

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At the Meeting of the
WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Woodgreen,
Witney, on Wednesday 24 February 2016 at 2.00 pm.

PRESENT

Councillors: N A MacRae MBE (Chairman), A J Adams, Mrs J C Baker, M A Barrett, A C Beaney, R J M Bishop, M Brennan, Mrs L C Carter, Mrs L J Chapman, A S Coles, J C Cooper, D A Cotterill, C Cottrell-Dormer, R A Courts, C G Dingwall, P J G Dorward, Mrs J M Doughty, H B Eaglestone, D S T Enright, P Emery, Mrs E H N Fenton, E J Fenton, S J Good, J Haine, P J Handley, A D Harvey, H J Howard, R A Langridge, Ms E P R Leffman, Mrs L E C Little, R D J McFarlane, J F Mills, T J Morris, Sir Barry Norton, T N Owen, Dr E M E Poskitt, A H K Postan, Mrs C E Reynolds, W D Robinson, G Saul, T B Simcox, G H L Wall and B J Woodruff.

59. MINUTES

RESOLVED: that the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 20 January 2016, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

60. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors N G Colston, Mrs M J Crossland (Vice Chairman), A M Graham, Miss G R Hill, E H James and P D Kelland

61. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr Frank Wilson and Mrs Christine Gore, Strategic Directors, declared an interest in Agenda Item No. 9 – 2020 Vision Programme Appointments by virtue of their posts being included in the report. They indicated they would leave the meeting during the consideration of that item.

62. RECEIPT OF ANNOUNCEMENTS

62.1 Additional Papers

The Chairman advised members that a revised Schedule 2 relating to the Budget and Council Tax 2016/2017 report had been circulated.

62.2 Webcasting of Meetings

Mr Langridge referred to discussion at the previous meeting regarding the possibility of webcasting council meetings and advised that he had asked officers to look at the issue.

Mr Langridge advised that costs were in the region of £25,000 to £30,000 for set up costs with an annual running cost of approximately £17,000 based on the systems used by Cherwell District Council and Gloucestershire County Council.

Mr Langridge suggested that it may be an issue that the Finance and Management Overview & Scrutiny Committee would wish to look at in more detail. Mr Morris, Chairman of that Committee, indicated that he would take the matter forward.

62.3 Councillor Ian Hudspeth

Mr Cooper indicated that Councillor Ian Hudspeth, Leader of Oxfordshire County Council, had been unwell and expressed his best wishes for a speedy recovery. Members associated themselves with Mr Cooper's comments.

63. PARTICIPATION OF THE PUBLIC

No submissions were received from the public in accordance with the Council's Rules of Procedure.

64. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE AND COUNCIL COMMITTEES

The Council considered the report of the Chief Executive setting out recommendations made by the Cabinet and the Council's Committees from 28 January to 10 February 2016.

The recommendations were proposed by Sir Barry Norton, Leader of the Council, and seconded by Mr Robinson.

RESOLVED: that the recommendations made by the Cabinet and the Council's Committees from 28 January to 10 February 2016 be approved in relation to:

(a) Revised Medium Term Financial Strategy 2015-2025 (Minute No. CT/104/2015/2016)

(b) Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy
(Minute No. CT/106/2015/2016)

65. REPORTS OF THE CABINET AND THE COUNCIL'S COMMITTEES

The reports of the meetings of the Cabinet and the Council's Committees held between 28 January and 10 February 2016 were received:

65.1 Open Space Grass Cutting

(Minute No. ENV/47/2015/2016)

Mr Enright asked if there had been any progress in respect of discussions with Witney Town Council regarding grass cutting. Mr Harvey indicated that there had been a delay and that he would clarify the present position with officers.

65.2 Recycling Bring Sites and Household Waste Recycling facilities

(Minute No. ENV/47/2015/2016)

Mr Saul sought further information regarding cost estimates by Ubico in respect of establishing a new facility in the north of the district. Mr Harvey advised that he would liaise with officers and respond to Mr Saul separately.

66. BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2016/2017

The report of the Cabinet setting out its recommendations for the Council's General Fund revenue budgets for 2016/17, Capital Programme for 2016/17 to 2020/2021 and to enable the Council to set the Council Tax for 2016/17 was received and considered.

Sir Barry Norton, Leader of the Council, introduced the budget proposals and a copy of the budget speech is attached as an Appendix to the original copy of these minutes.

Sir Barry then proposed the recommendations in the report and this was seconded by Mr Langridge.

Mr Langridge, Cabinet Member for Resources, expressed his thanks to officers and members for their help and support during the formulation of the budget. It was emphasised that it had been difficult and challenging in light of funding cuts by Oxfordshire County Council (OCC), changes to the New Homes Bonus and the large number of business rate appeals.

Mr Langridge indicated that shared services and other efficiency savings had prepared the council well for dealing with the challenges. Mr Langridge highlighted that grants to the voluntary sector had been protected for a further year but this may not be the case in

future years. Mr Langridge referred to the public consultation and that there had been support for a rise in council tax.

Mr Langridge referred to the feedback from the scrutiny committees and advised that the council would be able to support a grant to Wild Oxfordshire if they made an application. In addition the use of solar panels on council buildings was being taken forward.

Mr Langridge reported that in respect of fees and charges the council was seeking to support market traders by freezing pitch fees and there would be a 10% increase in trade waste charges to make the service more viable.

Mr Langridge concluded by emphasising that the proposed increase was the first in six years and would protect frontline services for residents.

Mr Robinson, in supporting the budget, expressed disappointment that reserves needed to be used. Mr Robinson thanked all staff involved in the budget process and the shared services programme.

Mr Robinson concurred that there was a degree of uncertainty and a lot of issues were outside of the council's control and emphasised the importance of the Medium Term Financial Strategy. Mr Robinson expressed the hope that reserves would not need to be used in future years.

Mr Enright, Leader of the Labour Group, echoed other councillors in thanking officers for their work on the budget and for adapting to new ways of working.

Mr Enright emphasised the input of opposition groups during development of the budget and welcomed the protecting of grants to partnership organisations and expressed the hope that these could be retained in future years.

Mr Enright highlighted the need to identify new revenue opportunities whenever possible and underlined the impact of central government cuts and the pressure this put on local councils. Mr Enright, whilst supporting the budget parameters, suggested that the council could do more to work with other Oxfordshire authorities and local town/parish councils.

Mr Enright advised that the Labour Group would be abstaining from the vote.

Mr Cooper, Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group, suggested that the announcement of additional funding for rural authorities at a late stage could have meant a lower rise was an option. Mr Cooper advised that his group had looked at this but would be supporting the £5 rise.

Mr Cooper cautioned against assuming such a rise was acceptable every year and the council needed to be cognisant of the impact, particularly on the elderly, of continued rises not just by this council but other authorities as well. Mr Cooper suggested any future increases needed to be justified and proved to be necessary.

In respect of town council precepts Mr Cooper highlighted that Woodstock had the lowest for any town in Oxfordshire.

Mr Cooper advised that the Liberal Democrat Group would vote for the budget as the proposed rise was considered acceptable.

Mr Courts emphasised the impact of spending by the last Labour government and thanked Mr Langridge for his hard work in respect of the budget. Mr Courts highlighted the importance of free parking from a business perspective and also the delivery of high speed broadband to rural areas.

Mr Dingwall concurred and emphasised that the council would do all it could to protect grants in the future. Mr Dingwall reminded members that the rise would equate to

approximately 10p a week and remained the second lowest precept for a shire district in the country.

Ms Leffman welcomed the public consultation that had been undertaken and suggested it was important that the views of residents were constantly sought. Ms Leffman, in acknowledging that community grants may need to be reviewed, suggested it was important that there was dialogue with such groups and plenty of notice given of any funding changes.

