



Council minutes

Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Wednesday 12 July 2023 in The Oculus, Buckinghamshire Council, Gatehouse Road, Aylesbury HP19 8FF, commencing at 4.00 pm and concluding at 6.35 pm.

Members present

P Birchley, M Harker OBE, S Adoh, A Alam, D Anthony, K Ashman, M Ayub, R Bagge, M Baldwin, D Barnes, S Barrett, K Bates, A Baughan, J Baum, D Blamires, A Bond, M Bracken, S Broadbent, N Brown, S Bowles, P Brazier, T Broom, R Carington, D Carroll, B Chapple OBE, S Chapple, Q Chaudhry, S Chhokar, J Chilver, A Collingwood, M Collins, P Cooper, C Cornell, A Cranmer, E Culverhouse, I Darby, T Dixon, T Egleton, P Fealey, M Flys, E Gemmell, P Gomm, D Goss, T Green, S Guy, G Harris, C Harriss, D Hayday, O Hayday, C Heap, A Hussain, I Hussain, M Hussain JP, Majid Hussain, Maz Hussain, N Hussain, T Hussain, P Irwin, C Jackson, S James, J Jordan, S Kayani, P Kelly, R Khan BEM, D King, M Knight, J MacBean, A Macpherson, I Macpherson, F Mahon, P Martin, R Matthews, Dr W Matthews, Z Mohammed, H Mordue, S Morgan, R Newcombe, C Oliver, A Osibogun, A Poland-Goodyer, C Poll, W Raja, N Rana, M Rand, S Rouse, G Smith, L Smith BEM, M Smith, N Southworth, M Stannard, P Strachan, R Stuchbury, L Sullivan, M Tett, N Thomas, D Thompson, J Towns, M Turner, P Turner, H Wallace, L Walsh, J Ward, J Waters, D Watson, A Wheelhouse, W Whyte, G Williams, S Wilson, M Winn and K Wood

Agenda Item

1 Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Caffrey, Christensen, Clarke OBE, Dhillon, Dormer, Drayton, Etholen, Fayyaz, Gaffney, Gaster, Griffin, Hall, Graham Harris, Hogg, Hunter-Watts, Johncock, Jones, Lambert, Lewin, Marshall, Naylor, Sarfaraz Raja, Rush, Sandy, Sir Beville Stanier, Summers, D Town, A Turner, Wadhwa, Waite, M Walsh, Wassell and Andrew Wood. Apologies were also received from Countess Howe, his Majesty's Lord Lieutenant of Buckinghamshire and Dame Ann Limb, The High Sheriff of Buckinghamshire.

2 Mrs Kathleen Peatey MBE JP

Tribute was paid to Mrs Kathleen Peatey MBE JP, who had recently passed away. The Chairman recorded sincere condolences to her family on their sad loss.

Mrs Peatey had been a Member of Wycombe District Council from 1976-1999, and was Leader of that Council from 1993-95, and the Chairman of Wycombe District Council during 1989-90. Mrs Peatey had been made an Honorary Alderman by WDC

in 2000, and of Buckinghamshire Council since 2020. She was also a long time Trustee for Wycombe Almshouses, and a Magistrate on the Wycombe and Beaconsfield bench between 1979 and 2002.

Members then observed a minute`s silence in memory of Kathleen Peatey MBE JP.

3 Minutes

RESOLVED –

That the Minutes of the Annual Council Meeting held on 17 May 2023 be approved as a correct record.

4 Declarations of Interest

There were none.

5 Chairman's Update

The Chairman detailed events that she had attended since the last Council meeting which included 3 events with the Armed Forces in Aylesbury, High Wycombe and Great Missenden, and the rural farm tour to Hard To Find farm, High Wycombe. Congratulations were extended to Councillor Mahboob Hussain JP who had recently celebrated 25 years as a Justice of the Peace. There had been a very busy schedule of events and the Vice Chairman was thanked for events she had attended.

