

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
**WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Woodgreen,  
Witney, on Wednesday 22 February 2017 at 2.00 pm.

PRESENT

Councillors: N A MacRae MBE (Chairman), Mrs M J Crossland (Vice-Chairman), A J Adams, M A Barrett, A C Beaney, R J M Bishop, M Brennan, Mrs L C Carter, Mrs L J Chapman, A S Coles, N G Colston, J C Cooper, D A Cotterill, C Cottrell-Dormer, C G Dingwall, Mrs J M Doughty, H B Eaglestone, P Emery, Mrs E H N Fenton, E J Fenton, S J Good, A M Graham, J Haine, P J Handley, A D Harvey, Miss G R Hill, H J Howard, E H James, R A Langridge, Ms E P R Leffman, Mrs L E C Little, R D J McFarlane MBE, J F Mills, T J Morris, T N Owen, Dr E M E Poskitt, A H K Postan, Mrs C E Reynolds, G Saul, H E T St John, G H L Wall and B J Woodruff.

58. MINUTES

**RESOLVED:** that the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 18 January 2017, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

59. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs J C Baker, R A Courts, P J G Dorward, D S T Enright, P D Kelland and T B Simcox.

60. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest from Members or Officers in items to be considered at the meeting.

61. RECEIPT OF ANNOUNCEMENTS

61.1 Alison Leask

The Chairman advised Members of the death of Alison Leask, the Council's former Landscape and Technical Services Officer, who had passed away following a long illness. He informed Members that Alison's funeral was to take place at 3:00pm on Friday, 3 March at Westmill Woodland burial ground, Watchfield. He reminded Members that Alison had been responsible for the work at both the Kilkenny Lane Country Park and the Repatriation Memorial Garden in Brize Norton and advised that arrangements for a suitable memorial to Alison and her work would be discussed with her family.

All those present at the meeting then stood in silence in memory of Ms Leask.

61.2 Carterton Fire Station

Members joined with the Chairman in congratulating Mr Handley on the success of his long running personal campaign to secure a commitment from the County Council to provide a Fire Station in Carterton.

61.3 Environmental and Regulatory Services Group

The Chairman was pleased to inform Members that the Environmental and Regulatory Services Group had been shortlisted in the Efficiency and Team of the Year category in the Local Government Chronicle Awards for its work delivering service transformation.

#### 61.4 West Oxfordshire Lifeguard Team

The Chairman welcomed Ryan Thompson, Callum Stevenson, David Hall and Jenny Beveridge, members of GLL's West Oxfordshire lifeguard team, to the meeting. The team had recently been runners up in a national lifeguarding competition held at the Olympic swimming pool in London. Members congratulated the team on their achievement.

#### 61.5 2020 Vision Partnership - Progress Towards the Company Set Up.

The Chairman reminded Members that David Neudegg, the Managing Director of the 2020 Vision Partnership, would be repeating the presentation he had previously made to the Finance and Management Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the progress towards the Company set up at the conclusion of the Council Meeting.

#### 61.6 Support for Syrian Refugees

Mr Mills reminded Members that the Council had made an early commitment to the Government's proposals to assist Syrian Refugees and was pleased to report that the Authority was now assisting six families. He advised that one of those family members had recently commenced full time employment and the Council was now focussing efforts on assisting others to secure full time employment.

The Chairman was pleased to note that the children were integrating well with the local community.

#### 61.7 Councillor Lynden Stowe

Mr Mills advised that Councillor Lynden Stowe was to stand down as leader at Cotswold District Council in May. Mr Mills paid tribute to the strong and consistent leadership provided by Councillor Stowe during a challenging time for local government and indicated that they had worked closely as both Councils had shared a number of services in a model which was proving a highly successful and efficient method of delivering value for residents. Mr Mills wished Councillor Stowe every success in the future, indicating that he left a significant legacy which he looked forward to developing further.

#### 61.8 Superfast Broadband Delivery

Mr Dingwall advised Members that the necessary open market review had been completed and the results were with the Council's consultants for analysis. The Council's objective remained to secure as close to 100% coverage as possible within the District in contrast to the County Council's contract with British Telecom which allowed for a 2% shortfall against the 90% target.