Mr McFarlane expressed support for the budget and that it was a shame it was not receiving full cross party backing. Mr McFarlane emphasised the positive impact of shared services, the vibrant economy of the district, low unemployment, leisure facilities and waste collection services. Mr McFarlane referred to the investment in broadband and flood defence works in the district.

Mr Morris suggested that the council was working very efficiently and emphasised the support for the budget through the scrutiny process.

Mrs Chapman referred to the OCC budget and that it had been agreed by all parties. Mrs Chapman reiterated previous speakers and highlighted that the district precept was the second lowest in the country and Oxford City was approximately three times higher.

Mr Harvey highlighted cost shunting by OCC and the impact of recycling credits and increased gate fees at the Ardley waste facility as additional costs for this council. Mr Harvey emphasised the retention of free parking and reported that the response to the car park strategy consultation had been very positive. Mr Harvey suggested it was an excellent budget based on the right priorities.

Sir Barry thanked members for their support and expressed disappointment that the Labour Group would not be supporting the budget. Sir Barry suggested that the budget was beneficial for all residents.

Mr MacRae thanked all involved in the development of the budget.

On being put to the vote the proposition

WAS CARRIED

The following 39 members voted for the proposition:

Councillors A J Adams, Mrs J C Baker, M A Barrett, A C Beaney, R J M Bishop, M Brennan, Mrs L J Chapman, J C Cooper, D A Cotterill, C Cottrell-Dormer, R A Courts, C G Dingwall, P J G Dorward, Mrs J M Doughty, H B Eaglestone, P Emery, Mrs E H N Fenton, E J Fenton, S J Good, J Haine, P J Handley, A D Harvey, H J Howard, R A Langridge, Ms E P R Leffman, Mrs L E C Little, N A MacRae MBE, R D J McFarlane, J F Mills, T J Morris, Sir Barry Norton, T N Owen, Dr E M E Poskitt, A H K Postan, Mrs C E Reynolds, W D Robinson, T B Simcox, G H L Wall and B J Woodruff

The following four members abstained from voting:

Councillors Mrs L C Carter, A S Coles, D S T Enright and G Saul

RESOLVED: that

- 1) The General Fund revenue budgets and use of balances for 2016/17 as detailed in Appendix A be approved;
- 2) The Capital Programme for 2016/17 to 2020/2021 as detailed in Appendix A be approved;
- 3) The Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix B be approved;
- 4) The report of the Strategic Director at Appendix C be noted;

- 5) The 2016/17 Pay Policy Statement as set out in Appendix D be approved;
- 6) For the purpose of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 Section 35(2), there are no special expenses for the District Council in 2016/17;
- 7) It be noted that at its meeting held on 20 January 2016 the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2016/17
 - a) For the whole Council area as 41,512.03 [item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")]; and
 - b) For dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish Precept relates as in the attached Schedule 1.
- 8) The Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2016/17 (excluding Parish Precepts and Special Expenses) is £86.63
- 9) The following amounts be calculated for the year 2016/17 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:-
 - a) £56,866,739 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act, taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils and any additional special expenses.
 - b) £50,027,647 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) of the Act.
 - c) £6,839,092 being the amount by which the aggregate at 9(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 9(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act, as its Council Tax requirement for the year (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act).
 - d) £164.75 being the amount at 9(c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (7(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish Precepts and Special Expenses);
 - e) £3,242,905 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish Precepts and Special Expenses) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act as per the attached Schedule 2.
 - f) £86.63 being the amount at 9(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 9(e) above by Item T(7(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish Precept or special item relates;
 - g) The amounts shown in Schedule 2 being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 9(f) above, the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area shown in Schedule 2 divided in each case by the amount at 7(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate;
 - h) The amounts shown in Schedule 3 being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 9(f) and 9(g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to

dwelling listed in valuation Band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands;

- 10) It be noted that for the year 2016/17 the Oxfordshire County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner for the Thames Valley have issued precepts to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated below:-

