the Partnership of the Year category.

CL122 DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS

The Council received a petition relating to street lighting in Newport Pagnell, from Ms Laura Kenyon.

The petition was referred to Councillor Mabbutt, the responsible Cabinet Member.

CL123 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

- (a) Question from Anita Rose, asked by the Mayor in her absence, to Councillor I McCall.

“Big George on 3 Counties Radio challenged you to a race with Councillor Euan Henderson.

Could you tell me where and when the race will take place and what the prize will be?

Answer from Councillor I McCall:

“Unfortunately, after being on the radio and agreeing to this challenge, I forgot to tell Councillor Euan Henderson, so this is news to him this evening. I am not quite sure whether he will accept the challenge or not, so I can't tell you where the race is, but Councillor Irene Henderson has offered to take bets.”

- (b) Question from Peter Geary to Councillor I McCall.

“Would the Leader of the Council like to comment on the relationship that the Liberal Democrat Councillors have with the officers of the Council?”

Answer from Councillor I McCall:

“The relationship between the Liberal Democrat Councillors and officers is the same as with all Councillors of this Council, it is a professional working relationship. The Cabinet probably has the closest relationship of all Members of the

Council, particularly with the Corporate Leadership Team, because we jointly form the top leadership team of the Council.”

- (c) Question from Laura Kenyon to Councillor I McCall.

“Would the Leader of the Council confirm the Council will now make the necessary additional lighting on the footpath referred to in the petition, a high priority?”

Answer from Councillor I McCall:

“I can’t comment on the priority lighting for this footpath has, as it is not my area of responsibility. I can tell you that the relevant Ward Members for Newport Pagnell consulted local residents a few years ago in that part of Newport Pagnell, about the need to light the footpath and, at that time, the majority of residents were against lighting the footpath because they felt it was inappropriate, to light what was effectively a country walk. If people have changed their minds, which may be the case as you have a petition to demonstrate that, my colleagues have said that they are willing to look into this matter again.”

CL124

REPORTS FROM CABINET AND COMMITTEES

- (a) Cabinet - 21 February 2006

Draft Local Transport Plan for Milton Keynes 2006/07 to 2010/11

Councillor G Mabbutt moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 21 February 2006, which was seconded by Councillor Barry:

“That the Local Transport Plan 2006/07 to 2010/11 be approved for submission to the Government Office of the South East and Department for Transport by 31 March 2006.”

The Council received a report from the Chair of the Environment Policy Development Committee, which had considered the draft Local Transport Plan.

On being put to the vote the recommendation was declared carried with 29 Members voting in favour, 0 Members voting against and 15 members abstaining from voting.

RESOLVED -

That the Local Transport Plan 2006/07 to 2010/11 be approved for submission to the Government Office of the South East and Department for Transport by 31 March 2006.

- (b) Licensing Committee - 22 February 2006

Gambling Act 2005 - Statement Supporting a Casino in Milton Keynes

Councillor Carruthers moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 22 February 2006, which was seconded by Councillor Wicker and on which a recorded vote was requested:

- “1. That the Council as Licensing Authority has no current intention to make a policy decision under Section 166 of the Gambling Act 2005 that would prevent the granting of a casino premises licence at a future date.
2. That the work the Cabinet will be undertaking under the Council’s economic development functions to actively promote a casino in Milton Keynes be noted.”

The voting on the recommendation was as follows:

FOR: Councillors Barry, Benning, Box, Bristow, Burke, Carruthers, Sandra Clark, Stephen Clark, Crooks, Drewett, Eastman, Eaton, Exon, Gerrella, Gillingham, E Henderson, I Henderson, Hopkins, Legg, Lloyd, G Mabbutt, D McCall, I McCall, McKenzie, Monk, Pendry, Seymour, Snell, Tallack, Tamagnini-Barbosa, Wicker, Williams, and Wilson (33)

AGAINST: Councillors Edwards, Geary, Holroyd, Hoyle, Irons and Miles (6)

ABSTENTIONS: Councillors Carstens, Dransfield, Jury, Morsley and Pugh, (5)

The recommendation was declared carried.

RESOLVED -

1. That the Council as Licensing Authority has no current intention to make a policy decision under Section 166 of the Gambling Act 2005 that would prevent the granting of a casino premises licence at a future date.
2. That the work the Cabinet will be undertaking under the Council’s economic development functions to actively promote a casino in Milton Keynes be noted.