Members who were able were asked to try to attend and support the Chairman's charity film event on Sunday 10 September at Pinewood Studios, with an outside picnic to see 'Rocketman'.

6 Petitions

Councillor P Martin presented an e-petition on behalf of a constituent relating to 'Stop Investing in Fossil Fuels.' The Chairman accepted and referred the petition to the Cabinet Member for Accessible Housing and Resources for response. The Cabinet Member thanked the resident for the petition and asked for it to be referred to Cabinet for further consideration.

7 Corporate Plan Refresh 2023-24

Buckinghamshire Council's Corporate Plan set out what the Council wanted to achieve and how this would be done, addressing the challenges faced and harnessing opportunities as they presented themselves. It reflected the services that mattered the most to residents.

The current plan had been approved in February 2020. A light-touch review of it had been undertaken to reflect current challenges facing the economy and other events and how these could have an impact on the Council's priorities, together with other key developments such as new national legislation.

The Leader introduced a draft of the refreshed Corporate Plan that could be seen attached at Appendix 1 to the Council report. The plan was intended to cover the

period until 2025, in accordance with the current Council term, and would continue to be subject to an annual refresh.

In response to queries, Members were informed:

- That Parish Councils were included in the Corporate Plan and deliverables as key stakeholders.
- That ageing demographics was placing additional pressures on the Council's budget. Proposals for future years would come forward in due course to be considered during budget scrutiny.
- That the Corporate Plan provided strategic direction for decision-making by the Cabinet and Council. Some areas would have individual Action Plans to assist in delivering the Council's key priorities.

RESOLVED –

That the refreshed Corporate Plan for the period 2020-25 be ADOPTED.

8 Annual Report of the Audit and Governance Committee

Prior to introducing the annual report prepared of the work carried out by the Council's Audit and Governance Committee during the 2022/23 financial year, Councillor R Newcombe, Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee informed Members that the Council's risk team (headed by Caroline Jenkins, Risk and Business Continuity Manager) had recently won Team of the Year 2023 at the ALARM (Association of Local Authority Risk Managers) annual awards.

Members were informed that the content and presentation of the annual report met the requirements of the CIPFA Audit Committees Guidance 2018 to report to full Council on a regular basis on the Committee's performance in relation to the terms of reference and the effectiveness of the Committee in meeting its purpose.

Members were informed that the Audit and Governance Committee had met six times during the year. Each meeting had reviewed a Forward Plan to ensure that the work being undertaken mirrored the level of risks and priorities of the Action. Any actions raised during previous Committee meetings were reviewed for completeness.

The Committee had continued to receive valued professional reports, support and advice from Corporate Finance, Treasury Management, Risk Management, Procurement, Internal Audit and from our External Auditors.

The Committee's work had included approving and monitoring the Council's Whistleblowing Policy, Anti-Fraud and Corruption Policy and Money Laundering Policy. The Committee was also responsible for overseeing the Council's financial reporting process and for approving the Council's Financial Statements and Annual Governance Statement. It was explained that due to a combination of factors the audit of the draft statement of accounts for the year ended 31 March 2021 had not yet been completed by the external auditors but was expected to be concluded

during December 2023. This was part of wider endemic problem across the country whereby 73% of local authority audits for 2021-22 were still outstanding and 300 audits for 2020-21 were also outstanding.

Information provided in the annual report to Council included:

- On audits undertaken during the year, including the Pension Fund audit.
- That the Annual Governance Statement for 2021/22 had been agreed in November 2022, with the AGS for 2022/23 due to be considered at the July 2023 meeting.
- That the terms of reference for Internal Audit (Internal Audit Charter), the Business Assurance Strategy including the Annual Internal Audit Plan, and the Counter Fraud Plan had been approved.
- That updates had been received on the work of the Counter Fraud/Investigations team, including details of successful outcomes, prosecutions and recoveries.
- That the Risk Management Group, is a sub-group of the Audit and Governance Committee, had met seven times during the financial year. The group review the strategic and key directorate risks facing the authority and the internal controls and governance in place to manage those risks to demonstrate how risk management is embedded within Services.
- That the Committee was responsible for approving the Risk Management Strategy, and the Risk Management Group monitors the effective implementation of the strategy, as well as undertaking the scrutiny role for the development of future Treasury Management strategy prior to its presentation to Council for approval. Mid-term and annual reports on the extent of compliance with the approved Treasury Management strategy and an analysis of the performance against the targets set were also received.
- That a review of the impact and effectiveness of the Audit and Governance Committee had been carried out in June 2023 using the CIPFA Self-Assessment of Best Practice. The review had concluded that the Committee conformed with the majority of the principles of good practice, with some areas for improvement. An improvement plan had been developed to address areas of partial or non-conformance.

The Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee placed on record his thanks to Members and Officers who have supported the work of the Committee by presenting, discussing, challenging, and debating solutions to the governance, risk, financial, and control environment of the Council.

In response to a question, Members were informed that it was anticipated that the 2020-21 audit of the accounts would be completed by December 2023. The proposed timetable for all subsequent audits had been discussed at the Audit and Governance Committee meeting on 5 July 2023.

RESOLVED –

That the Audit and Governance Committee Annual Report 2022/23 be NOTED.

9 Reports from Cabinet Members

Members received reports from Cabinet Members. There was an opportunity for members to ask questions of individual Cabinet Members about matters and issues affecting their portfolios.

Leader of the Council, Councillor Martin Tett

The Leader received questions on charging for commercial waste, the Electoral Review of Buckinghamshire and on flood risk. Members were informed:

- (i) That secondary legislation would be required before the Government introduced new arrangements for Councils not to be able to charge for commercial waste. It was anticipated that the new arrangements might apply from the start of 2024. The details of the impact on the Council were still to be fully understood but it was likely to lead to £1m in additional budget pressures.
- (ii) That the meeting with Lee Rowley MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State (Local Government and Building Safety) had discussed the general context and issues facing the Council including from ageing demographics, social care and waste.
- (iii) That there were a wide range of issues that would need to be looked at now that the Electoral Review of Buckinghamshire had concluded. Work had not yet been done on Community Board boundaries that would need to change from 2025.
- (iv) That the transport team's risk assessments would include planning for issues such as flooding incidents and responding to the impacts of extreme weather conditions.

Cabinet Member for Culture and Leisure, Councillor Clive Harriss

The Cabinet Member received questions on Higginson Park and on accessible play parks. Members were informed:

- (i) That the new Higginson Park play area was on track to be open towards the end of July 2023.
- (ii) That he would check to see who had been consulted relating to accessibility when new play parks had been built. He apologised for the oversight in not mentioning the Whizz Fizz Fest and Aylesbury on Sea in his report, which had been delivered through partnership working with the Aylesbury Town Council.

Cabinet Member for Homelessness and Regulatory Services, Councillor Mark Winn

The Cabinet Member received questions on the Bridge Court temporary accommodation facility, High Wycombe, and on rough sleepers. Members were informed:

- (i) That the Council was taking the opportunity to move families from B&B accommodation into the Bridge Court accommodation, that was saving the Council a considerable amount of money. This also demonstrated the need to provide additional temporary accommodation.
- (ii) That a site with a number of rough sleepers highlighted by the Members

was currently being investigated by Officers. It was stated the rough sleeping numbers did fluctuate and tended to be higher during the Summer months. The Cabinet Member would speak to the Oasis Partnership and community safety about the instances of begging that had been occurring in the vicinity of collection points in the Wycombe town centre.

Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration, Councillor Peter Strachan

The Cabinet Member received questions on the lack of provision for religious worship as part of new developments and on the visitor economy. The Member was asked to write to the Cabinet Member on the planning issues so that he could provide a fuller response. The Cabinet Member stated he was happy to meet with a Member to discuss his concerns about the visitor economy.