<u>Valuation Band</u>	Oxfordshire County Council	Police and Crime Commissioner for Thames Valley
	£	£
A	854.43	111.31
B	996.83	129.86
C	1,139.24	148.41
D	1,281.64	166.96
E	1,566.45	204.06
F	1,851.26	241.16
G	2,136.07	278.27
H	2,563.28	333.92

- 11) The Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the amounts shown in Schedule 4 as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2016/17 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.
- 12) The Council's basic amount of Council Tax for 2016/17 is not excessive in accordance with principles approved under Section 52ZB Local Government Finance Act 1992.
- 13) The Strategic Director (Chief Finance Officer), GO Shared Service Head of Finance, Group Manager of Legal and Property Services, Joint Principal Solicitor, Joint Legal Executive, Group Manager Revenues and Welfare Support, Joint Operations Manager, Joint Support Lead Officer, Overpayments Officer, Senior Recovery Revenues Officer, Senior Revenues Officer, Revenues Officer, and Recovery Officer be authorised to:-
- a) Collect and recover any National Non-Domestic Rates and Council Tax; and
 - b) Prosecute or defend on the Council's behalf or to appear on its behalf in proceedings before a magistrate's court in respect of unpaid National Non-Domestic Rates and Council Tax.

(Mrs Gore and Mr Wilson left the meeting at this juncture)

67. 2020 VISION PROGRAMME APPOINTMENTS

Consideration was given to the report of the Chief Executive regarding the residual staffing structure within the council further to the 2020 Vision Programme.

Sir Barry introduced the report and advised that it was a follow up to decisions made by Council in October. Sir Barry proposed the recommendations subject to the following additional recommendation:

- (e) That, as a consequence of the deletion of the post of Chief Executive from the establishment, (i) references to the post of Chief Executive in the Council's Constitution be amended to refer

to the Head of the Paid Service; and (ii) the Head of the Paid Service be designated as Proper Officer for all functions where previously the Proper Officer was the Chief Executive, and for any functions which are not specified.'

Sir Barry explained that the additional recommendation would mean that the constitution fully reflected the decisions at (a) to (d).

Mr Dingwall, Cabinet Member for the 2020 partnership, seconded the proposal and offered his congratulations to the officers that had been appointed to the partnership roles.

Mr Enright expressed his support for the recommendations and highlighted the progress with the 2020 project and that many of the initial concerns had been fully addressed. Mr Enright reiterated previous concerns that shared working with authorities in Oxfordshire was not being developed further.

Mr Enright urged some caution in respect of a unitary bid for Oxfordshire and that this was an unknown factor at the moment. Mr Enright echoed other speakers in respect of officers appointed to the partnership.

Mr Langridge highlighted the work of Mr David Neudegg during his time as Chief Executive at West Oxfordshire and wished him luck in his new role as Partnership Managing Director. Mr Langridge also congratulated Mr Frank Wilson on his appointment as Head of Paid Service.

Mr Cooper concurred with others in congratulating officers on their new roles. In respect of a unitary authority Mr Cooper suggested that any case would need to be very robust and until then he was not convinced that a countywide unitary was the right approach.

Mr Cooper indicated that there was already some sharing of posts and work with other Oxfordshire councils. Mr Cooper suggested it would have been useful if members had been notified of the additional recommendation in advance.

Finally Mr Cooper asked if a departmental structure chart could be produced so that members knew who to contact on various issues. The Chief Executive advised that this could be done once appointments were finalised.

Mr MacRae thanked Mr Neudegg for his help and support during his time as Chief Executive.

Mr Neudegg thanked members for their best wishes and that it had been a privilege to work with councillors, staff and the communities of West Oxfordshire. Mr Neudegg indicated that the council was in safe hands with the new management team and whilst this would be his last council meeting in his current role he would still have an involvement through the 2020 partnership.