(c) Cabinet - 7 March 2006

(i) Every Child and Young Person in Milton Keynes Matters: Children and Young People Plan 2006/09

Councillor Sandra Clark moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 7 March 2006, which was seconded by Councillor Snell:

“That the Children and Young People Plan 2006/09 be approved.”

The Council received a report from the Chair of the Learning and Development Policy Development Committee, which had considered the draft Children and Young People Plan 2006/09.

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

RESOLVED -

That the Children and Young People Plan 2006/09 be approved.

(ii) Proposed Modifications to the Minerals Local Plan:
Response to Objections

Councillor Mabbutt moved the following recommendation from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 7 March 2006, which was seconded by Councillor D McCall:

- “1. That it be agreed that there should not be a further public inquiry into the Minerals Local Plan.
2. That it be agreed that the further minor changes to the Minerals Local Plan, do not require to be advertised.
3. That the Minerals Local Plan, as proposed to be modified, be adopted.
4. That the Head of Planning and Transport, in consultation with the accountable Cabinet Member, be authorised to publish the Notice of Adoption of the Local Plan, and agree any minor updating or factual corrections prior to publication of the newly adopted Minerals Local Plan.”

A recorded vote on clause 1 of the recommendation was requested. The voting was as follows:

FOR: Councillors Barry, Benning, Burke, Carruthers, Sandra Clark, Stephen Clark, Crooks, Drewett, Eastman, Eaton, Exon, Gerrella, E Henderson, I Henderson, G Mabbutt, D McCall, I McCall, Monk, Pugh, Seymour, Snell, Tallack, Tamagnini-Barbosa, Wicker and Williams (25)

AGAINST: Councillors Box, Bristow, Carstens, Dransfield, Edwards, Geary, Gillingham, Holroyd, Hopkins, Hoyle, Irons, Jury, Legg, Lloyd, McKenzie, Morsley, Pendry and Wilson (18)

ABSTENTIONS: (0)

Clause 1 of the recommendation was declared carried.

On being put to the vote the remaining recommendations were declared carried, with 25 Members voting in favour, 11 Members voting against and 7 Members abstaining from voting.

RESOLVED -

1. That it be agreed that there should not be a further public inquiry into the Minerals Local Plan.
2. That it be agreed that the further minor changes to the Minerals Local Plan, do not require to be advertised.
3. That the Minerals Local Plan, as proposed to be modified, be adopted.
4. That the Head of Planning and Transport, in consultation with the accountable Cabinet Member, be authorised to publish the Notice of Adoption of the Local Plan, and agree any minor updating or factual corrections prior to publication of the newly adopted Minerals Local Plan.

(Councillors Box and I McCall declared personal interests in this item as Trustees and Directors of the Milton Keynes Parks Trust.

Councillor Miles declared a prejudicial interest in this item as a Trustee and Director of the Milton Keynes Parks Trust and left the meeting during consideration of the item.)

CL125

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

(a) Question from Councillor Wilson to Councillor D McCall:

“How many Fixed Penalty Notices for Litter and fly tipping were issued in each of the years 2003/04, 2004/05 and 2005/06 (to date) and for which Wards, how many fines were paid for each year, how many led to prosecutions, and why does DEFRA not have returns for 2004/05 for Milton Keynes?”

Answer from Councillor D McCall:

“This is a very detailed question in many parts and it will take some research to actually provide all the answers. I am not actually sure whether we have some of the data, particularly when it comes down to Ward level. I do know that we do take the issue of litter enforcement very seriously and, of course,

we have recently employed four Enforcement Officers and a Enforcement Co-ordinator, who are doing a lot of work, including targeting offenders, which will become more visible as time goes on. I don't think the number of Fixed Penalty Notices issued is necessarily a good indicator about how well the Council is doing about targeting the problem.

The Council issues a lot of warning and advisory letters, which do have a positive affect. The Council tries to educate rather than go straight for enforcement. However, the Council is not frightened to take enforcement action and in the past the Council has worked with the Police and the Environment Agency to take offenders to Court.

Birmingham City Council is reported to have issued 863 fixed penalty notices, but only 155 have ever been paid and only three prosecutions undertaken.

This Council only issues fixed penalty notices when the case will stand up in Court. If people do not pay in Milton Keynes they will be taken to Court.

I will endeavour to answer your detailed question in writing.

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

(b) Question from Councillor Hoyle to Councillor I McCall:

"Will you please supply me with the last three years' accounts for the Springfield Initiative, on which I believe you sit as a Trustee, together with the details and duties of the other Trustees?"

Answer from Councillor I McCall:

"I am not sure if these details are publicly available, I will take advice on that.