Cabinet Member for Education and Children's Services, Councillor Anita Cranmer

The Cabinet Member received questions on SEND provision and on the quality of education in the county. Members were informed:

- (i) On the proactive work the Council was doing on SEND provision. There were 6,000 children in Buckinghamshire with an EHCP, with there being a 9% increase in SEND applications this year. Steps being taken included simplifying the application procedure and increasing SEND provision by appointing 3 new Divisional i-SEND Officers, recruiting additional educational psychologists, and adding to the property areas where SEND could be provided.
- (ii) That the Council totally supported excellent education. It was commented that independent schools were very generous in terms of sharing their facilities and teaching expertise and in providing other help. The grammar schools were exactly the same and the Council had very good relations with them.

Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Angela Macpherson

The Cabinet Member received questions on people in care and on the Autism Strategy. Members were informed:

- (i) That the Council was seeing an increase in demand for adult social services as well as in the number of people requiring residential or nursing care. At the same time, there had also been an increase in the number of people the Council was providing information, guidance and assistance to so that they can continue to stay at home and access the right services in the community.
- (ii) On what the Council was doing to develop the emerging Autism strategy. The Cabinet Member also commended the Dementia Journey scrutiny rapid review that had been submitted the day before to Cabinet.

Cabinet Member for Communities, Councillor Arif Hussain

There were no questions to the Cabinet Member for Communities.

Councillor M Harker OBE (the Council's Armed Forces champion and chair of the Civilian Military Partnership Board) informed Members that the Council had recently

achieved Gold in the Defence Employers Recognition Scheme, which was the highest level for employer organisations that had pledged, demonstrated and advocated support to defence and the armed forces community. It also aligned with the values of the Armed Forces Covenant.

Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change, Councillor Gareth Williams

The Cabinet Member received questions on protection for trees and on the groundwater strategy. Members were informed:

- (i) That as well as planting 145,000 trees in the last year, the Council also took protecting mature trees extremely seriously, particularly with reference to holding HS2 to account which had included putting in place a Tree Protection Order against them.
- (ii) On project groundwater, where the Government had funded 3 pilot projects in Chesham, Marlow and Chalfont St Peter. Hopefully, the learning from these would benefit other areas in the county that were subject to flooding.

Cabinet Member for Transport, Councillor Steven Broadbent

The Cabinet Member received questions on potholes and on HS2 funding for road safety. Members were informed:

- (i) On the continuing work being done by 15 gangs, 7 days per week, to maintain roads and respond to outstanding jobs across the county's road network.
- (ii) That HS2 had provided just under £4m for road safety which was being used to negate the impact of their increased traffic movements rather than for projects such as road re-surfacing. There were currently approximately 23 schemes allocated that would cost £3.5m to deliver. It was stated a project relating to the A418 Wing was in the advance stages of being designed.

Cabinet Member for Accessible Housing and Resources, Councillor John Chilver

The Cabinet Member received questions on asset management and on school travel plans. Members were informed:

- (i) That the Cabinet Member was always happy to talk to Members about Council assets located in their Wards. A property and assets review was about to be launched to update the Council's database and ensure that assets were being best operated and used.
- (ii) That parking was one of the key issues considered by the schools property team when new schools or extensions to existing schools were being planned and delivered. This would include consultation and engagement on any plans.

10 Notices of Motion

The Chairman informed Members that four motions had been submitted to the meeting. The motions related to:

- (i) Cross Party working on the Buckinghamshire Council Local Plan.
- (ii) Day Travel Card.
- (iii) Implementing a 20 mph speed limit on roads outside all schools in

- Buckinghamshire.
(iv) Scrutiny.

(i) Cross Party working on the Buckinghamshire Council Local Plan.

The motion was proposed by Councillor Stuart Wilson and seconded by Councillor Robin Stuchbury –

“This Council regards the development of the new Buckinghamshire Council Local Plan (LP4B) as one of the most significant actions during this Council term of office to May 2025 and the next. It understands the importance of creating the LP4B based on the widest possible views from all parts of the county as represented by the elected Members. It is noted that cross-political group participation in its development is absolutely necessary to ensure that there is fair and transparent representation across all sections of our communities, towns, villages and rural areas.