On being put to the vote the proposition was unanimously carried.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the posts specified in paragraph 3.12 of the report be deleted from the establishment with effect from 1 April 2016;
- (b) That the post specified in paragraph 3.13 of the report be established with effect from 1 April 2016;
- (c) That, as referenced in paragraph 5.3 of the report, the salary of each of the Strategic Directors be increased by £1,366 per annum, with effect from 1 April 2016;
- (d) That the remaining content of the report be noted; and

- (e) That, as a consequence of the deletion of the post of Chief Executive from the establishment, (i) references to the post of Chief Executive in the Council's Constitution be amended to refer to the Head of the Paid Service; and (ii) the Head of the Paid Service be designated as Proper Officer for all functions where previously the Proper Officer was the Chief Executive, and for any functions which are not specified.

(Mrs Gore and Mr Wilson re-joined the meeting at this juncture)

68. COUNCIL PLAN 2016-2019

The report of the Joint Head of Business Information and Change seeking consideration of the Council Plan for the period 2016 to 2019 was received.

Sir Barry introduced the report and proposed the recommendations. Mr Howard seconded the proposal and thanked all those involved in preparing the new plan. Mr Howard suggested that the plan reflected the ambitions of the council and expressed particular support for the development of Carterton Leisure Centre.

Mr Enright indicated his support for the plan and emphasised the importance of reviewing the document to reflect changes in the nature of the district. Mr Enright gave his congratulations to Sir Barry on his investiture as a Knight of the Realm.

Mr Morris highlighted that the new plan had been supported by the scrutiny meetings and suggested that Witney would benefit from upgraded leisure facilities.

Mr Dingwall expressed particular support for the section relating to the provision of affordable homes in the district.

Mr Mills, Cabinet Member for Leisure, thanked members for their support of leisure provision and highlighted the public health benefits that could accrue from improved facilities.

Mr Mills referred to the increasing elderly population in the district and the leadership role of the council in this regard. Mr Mills emphasised the need to retain community hospital provision.

Mr Coles expressed his support for the plan but suggested that the introduction should make it clear that environmental issues and business support were not mutually exclusive.

Sir Barry acknowledged that the two could complement each other and this was reflected in the introduction to the document. Sir Barry thanked members for their support and confirmed the plan would be reviewed regularly.

Sir Barry thanked Mr Enright for his comments in respect of his Knighthood. Sir Barry advised that the investiture ceremony had been held on 29th January by HRH the Prince of Wales.

On being put to the vote the proposition was unanimously carried.

RESOLVED: That, the Council Plan 2016 to 2019 be adopted.

69. NOTICE OF MOTION RELATING TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Democratic Services in relation to a motion received at the Council meeting on 21 October 2015 in respect of the potential impact of the Government's Starter Homes Initiative on the overall delivery of affordable housing in West Oxfordshire.

Mr Saul referred to discussion of the motion at the Cabinet meeting held on 10 February where it resolved that Council be advised that the motion be rejected.

Mr Saul suggested that the original motion still had value and, whilst acknowledging that starter homes were positive, there was a need for affordable rented accommodation and policy should reflect the local need for housing.

Mr Saul highlighted that the council response to a consultation on the National Planning Policy Framework had indicated that introducing starter homes was a very positive step to address this issue but this needed to be done in a way that did not undermine the ability to also deliver affordable housing homes for rent. Mr Saul also highlighted paragraph 3.17 of the report.

Mr Saul acknowledged that a lot of detail was still awaited on the starter homes initiative but this was an opportunity for the council to reaffirm support for delivery of mixed tenure housing in the district. Mr Saul suggested that starter homes would only be affordable to those who could obtain a mortgage at the expense of rented accommodation for those most in need.

In conclusion Mr Saul indicated that he was not opposed to starter homes but it was vital to retain flexibility in the type of housing available and avoid arbitrary quotas.

Mr Saul proposed the original motion in the following terms:

“In his speech to his party’s annual conference, the Prime Minister confirmed that planning laws would be changed to allow developers to fulfil their obligation to build affordable homes by offering starter homes priced at 20% below market rate in place of building affordable homes for rent or for sale through “intermediate” housing schemes such as shared ownership.