#### 61.9 Visit to the University of Oxford's Oncology Department

Mr Cooper thanked the Chairman for making arrangements for Members of the Council to visit the University of Oxford's Oncology Department. He emphasised how interesting they had found it and was particularly complimentary as to the way in which Dr Martin Christlieb, the Department's Public Engagement Manager, was able to make such a complex subject understandable to the layman.

Members asked that their appreciation be conveyed to Dr Christlieb.

#### 62. PARTICIPATION OF THE PUBLIC

Whilst no submissions were received from the public in accordance with the Council's Rules of Procedure, the Chairman welcomed those Members of the public present to the meeting.

63. 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 19 January to 15 February 2017.

Given that green energy generation was critical in reducing the impact of climate change, Mr Coles expressed his support for the recommendation at minute No. CT/129(b)/2016/2017 that the Council approves an addition to the Capital Programme of £500,000 to support the refinancing of the Southill Solar project. However, expressed his disappointment that it came at a time when changes to the tax regime meant that schools and businesses would miss out on the financial savings generated.

Ms Leffman thanked the Cabinet for its decision to support the project, indicating that it offered a good financial return to the Council whilst providing community benefit to Charlbury and the surrounding area.

The recommendations were proposed by Mr Mills and seconded by Mr Morris and on being put to the vote were carried.

**RESOLVED:** that the recommendations made by the Cabinet and the Council's Committees from 19 January to 15 February 2017 be approved in relation to:

- (a) The revised Medium Term Financial Strategy - (Minute No. CT/125/2016/2017);
- (b) The Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy - (Minute No. CT/127/2016/2017);
- (c) The addition to the Capital Programme of £500,000 to support the refinancing of the Southill Solar project (Minute No. CT/129(b)/2016/2017).

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

The reports of the meetings of the Cabinet and the Council's Committees held between 19 January and 15 February 2017 were received:

64.1 Rural Broadband Project Update  
(Minute No. F&M/63/2016/2017)

Ms Leffman was pleased to note that the Council was pressing forward with this project to provide coverage to those parts of the District currently overlooked. However, she expressed concern that some parts of the Station Lane Industrial Estate in Witney lacked coverage. In response, Mr Dingwall advised that, whilst some premises had existing contracts with BT for secure broadband, the Council's scheme would seek to provide coverage for those that did not.

65. ONE OXFORDSHIRE UNITARY PROPOSALS

The report of the Strategic Director and Head of Paid Service regarding the County Council's One Oxfordshire Project, copies of which had been circulated, was received and considered.

In proposing the recommendations, Mr Mills refuted suggestions that his open letter to residents was tantamount to scaremongering. It was evident from the responses that had been received that the concerns he had expressed over the One Oxfordshire proposal were reflective of the views shared by local residents. Mr Mills emphasised that the current debate over local government reorganisation was not of West Oxfordshire's making or timing. However, as the views of local residents on the matter were clear, it was incumbent upon the Authority to respond to the County Council's project so as to ensure that these contrary views were properly represented.

Whilst the report sought approval of additional funding of £25,000 for consultancy support, this figure was dwarfed by the £200,000 committed by the County Council on its own campaign. Given that there were other pressing demands on its financial resources, it was sad that the Council had to incur this expenditure. However, it was important for the Council to put forward its own perspective and to explain that it was able to achieve far greater levels of savings through joint working and efficiency savings than those projected by the County through structural reorganisation.

The proposition was seconded by Mr Morris.

Mr Cooper cautioned that approval of such expenditure would be seen by the public against a backdrop of spending cuts. He noted that, since the Council's decision to set aside funding to support a devolution deal, the Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire District Council had modified their position and were supporting the One Oxfordshire model. He indicated that he could not support the allocation of funding as the argument put forward was not well enough based; for example, concerns over the potential loss of free parking were not sustained by the differing strategies employed across a single district in Kidlington and Banbury. Mr Cooper suggested that the Council's response to date was a 'knee jerk' reaction; its position was not sufficiently well defined and Members were being asked to commit funds without a clear objective. There was insufficient evidence to support the concerns raised in Mr Mills' letter.

Mrs Carter advised that she would support the recommendation but stressed the need to remain mindful of the cost as both the District and County Councils' campaigns were funded by taxpayer's money during a time of austerity. Whilst the District's expenditure was dwarfed by that of the County Council, she suggested that the Council explore low cost PR initiatives as it was unable to compete with the County Council's expenditure.