Council requires Cabinet to ensure that:

- a. **All future LP4B working parties/task & finish groups and such like involving any Members will include Group Leaders or their delegates as full participants; and,**
- b. **All future LP4B working parties/task & finish groups and such like involving any Members will also include additional representatives from all political groups, as a minimum in line with political proportionality, to ensure any geographical or other gaps are covered.”**

Councillor Wilson briefing explained the rationale of the motion. During the debate the Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration explained the role and makeup of the Local Plan Working Group, and detailed the scrutiny and consultation that would be undertaken as the Local Plan was being developed.

At the conclusion of the debate, a requisite number of Members present requested that a recorded vote be held. Following a recorded vote, the motion was declared to be **LOST**.

Voting was as follows:

FOR (25): Councillors Baldwin, Bates, Baughan, Cooper, Dixon, Gemmell, Guy, D Hayday, O Hayday, I Hussain, Majid Hussain, N Hussain, T Hussain, James, Kayani, Kelly, R Khan BEM, Morgan, Poland-Goodyer, W Raja, G Smith, M Smith, Stuchbury, Wheelhouse and Wilson.

AGAINST (80): Councillors Adoh, Alam, Anthony, Ashman, Ayub, Bagge, Barnes, Barrett, Baum, Birchley, Blamires, Bond, Bowles, Bracken, Brazier, Broadbent, Broom, Brown, Carington, Carroll, B Chapple OBE, S Chapple, Chaudry, Chhokar, Chilver, Collins, Cornell, Cranmer, Culverhouse, Darby, Egleton, Fealey, Flys, Gomm,

Goss, Green, M Harker OBE, Harriss, Heap, A Hussain, Maz Hussain, Mahboob Hussain JP, Irwin, Jackson, Jordan, King, Knight, MacBean, A Macpherson, I Macpherson, Mahon, Martin, R Matthews, W Matthews, Mohammed, Mordue, Newcombe, Oliver, Osibogun, Poll, Rana, Rand, Rouse, L Smith BEM, Southworth, Stannard, Strachan, Sullivan, Tett, Thomas, Thompson, Towns, M Turner, P Turner, L Walsh, Ward, Waters, Williams, Winn and K Wood.

ABSTENTIONS: There were none.

(ii) Day Travel Card

The motion was proposed by Councillor Steven Broadbent and seconded by Councillor Martin Tett –

“This council notes the proposed removal of Day Travel Cards by the Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, for those travelling into and throughout London. This will result in Buckinghamshire residents having to buy separate Rail and London transport service tickets.

Currently, Day travelcards provide unlimited travel on TfL services, including London Underground, Bus, Tram, Docklands Light Railway, London Overground and Elizabeth line, and National Rail services in London. They can also be used to obtain a one third reduction in River Services fares.

The proposals to remove Day Travelcards constitute an unfair, unacceptable and expensive levy on Buckinghamshire residents who wish to travel to London. The proposals have deliberately targeted the removal of the Day travelcard as a method to generate additional income for TfL.

It is anticipated by the Mayor’s own consultation that the withdrawal of day travelcards will result in Rail Operators ceasing to sell Zone 1-6 travelcards. This will add barriers and travel friction to journeys to London – running counter to evidence that passenger journeys and the use of public transport are enhanced by improving integrated ticketing not reducing it.

No regard is given in the proposals for the potential loss of revenue to the London economy that may be caused by the increase in travel costs as Buckinghamshire residents risk being priced out of the nation’s capital. Employers, retail and leisure businesses, theatres and many others may see a reduction in revenue as the people of Buckinghamshire reduce their time and/or expenditure in London.

The Cabinet Member for Transport has written to TfL on this matter to express concern and a lack of support for these proposals.