I would point out that I always declare an interest when issues concerning the Springfield Initiative are raised at Cabinet and actually leave the room"

Councillor Hoyle asked a supplementary question, which was answered by Councillor I McCall.

(c) Question from Councillor Miles to Councillor D McCall:

"You will recall our correspondence and that between myself and your officers about landscaping and trees that are getting over-bearing around people's houses and my question to you at the October meeting of the Council, if my memory serves correctly.

As some time has now elapsed, I wondered if you could let me have a written response as to the current position with regard to the development of policy in this area within the next 28 days.?"

Answer from Councillor D McCall:

"I understand that you have asked me to respond to you within 28 days. If you could remind me of the officer that you have been dealing with, I will endeavour to assure you that you will receive a full reply within 28 days."

(d) Question from Councillor Hopkins to Councillor I McCall:

"At a recent meeting of the Danesborough Forum, Cheryl Montgomery of the Milton Keynes Partnership Committee, confirmed that the preferred option for Milton Keynes expansion would be declared at the Board meeting on 20 March 2006. Can you confirm whether this is the case?"

Answer from Councillor I McCall:

"That is not the case, the papers for the Partnership Committee on 20 March 2006 have been published and following pressure by the Council Members on the Partnership Committee, Councillors Euan Henderson, Bristow and myself, and some other members on the Partnership Committee there is no preferred option, no housing numbers or any thing of that sort. We have pushed to delay these things coming forward because we believe that there is still an awful lot of work to be done, including the Council's Planning Officers looking at the details of the technical reports, which were still not available as late as last Friday. The recommendations which are coming to the Partnership Committee next week are about agreeing the evaluation criteria , agreeing the amended overarching vision; principles; objectives and so on and to note the sustainability assessment. There is nothing to do with agreeing a preferred option."

Councillor Hopkins asked a supplementary question, which was answered by Councillor I McCall.

(e) Question from Councillor Geary to Councillor I McCall:

"Do you agree that 1:1:1 working groups have in the past and will continue in the future to play an extremely important role in the development of policies?"

Answer from Councillor I McCall:

"I think that working groups of all sizes have played an important part in the working of the Council. There are examples in the amendment I am putting forward to the motion tonight where working groups which are not 1:1:1 have done good work and actually influenced decisions of the Cabinet."

Councillor Geary asked a supplementary question, which was answered by Councillor I McCall.

(f) Question from Councillor Dransfield to Councillor Wilson:

“Are you in agreement with the Leader of the Labour Group and in favour of the redistribution of Revenue Support Grant away from places like Milton Keynes, which includes potentially depriving the poorer parts of Milton Keynes, the very Wards that Labour Members tend to represent, of resources, and taking money away from poor people in Milton Keynes who need it?”

Answer from Councillor Wilson:

“I am in favour of the redistribution of funds, whether local or national, so that resources go to the areas of proven need. It is quite clear that there are areas of deprivation around the country which, in many cases, are greater than some places in the south and east of the country. To that extent, we totally support the redistribution of funds made in the Revenue Support Grant Settlement. It is worth noting that no authority has had as good, or as large, a settlement from the Government in the last three years as Milton Keynes. Looking forward to 2007/08, no unitary authority in this country is having such a large percentage increase in its Revenue Support Grant as Milton Keynes. What we now look forward to is a redistribution formula for parish councils from this Administration which has failed to recognise the fact that deprived areas are singularly suffering as a consequence of a lack of any distribution formula whatsoever.”

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

(g) Question from Councillor Bristow to Councillor G Mabbutt:

“I am very grateful to you for your support in ensuring that £90,000 is allocated in the Capital Programme this year for the work on Buckingham Road. Is this a sum that will actually cover all the works that we discussed on site, or is this only part, with the Scheme being over two or three years?”

Answer from Councillor G Mabbutt:

“The amount shown in the Programme is the amount recommended by the highways officer. If the Scheme was going to be over two or three years, it would have been shown in the Capital Programme agreed at the Council meeting on 28 February 2006. If expenditure was shown only in one year, then that would be the total amount for the Scheme. If that sum is insufficient, then I’m sure officers will probably come back with other proposals.”

(h) Question from Councillor Burke to Councillor Wilson:

“Why have you never chosen to put an item on litter enforcement on the Performance Review and Audit Panel, even though you are the Chair of that Panel?”

Answer from Councillor Wilson:

“We have indeed raised such issues at that Panel, particularly in relation to BVPI199, a measure of how dirty the streets are.

It was disappointing to see that the Council was actually in the fourth quartile last year and is likely to be in the bottom quartile again this year.