Ms Leffman suggested that it had not been made clear exactly what Members were being asked to vote for. In the absence of a defined position, any communication strategy lacked clarity and it was not clear whether residents were being asked to comment upon West Oxfordshire in its own right or on the retention of a two tier local government structure. She suggested that the Council needed to establish a defined position before asking Members to allocate funding in its support.

Ms Leffman also expressed concern over the content of Mr Mills' letter. She indicated that suggestions that Chipping Norton Theatre and Citizens Advice were under threat were unfounded. Equally, there was no evidence that free car parking would be lost. She considered that the letter was misleading and indicated that, given the responsibility to ensure that taxpayers' money was well spent, she would not support the proposition without knowing what the Council proposed to say or do.

Mr Postan suggested that the funding was necessary to enable the Council to provide evidence to Central Government and to promote a dialogue internally and with the local electorate. He suggested that a small proportion of the funding in the region of 5% be retained for small projects such as direct PR to enable Members to speak directly to the electorate.

Mr Graham indicated that he shared the concerns expressed and was disappointed that the Leader of the Council had taken such action before the Council had been given the opportunity to debate the way forward. He emphasised that the interests of local residents came first but cautioned against undermining their ability to assess the merits of the respective arguments as they did not need to be told the position. The Council had not yet formally determined how to proceed but the Leader's letter implied that a position had already been taken. The content was not evidence based but relied upon supposition and, as such, it did not serve the Council well to suggest that services could

be lost without evidence to support the contention. It would be more appropriate for the Council to ask what residents felt to be the best way forward through a transparent and open consultation process without prejudice or bias.

Mr Saul questioned whether reference to a potential legal review of the County Council's position related to obtaining legal opinion or submitting an application for Judicial Review, indicating that he would wish to have the opportunity to vote on whether to pursue such a course of action.

Mr Handley acknowledged that conducting a consultation exercise would cost money. However, the County was funding its own exercise and, without conducting its own research, West Oxfordshire would have little evidence to rely upon. Whilst Members might feel that the creation of a unitary authority would not make sense, it was imperative that the Council establish an evidence base in order to make a measured response backed up by facts. Mr Handley noted that South Oxfordshire and the Vale of White Horse had agreed to harmonise services and costs and could not see that West Oxfordshire would be permitted to retain free car parking under a unitary authority. Expenditure of £25,000 was insignificant in comparison to what the District stood to lose as one of the best performing councils with the second lowest Council Tax amongst shire districts, its good reputation, prudent investments and proven record of success in achieving efficiency savings through joint working. These things were worth fighting for and the County Council's proposals threatened a loss of local accountability. The Council needed to establish facts to put before Central Government and there was an unavoidable financial cost in doing so.

(Mr James joined the meeting at this juncture)

Mr Howard indicated that the County had stolen a march on West Oxfordshire in commencing its campaign and the Council needed to wake up and respond or face the possibility of disappearing without trace, its assets that provide income to the District being lost.

Mr Beaney indicated that he did not understand the County Council's suggestion that West Oxfordshire could retain free parking and low Council Tax under a unitary authority but the Council needed to consider the risks and benefits of all options rather than simply addressing one.

Mr Coles advised that he would support the recommendation. The Leader of the Council had spoken at length and, given the County Council's campaign, it was important to support the proposition. However, the Council needed to remain mindful of costs and the danger of disseminating misleading information.

Dr Poskitt suggested that the Government had prompted the current uncertainties. She advised caution against the use of loaded questionnaires, suggesting that the recent letter sent by the Leader of the Council had been loaded. Where there were divergent views, it was better to engage in dialogue rather than to polarise opinions. Dr Poskitt questioned the current communication strategy which appeared to centre on the protection of services and suggested that the Council should take a broader view of what was required in future rather than simply seek to protect the current position.