This Council therefore resolves:

- **To demand that London Mayor, Sadiq Khan, immediately withdraws his proposals for the removal of day Travelcards.**

- **To request that the Leader of the Council writes to Sadiq Khan informing him of this resolution of Buckinghamshire Council, the discriminatory nature of his proposal, the impact on Buckinghamshire residents, the negative impact on the economy of London and therefore the need to abandon plans to remove Day Travelcards.**
- **That the Leader write to the Secretary of State for Transport urging him to intervene in this matter.”**

Councillor Broadbent briefing explained the rationale of the motion. During the debate Members raised a number of issues including that the proposed removal of Day Travel Cards for those travelling into and throughout London would unfairly and adversely impact Buckinghamshire residents, both those that worked in London but also those that travelled there for leisure and family outings. It would also have a negative impact in removing vehicles from road networks and discouraging people from travelling on public transport.

At the conclusion, a requisite number of Members present requested that a recorded vote be held. Following a recorded vote, the motion was declared to be **CARRIED**.

Voting was as follows:

FOR (99): Councillors Adoh, Alam, Anthony, Ashman, Ayub, Bagge, Baldwin, Barnes, Barrett, Baughan, Baum, Birchley, Blamires, Bond, Bowles, Bracken, Brazier, Broadbent, Broom, Brown, Carington, Carroll, B Chapple OBE, S Chapple, Chaudry, Chhokar, Chilver, Collins, Cooper, Cornell, Cranmer, Culverhouse, Darby, Dixon, Egleton, Fealey, Flys, Gemmell, Gomm, Goss, Green, M Harker OBE, Harriss, O Hayday, Heap, A Hussain, I Hussain, Maz Hussain, Mahboob Hussain JP, N Hussain, T Hussain, Irwin, Jackson, James, Jordan, Kayani, Kelly, R Khan BEM, King, Knight, MacBean, A Macpherson, I Macpherson, Mahon, Martin, R Matthews, W Matthews, Mohammed, Mordue, Morgan, Newcombe, Oliver, Osibogun, Poland-Goodyer, Poll, W Raja, Rana, Rand, Rouse, L Smith BEM, Southworth, Stannard, Strachan, Sullivan, Tett, Thomas, Thompson, Towns, M Turner, P Turner, L Walsh, Ward, Waters, Watson, Wheelhouse, Williams, Wilson, Winn and K Wood.

AGAINST (4): Councillors Guy, Majid Hussain, G Smith and M Smith.

ABSTENTIONS (3): Councillors Bates, D Hayday and Stuchbury.

RESOLVED –

- (1) That this Council demands that the London Mayor, Sadiq Khan, immediately withdraws his proposals for the removal of Day Travelcards.
- (2) That the Leader of the Council should write to Sadiq Khan informing him of the resolution of Buckinghamshire Council, the discriminatory nature of his proposal, the impact on Buckinghamshire residents, the negative impact on the economy of London and therefore the need to abandon plans to remove

Day Travelcards.

- (3) That the Leader of the Council should write to the Secretary of State for Transport urging him to intervene in this matter.

(iii) Implementing a 20 mph speed limit on roads outside all schools in Buckinghamshire

The motion was proposed by Councillor Adam Poland-Goodyer and seconded by Councillor Peter Cooper –

“We request that Council seek to adopt a new policy implementing a 20mph speed limit on the roads in Buckinghamshire where there are schools.

Council notes that:

- Buckinghamshire Council should be providing a safe environment for children and adults to work and study by reducing casualties on the roads and community inequality.
- As part of Buckinghamshire Councils climate challenge, it is acknowledged that 20mph speed limits lower emissions, tackle congestion, improves air quality and reduces ambient noise. DFT guidance states that 20mph schemes have environmental benefits through saving fuel and reducing pollution.
- Buckinghamshire Council is committed to increasing child and adult activity levels and mental health and wellbeing by promoting walking and cycling, which after the pandemic should be a key concern of this Council to address all aspects of public health.
- 20mph schemes promote quality of life, community benefits and encouragement of healthier and more sustainable transport modes such as walking or cycling.
- There are currently over 2000 20mph schemes in the UK in operation.
- Reducing speed reduces collisions and casualties as the collision frequency is lower at lower driving speeds. There is also a greater chance of survival if struck at 20mph (90%) compared to 30mph (50%).
- The Royal Society for the prevention of accidents found that the risk of pedestrians being fatally injured at 20mph was 2.5% compared to a 20% chance at 30mph.
- DFT’s free flow speed report shows that 50% of drivers drive at less than 30mph in a 30mph zone. In a 20mph zone 80% of drivers drive less than 20mph.