As the National Housing Federation has stated, this is likely to lead to fewer homes being built for social rent or affordable rent at a time when the extension of right to buy to housing association tenants is also likely to reduce the available stock of social housing.

In the light of the above, this Council:

1. Confirms its support for the creation of mixed tenure developments that recognise the District’s significant need for affordable rented accommodation in contributing towards the District’s identified affordable housing needs as set out in the provisions of Policy H3 in the Council’s emerging Local Plan 2031; and

2. Requests that in promoting schemes to encourage new starter homes for sale the government should also introduce measures that encourage the building, in at least equal numbers, of a combination of (a) affordable, secure homes for rent and (b) affordable shared ownership properties in the various forms that Housing Associations have developed (e.g. rent to buy; part buy part rent; shared equity) so that the creation of new starter homes is not at the expense of these latter forms of social housing.”

Ms Leffman seconded the proposal and reserved the right to speak later in the debate.

Mr McFarlane advised that he would not support the motion and suggested that a supply of new houses and initiatives to facilitate this needed to be brought forward. Mr McFarlane indicated that Neighbourhood Plans and Help to Buy schemes were positive in this regard.

Mr Langridge suggested that the aspiration to own a home helped with social mobility and starter homes could aid people getting on to the housing ladder.

Mr Enright emphasised that the motion was not against starter homes but it was important that a range of tenures were available to meet local housing needs.

Mr Courts acknowledged the motivation behind the motion but there were already mechanisms such as the Council and Local Plans to deliver a range of housing. Mr Courts referred to his comments at the Cabinet meeting regarding social housing stock and reiterated that home ownership was key in aiding social mobility.

Mr Handley suggested that development was on-going in the district but more houses were needed and any policy that helped deliver homes for first time buyers was beneficial.

Sir Barry emphasised that the council always sought to support social rented housing where possible. In respect of the waiting list Sir Barry advised that the number in priority need was 474 and it was important to try and meet the ambitions of those wanting to own a home as well as those renting. Sir Barry suggested that a balance could be achieved through existing plans.

Mr Cooper suggested there was no easy answer to the issue and it was difficult to see how one for one replacement of social housing sold to tenants under right to buy could work. Mr Cooper referred to the lack of social housing stock in some areas. Mr Cooper highlighted that large amounts of land were owned by large estates and educational establishments and whilst some were proactive in providing land for affordable housing this was not always the case.

Mr Coles reiterated that the motion was not against the starter homes initiative. Mr Coles indicated that a lot of people had been removed from the housing waiting list but many were still in need of housing. Mr Coles suggested that house prices were prohibitive to many and the motion highlighted the need to look at a range of options.

Mrs Chapman acknowledged the need for housing and that social rented provision would always be required and this could be achieved, along with providing other types of housing, through existing mechanisms.

Mr Dingwall advised that since Cottsway housing had taken on the housing stock the number of properties available through them had increased to around 4,500 homes. Mr Dingwall suggested that innovative approaches were required and cited policies adopted by Cherwell District Council as an example.

Ms Leffman suggested that the debate had demonstrated that this was a difficult issue and factors such as affordability needed to be addressed. Ms Leffman suggested the 20% discount on starter homes would only help a few and would be out of reach for many residents.

Ms Leffman highlighted the problem of sites having planning permission but developments not being built quickly. Ms Leffman suggested the motion opened up the discussion on affordable housing and ways to deliver what was needed locally.

Ms Leffman advocated that the starter homes initiative was not perfect and that one for one replacement of social housing would not work in many cases as a new property could not be built in the vicinity of the house being sold.

Ms Leffman advised that far more could be done and the government should be asked to reconsider its approach on some issues.

Mr Saul, as mover of the motion, indicated that he had nothing further to add.

On being put to the vote the motion

WAS LOST

70. SEALING OF DOCUMENTS

The Council received and noted the report of the Chief Executive which gave details of documents numbered 11159 to 11174 sealed since the last meeting.

The meeting closed at 3.40pm

CHAIRMAN