Mr Dingwall thanked the Labour Group for its support, suggesting that West Oxfordshire's position was more securely founded than that of the County Council. Given that the One Oxfordshire proposal was based upon the creation of a new authority which would go on to formulate its own policies, the County Council was not in a position to give any assurance as to the form such policies would take. If the new authority wished to act equitably, it was difficult to see how it could maintain the current

differentials in Council Tax levels between districts. The Council had been successful in representing West Oxfordshire as an area and it had differences that were worthy of being preserved. It had a proven track record of efficiency and was continuing to develop further efficiency savings at the forefront of collaborative working. Mr Dingwall indicated that it was essential to fight against the creation of a unitary Oxfordshire as it was inevitable that the majority of funding would be drawn towards the urban centre of Oxford. Once the unitary proposal had been defeated; West Oxfordshire could demonstrate to the County Council how it might work more efficiently.

Mr Emery expressed his opposition to the creation of a unitary authority as Oxfordshire was primarily a rural area. He questioned how a single authority would be able to effectively address the differences and disparate nature and size of the county. In response to suggestions that the Council's publicity had been loaded, he indicated that it compared favourably with that produced by the County.

Mrs Chapman expressed her unqualified support for the proposition, suggesting that failure to do so would result in the loss of all the good work West Oxfordshire had delivered in the past; free car parking, low Council Tax and an efficient, well run council. Residents wished to see these benefits retained and it was well worth incurring the proposed level expenditure to protect them. The Leader of the Council had been right in warning residents of the threat posed by the County Council's proposals as the creation of a single authority would lead to harmonisation to the detriment of the District.

Mr Cotterill suggested that the proposed expenditure represented insurance against potential risk. He viewed it as a premium to protect the District's tourist industry as free car parking was of critical importance as many hotels lacked private parking provision.

Mr Harvey indicated that he had found it a pleasure and a privilege to work for West Oxfordshire and for the County Council in the past. He advised that, when working in County partnerships, Officers had had to battle against conflicting interests to secure a reasonable deal for West Oxfordshire. In a unitary authority, representation would be governed by population. This would favour the urban centre of Oxford over the rural areas and West Oxfordshire would find itself under-represented with funding being concentrated on the City. West Oxfordshire would lose out massively in a unitary county and it was essential that the Council was in a position to counter OCC's claims.

Mr Good advised that, following his recent appointment as the Council's representative to Cottsway Housing, it had become apparent that the housing company had serious concerns over the County Council's proposals. Cottsway valued its relationship with West Oxfordshire and the Council's Officers and was concerned that this would be lost. The Chief Executive and the Chairman of Cottsway has asked to meet with the Leader of the Council and other Members to discuss their concerns further.

Mr Morris agreed that the interests of West Oxfordshire's residents were paramount and it was apparent from the responses received that the services provided by the Council were held in high regard. It was true to say that those services would be at risk under a unitary authority but, equally, there was no certainty that they would be lost as those that were highly valued could be retained. Mr Morris acknowledged that some myths had arisen around the consultation and agreed that it was important to ensure that information provided was accurate and clear. It was also important that the Council kept residents informed and encouraged them to engage in the consultation process; pointing out both the benefits and risks of a unitary Oxfordshire.

Mr Morris noted that West Oxfordshire had been achieving efficiency savings through the 2020 programme for years and would continue to do so. The level of savings that could be achieved through collaborative working far outweighed the 2 ½% proposed by the County through its One Oxfordshire Proposals.

The Council's had already agreed to explore the possibility of a devolution deal but it had to react to the current position and encourage residents to engage with the consultation process.

In conclusion, Mr Mills advised that information within the consultant's report previously commissioned by the County Council outlined the impact of Council Tax harmonisation. This could result in a 20% rise over four years. It was wrong to connect devolution with local government reorganisation as they were two very different things. The Leader of the County Council had suggested that the potential for a devolution deal was dead based solely upon comments made by Lord Porter at a recent District Councils Network meeting. Mr Mills remained confident that this was not the case.

He emphasised that devolution and local government reorganisation were two very different issues; a devolution deal offered the possibility of providing additional funding and power to local areas whereas local government reorganisation simply sought to reduce overheads. Faced with a reduction in income and increasing demand for services the County had chosen to pursue the unitary option in which funding would be secured through Council Tax and Business Rates. West Oxfordshire had shown that there were alternative ways to secure income through its emerging business model and investments.