Council further recognises that:

- Between 2020 and 2021 on Urban and Rural roads in Buckinghamshire there was a total of 701 accidents and 831 casualties. 26 of these were children who were walking on the pavement and 48 were adults. 17 of these were children riding bikes to and from school, and 59 were adults cycling on the road. 1 Pedestrian and 2 people in a vehicle were killed. 5 Children walking on the pavement were seriously injured and 14 adults. 1 Child and 13 Adults was seriously injured riding a bike. All this information is available on the DFT

website.

- On the government website it states local speed limits are determined by local traffic authorities having regard to the guidance issued by the DfT.
- Other Councils who have adopted the 20mph speed limit policy have not had to implement the costly expense of physical calming measures.
- Thames Valley Police have no policy to enforce based on arbitrary speed limits alone but will enforce based on the threat of harm, risk, and resourcing. 20mph speed limits are not excluded from this and will be enforced where appropriate.

Council therefore resolves to:

- Establish a cross party working group to seek to implement a Council wide 20mph speed limit outside all schools as soon as possible. This should include identifying which roads the 20mph speed limit should be implemented and explore enforcement measures such as average speed/ ANPR cameras and community speed watch initiatives.
- Ask the Chief Executive/Leader of the Council to write to all the Town and Parish Councils in Buckinghamshire, inviting them to consult with Buckinghamshire Council on the proposed 20mph speed limits.”

Councillor Poland-Goodyer briefing explained the rationale of the motion. During the debate Members raised a number of issues as follows:

- That there was already a mechanism in place with Community Boards and Parish Councils to identify and implement, where required, 20 mph speed limits on a case-by-case basis.
- That the police had a policy of not enforcing 30 mph speed limits outside schools (unless there was an identified threat or risk) and this would not change if 20 mph speed limits were introduced. A far greater problem was caused in the near vicinity of schools, usually by parents, through bad parking and other dangerous and inconsiderate practices.
- The Cabinet Member for Transport provided statistics that in 2020/21 there had been 15 injury incidents outside schools although none had been caused through speeding. It was also commented that through mechanisms in place there were already 105 roads in the county that had 20 mph limits.

At the conclusion of the debate, a requisite number of Members present requested that a recorded vote be held. Following a recorded vote, the motion was declared to be **LOST**.

Voting was as follows:

FOR (26): Councillors Baldwin, Bates, Baughan, Cooper, Dixon, Gemmell, Guy, D Hayday, O Hayday, I Hussain, Majid Hussain, N Hussain, T Hussain, James, Kayani, R Khan BEM, Knight, Morgan, Poland-Goodyer, W Raja, G Smith, M Smith, Southworth, Stuchbury, Wheelhouse and Wilson.

AGAINST (80): Councillors Adoh, Alam, Anthony, Ashman, Ayub, Bagge, Barnes,

Barrett, Baum, Birchley, Bond, Bowles, Bracken, Brazier, Broadbent, Broom, Brown, Carington, Carroll, B Chapple OBE, S Chapple, Chaudry, Chhokar, Chilver, Collingwood, Collins, Cornell, Cranmer, Culverhouse, Darby, Egleton, Fealey, Flys, Gomm, Goss, Green, M Harker OBE, Harriss, Heap, A Hussain, Maz Hussain, Mahboob Hussain JP, Irwin, Jackson, Jordan, Kelly, King, MacBean, A Macpherson, I Macpherson, Mahon, Martin, R Matthews, W Matthews, Mohammed, Mordue, Newcombe, Oliver, Osibogun, Poll, Rana, Rand, Rouse, L Smith BEM, Stannard, Strachan, Sullivan, Tett, Thomas, Thompson, Towns, M Turner, P Turner, L Walsh, Ward, Waters, Watson, Williams, Winn and K Wood.