Ben Bradshaw, one of the Government’s ministers, speaking at a conference just 10 days ago, criticised a number of authorities, including this one, which had not made use of the fixed penalty notice arrangements.”

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

(i) Question from Councillor I McCall to Councillor Wilson:

“What steps did you take when you were Leader of the Council to make differential financial arrangements for parish councils within Milton Keynes, to address the issues of deprivation, an issue which, since May 2002, you seem to have got very passionate about and raise it at every single Council meeting, and frequently in between?”

Answer from Councillor Wilson:

“You will appreciate that Milton Keynes was not fully parished until a little before May 2002. However, it was under my Administration that we started to give grants to parish councils, particularly the Parish Partnership Fund.

One of things that has disappointed me is that there is not a greater proportion of Council grants going to areas of deprivation, and there should be an explicit criterion in the Parish Partnership Fund arrangements covering this. I actually proposed that at the time, but because of the weight of evidence from a number of parish councils, it would not have necessarily been the best thing to do. Unless this Council as a whole, and the Administration in particular, starts to recognise that its very policies are ensuring that the people who are the most worst off have to pay the largest amount of Council Tax, which is the most regressive system possible to imagine, not only will it cause the parish councils to come to a halt in terms of their progress but, frankly, we have got policies to ensure the continuation of poverty in the very areas where need is most.”

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

LONDON OLYMPICS 2012

Councillor E Henderson moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Legg:

“That this Council:

1. notes the success of the London 2012 bid team and congratulates them on securing the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games for this country;
2. believes that Milton Keynes should have a significant role in supporting the successful delivery of the Games in every possible way;
3. will support the development of our young citizens, in particular, so that as many as possible are enabled to participate in the Games, whether as an athlete, a volunteer, an official, or in some other way;
4. recognises the positive impact the Games could have for Milton Keynes, not only in sporting activities, but also in the fields of culture, economic development and citizenship; and
5. will work actively with partners to ensure Milton Keynes shares in the benefits that will accrue from the Games.”

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

RESOLVED -

That this Council:

1. notes the success of the London 2012 bid team and congratulates them on securing the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games for this country;
2. believes that Milton Keynes should have a significant role in supporting the successful delivery of the Games in every possible way;
3. will support the development of our young citizens, in particular, so that as many as possible are enabled to participate in the Games, whether as an athlete, a volunteer, an official, or in some other way;
4. recognises the positive impact the Games could have for Milton Keynes, not only in sporting activities, but also in the fields of culture, economic development and citizenship; and
5. will work actively with partners to ensure Milton Keynes shares in the benefits that will accrue from the Games.

UNIVERSITY FOR MILTON KEYNES

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

- “1. That this Council notes:
 - (a) the recent completion of the Sector Skills network throughout the UK and the designation by the Government of the first four sector-based skills academies;
 - (b) the contribution made by inadequate skills development to Britain's disappointing productivity compared with other countries, as indicated in a number of national and international reports; and
 - (c) the perception that - within Milton Keynes - many school-leavers opt for an immediate job and remuneration, rather than continuing to invest in their career through modern apprenticeships or other post-secondary education.
2. That the Council therefore warmly supports the initiative of Universities Milton Keynes (UMK) which is already offering 16 foundation degrees and a wide variety of business and professional qualifications in response to local demand from both students and employers.
3. That the Council calls upon the Government to support the development of a fully fledged local university in Milton Keynes that will complement the work of Milton Keynes College and bring great economic, social and cultural benefit to the city as a whole.”

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

RESOLVED -

1. That this Council notes:
 - (a) the recent completion of the Sector Skills network throughout the UK and the designation by the Government of the first four sector-based skills academies;
 - (b) the contribution made by inadequate skills development to Britain's disappointing productivity compared with other countries, as indicated in a number of national and international reports; and
 - (c) the perception that - within Milton Keynes - many school-leavers opt for an immediate job and remuneration, rather than continuing to invest in their career through modern apprenticeships or other post-secondary education.
2. That the Council therefore warmly supports the initiative of Universities Milton Keynes (UMK) which is already offering 16 foundation degrees and a wide variety of business and

professional qualifications in response to local demand from both students and employers.

3. That the Council calls upon the Government to support the development of a fully fledged local university in Milton Keynes that will complement the work of Milton Keynes College and bring great economic, social and cultural benefit to the city as a whole.

CL128 MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL LIBRARY SERVICE

RESOLVED -

That the withdrawal of the motion be agreed.