In December, the County Council had agreed to a twin track approach on devolution, a position it had maintained until recently. In questioning what had changed, Mr Mills suggested that, in saying that a devolution deal was dead, the County Council was selling Oxfordshire short. He encouraged all Members to have faith in West Oxfordshire and support the recommendation. Doing so would put the interests of residents first as resisting a unitary bid would allow time to talk and enable West Oxfordshire to show the County how savings could be made. West Oxfordshire had made savings of some 15% to date and expected to increase these to 30% by 2020. If the County Council was to take similar measures it could make savings of some £20 Million a year; four or five times that envisaged in the One Oxfordshire proposal.

The recommendations were then put to the vote and were carried.

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) That additional funding of £25,000 be approved, in order to finance the current communications strategy and other actions to protect the services and democratic mandate of West Oxfordshire residents, to be financed from the anticipated underspends in the 2016/17 revenue budget; and
- (b) That the Leader of the Council be requested to respond to the proposals following feedback from Councillors at the meeting.

(In accordance with paragraph 15(d) of the Council Procedure Rules, Mr Mills and Mr Coles requested respectively that the votes of the members of the Conservative and Labour groups in favour of the foregoing recommendations be recorded).

66. **BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2017/2018**

The report of the Cabinet setting out its recommendations for the Council's General Fund revenue budgets for 2017/18, Capital Programme for 2017/18 to 2021/2022 and to enable the Council to set the Council Tax for 2017/18 was received and considered.

Mr Mills, the 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. Mr Mills then proposed the recommendations in the report and this was seconded by Mr Morris.

Mrs Carter expressed her thanks to Officers and indicated that, whilst welcoming elements of the budget such as the retention of funding to the voluntary sector, support for community transport initiatives, funding of homelessness support and the protection of services, this was not the budget that the Labour Group would have delivered. She indicated that residents needed support to address the impact of the cuts imposed by the Oxfordshire County Council and believed that West Oxfordshire could do more and be more pro-active in this respect.

In particular, Mrs Carter expressed her sadness at the closure of the Chipping Norton Children's Centre which was to close that day. She implored the Council to be more ambitious going forward and advised that, whilst supporting the retention of a low Council Tax and free car parking, the Labour Group intended to abstain from voting on the budget.

Mr Cooper advised that the Liberal Democrats would be supporting the budget but warned that the Council needed to continually test whether it was able to justify future increases in Council Tax.

He reiterated the suggestion that he had made in previous years that the Council should consider whether it could achieve further savings through a review of its Committee Structure. Mr Cooper also drew Members' attention to the Homelessness Reduction Bill which could place further responsibilities upon the Council and, whilst welcoming the decision to maintain the current level of funding for Citizens Advice, suggested that the Council should consider whether these would be better met externally or in house.

Mr Dingwall expressed his thanks to Officers on behalf of all those who benefited from the Council's services.

In supporting the budget, Mr McFarlane expressed his disappointment at the reduction in New Homes Bonus to the Council as it had been established by Government to incentivise development. He drew attention to the efficiency savings secured through shared services and reiterated the view that a unitary authority for Oxfordshire would be detrimental. He welcomed the limited reliance on the use of reserves in support of the high quality services the Council provided to residents including leisure facilities, free parking, flood prevention and recycling and refuse collection, all of which contributed to West Oxfordshire being one of the best places to live, work and visit in Great Britain. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the Rural Broadband project would reach a successful conclusion.

Mr Postan suggested that West Oxfordshire should be held up as an example to other authorities; providing advice on securing efficiencies. Mr Howard thanked Members for their continued commitment to Phase II of the Carterton Leisure Centre.

Ms Leffman expressed her support for the budget and the general principle of free car parking. However, given the perceived difficulties arising from long term parking in specific locations such as in the vicinity of Charlbury railway station, she questioned whether there was merit in developing a selective charging regime for traffic management purposes.

Mrs Chapman noted that the Council had supported the provision of additional parking at Long Hanborough Station and went on to express her support for the budget proposals.



Mr Harvey expressed his support for the budget which built upon the good work of previous years. With regard to car parking, he advised that surveys had been undertaken in the past, none of which had provided evidence to support the suggestion that spaces were being sterilised for long periods by Oxford commuter parking. Mr Harvey went on to note that additional parking provision had been made available through developer contributions. Dr Poskitt advised that parking provision in Woodstock and Burford was at capacity.

Mr Handley and Mrs Reynolds expressed their support for the budget which built upon past achievements and supported businesses in the District.