ABSTENTIONS: There were none.

(iv) Scrutiny

The motion was proposed by Councillor Stuart Wilson and seconded by Councillor Robin Stuchbury –

“Council noted the importance of Scrutiny for Buckinghamshire Council following the Annual Scrutiny Report presented to Council in April 2023. The Minutes of that meeting record that the process at Buckinghamshire is highly regarded by other councils, and by the LGA. Buckinghamshire Council strives to operate best practice.

According to the Centre for Governance & Scrutiny, pre-decision scrutiny results in more meaningful engagement for Scrutiny Committees leading to better decision-making. Call-in procedures are used to scrutinize policy post-decision if necessary. Forward Plans are aligned to enable Scrutiny in advance of Executive decision-making at Cabinet.

In Buckinghamshire Council, detailed policy decision papers rarely come before Scrutiny Committees in advance of Cabinet, although policy development papers are sometimes put before Scrutiny Committees which is to be applauded. The notable exception of consistent Pre-Decision Scrutiny is Budget Scrutiny which is a compressed timeframe prior to Cabinet approval and publication to Full Council.

The call-in scope is limited by the Constitution to procedural matters, rather than policy content, so there is very limited opportunity for a Scrutiny Committee to scrutinize and recommend amendment of detailed policy either in advance or indeed after a policy decision has been taken.

This Council notes:

- The best practice of Pre-Decision Scrutiny of Policy highlighted by the Centre for Governance & Scrutiny and in the recent training delivered to Members.

This Council resolves that:

- The Pre-Decision Scrutiny of Policy is adopted by Buckinghamshire Council, such that all Policy Decisions undergo Pre-Decision Scrutiny through the relevant Select Committee prior to going to Cabinet.

- Pre-Decision Scrutiny of any Policy Decision considered to be confidential on grounds permitted by law will be held in a confidential Scrutiny session.
- The Council's emergency powers remain available in appropriate circumstances to override the need for Pre-Decision Scrutiny; in such circumstances, a Decision can be reviewed at the appropriate Select Committee at the next available opportunity.
- Pre-Decision Scrutiny by Select Committees will result in a Pre-Decision Scrutiny Report submitted to the relevant Cabinet Portfolio Holder(s) for full consideration in advance of a Policy Report to Cabinet, which should include the Pre-Decision Scrutiny Report as an appendix.
- Any Policy Decision taken by Cabinet without Pre-Decision Scrutiny, or the Pre-Decision Scrutiny Report being appended to the Cabinet Report, is subject to Call-In by the relevant Select Committee on procedural grounds.
- Forward Plans and Calendars for Select Committees and Cabinet are amended within three months of this resolution to enable Pre-Decision Scrutiny of Policy for the remaining term of this Council and beyond."

Councillor Wilson briefing explained the rationale of the motion. During the debate Members raised a number of issues as follows:

- That the Council already operated one of the strongest, most powerful Select Committee systems in the country that was an LGA role model. The Select Committees worked in a constructive and bipartisan way to hold the Executive to account, and had powers to call-in Executive decisions and summons the Leader or Chief Executive to attend scrutiny meetings.
- That Select Committees were already able to, and did, undertake pre-decision scrutiny which was working well. An excellent example of this was budget scrutiny.
- That the motion was not intended to hold up decision-making but to focus on pre-decision scrutiny of the most important policy decisions of the Council.

At the conclusion the motion was put to the vote and declared to be **LOST**.

11 Questions on Notice from Members

The written responses to questions from Members, published as a supplement to the agenda, were noted.

12 Report for information - Key Decisions Report

A list of decisions taken by the Leader since the last Full Council meeting on 17 May 2023 were received and noted.

13 Date of Next Meeting

4pm, Wednesday 20 September 2023.