CL129 RENEWABLE AND SUSTAINABLE ENERGY IN MILTON KEYNES

Councillor Geary moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Dransfield:

- “1. That this Council supports appropriate sources and methods of sustainable and renewable energy in the Borough of Milton Keynes.
2. That due to the lack of area and distance between rural and suburban developments, this Council does not support the introduction of commercial scale wind farms within the Borough of Milton Keynes, thereby helping to protect the quality of life currently enjoyed by the rural and urban fringe communities of the Borough of Milton Keynes.”

Councillor Williams moved the following amendment, which was seconded by Councillor Wicker and on which a recorded vote was requested:

“That paragraph 2 of the motion be deleted and replaced with:

‘That this Council reaffirms its commitment to ‘Renewable Energy: Policy D5’ of the Milton Keynes Local Plan, adopted in December 2005, which states:

‘Planning permission will be granted for proposals to develop renewable energy resources unless there would be:

- (a) Significant harm to the amenity of residential areas, due to noise, traffic, pollution or odour;*
- (b) Significant harm to a wildlife species or habitat;*
- (c) Unacceptable visual impact on the landscape.*

Wind turbines should, in addition, avoid unacceptable shadow flicker and electro-magnetic interference and be sited at least 350m from any dwelling”.

The voting on the amendment was as follows:

FOR: Councillors Barry, Bristow, Burke, Carruthers, Sandra Clark, Crooks, Drewett, Eastman, Eaton, Edwards, Exon, Gerrella, E Henderson, I Henderson, Irons, Legg, Lloyd, G Mabbutt, D McCall, I McCall, Monk, Morsley, Pendry, Seymour, Snell, Tallack, Tamagnini-Barbosa, Wicker, Williams and Wilson (30)

AGAINST: Councillors Dransfield, Geary, Hoyle, and Jury, (4)

ABSTENTION: Councillor Carstens, (1)

The amendment was declared carried

On being put to the vote, the substantive motion was declared carried with 30 Members voting in favour, 5 Members voting against and 0 Members abstaining from voting.

RESOLVED -

"1. That this Council supports appropriate sources and methods of sustainable and renewable energy in the Borough of Milton Keynes.

2. That this Council reaffirms its commitment to 'Renewable Energy: Policy D5' of the Milton Keynes Local Plan, adopted in December 2005, which states:

'Planning permission will be granted for proposals to develop renewable energy resources unless there would be:

(a) Significant harm to the amenity of residential areas, due to noise, traffic, pollution or odour;

(b) Significant harm to a wildlife species or habitat;

(c) Unacceptable visual impact on the landscape.

Wind turbines should, in addition, avoid unacceptable shadow flicker and electro-magnetic interference and be sited at least 350m from any dwelling'.

(Councillor G Mabbutt declared a personal interest in this Item as a member of Bozeat and Lavendon Oppose Turbines.

Councillor Seymour declared a personal interest in this as a member of Bucks Lacks Enough Wind.

Councillors Benning, Box, Stephen Clark, Gillingham, Holroyd, Hopkins, McKenzie and Pugh declared personal interests in this as members of the Development Control Committee.)

CL130

ROLE OF WORKING GROUPS IN OVERVIEW, POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY

RESOLVED -

That the withdrawal of the motion be agreed.

CL131 POLICY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEES AND SCRUTINY PANELS ANNUAL REPORT

The Council received the Annual Report from the Council's Policy Development Committees and Scrutiny Panels

CL132 QUARTERLY REPORTS ON SPECIAL URGENCY DECISIONS

The Council noted that the special urgency provisions under Access to Information Procedure Rule 17.3 had been used once in the period October 2005 to February 2006 and that the item related to a delegated decision taken on 4 November 2005 by Councillor G Mabbutt in consultation with Councillor Crooks, relating to 'Bank Indemnities for Parking Income'

CL133 COMMITTEES - MEMBERSHIP

The Council noted the following changes in membership of the Council's Committees/Panels:

- (a) Business Management Group
That Councillor Long had been replaced by Councillor Wilson.
- (b) Development Control Committee
That Councillor Legg had been replaced by Councillor McKenzie.
- (c) Environment Policy Development Committee
That Councillor Bristow had been replaced by Councillor Legg.
- (d) Learning and Development Policy Development Committee
That Councillors Dransfield, Legg and A Mabbott had been replaced by Councillors Carstens, Irons and Miles respectively.
- (e) Social Care and Housing Policy Development Committee
That Councillor Coventry had been replaced by Councillor Long.

THE MAYOR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 11.05 PM