Mr Morris expressed his thanks to the Strategic Director and Head of Paid Service and to Paul Stuart, the Go Shared Service Head of Finance who was to retire shortly having prepared some 16 previous budgets. Members joined Mr Morris in thanking Mr Stuart for his contribution to the Council.

Mr Morris noted that the budget envisaged minimal use of reserves and absorbed the impact of the cuts imposed by Oxfordshire County Council in relation to the disposal of green waste. The Budget provided on-going efficiency savings, support for Affordable Housing and the local economy. It built upon the 2020 efficiency programme and Mr Morris drew attention to the savings achieved since the formation of the Environmental and Regulatory Services Group. The level of Council Tax proposed retained the Council's position as the second lowest charging shire authority in England. Mr Morris agreed that there was more to be done going forward and acknowledged Mr Cooper's comments regarding the Committee Structure.

In summing up, Mr Mills advised that the Council's Officers had pointed out an error of some £41,000 in the County Council's accounts that could have been applied to continue to the continued operation of the ACE Centre or the Elms Day Centre. However, the County had decided to place that money into a contingency fund. He advised that work on the review of the committee structure had been put on hold as Officers were fully employed in responding to the County Council's proposals and there was not sufficient spare capacity within the authority to address both issues. In response to Mr Cooper's reference to the Homelessness Reduction Bill, Mr Mills reminded Members that the Council had agreed to contribute to the provision of floating support and the Community Housing Fund would be used to bring difficult to let properties back into use.

The proposition was then put to the vote and

**WAS CARRIED**

The following 38 members voted for the proposition:

Councillors A J Adams, M A Barrett, A C Beaney, R J M Bishop, M Brennan, Mrs L J Chapman, N G Colston, J C Cooper, D A Cotterill, C Cottrell-Dormer, Mrs M J Crossland, C G Dingwall, Mrs J M Doughty, H B Eaglestone, P Emery, Mrs E H N Fenton, E J Fenton, S J Good, A M Graham, J Haine, P J Handley, A D Harvey, Miss G R Hill, H J Howard, E H James, Ms E P R Leffman, Mrs L E C Little, N A MacRae MBE, R D J McFarlane MBE, J F Mills, T J Morris, T N Owen, Dr E M E Poskitt, A H K Postan, Mrs C E Reynolds, H E T St John, G H L Wall and B J Woodruff

The following three members abstained from voting:

Councillors Mrs L C Carter, A S Coles and G Saul.

**RESOLVED:** that:-

- 1) the General Fund revenue budgets and use of balances for 2017/18 as detailed in Appendix A be approved;
- 2) the Capital Programme for 2017/18 to 2021/2022 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 2017/18 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 2017/18;
- 7) it be noted that at its meeting held on 11 January 2017 the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2017/18
  - a) for the whole Council area as 42,580.71 [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 2017/18 (excluding Parish Precepts and Special Expenses) is £91.63
- 9) the following amounts be calculated for the year 2016/17 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:-
  - a) £57,067,306 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) £49,681,894 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) of the Act.
  - c) £7,385,412 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) £173.45 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) £3,483,742 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) £91.63 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 dwellings 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 2017/18 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:-

| <b>Valuation Band</b> | <b>Oxfordshire County Council</b> | <b>Police and Crime Commissioner for Thames Valley</b> |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
|                       | £                                 | £  |
| <b>A</b>              | 897.06                            | 113.52   |
| <b>B</b>              | 1,046.57                          | 132.44   |
| <b>C</b>              | 1,196.08                          | 151.36   |
| <b>D</b>              | 1,345.59                          | 170.28   |
| <b>E</b>              | 1,644.61                          | 208.12   |
| <b>F</b>              | 1,943.63                          | 245.96   |
| <b>G</b>              | 2,242.65                          | 283.80   |
| <b>H</b>              | 2,691.18                          | 340.56   |

- 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 2017/18 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.
- 12) the Council's basic amount of Council Tax for 2017/18 is not excessive in accordance with principles approved under Section 52ZB Local Government Finance Act 1992.
- 13) the Strategic Director (Chief Finance Officer), 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.

67. SEALING OF DOCUMENTS

The Council received and noted the report of the Head of Paid Service which gave details of documents numbered 11306 to 11315A sealed since the last meeting.

The meeting closed at 3:40pm

CHAIRMAN