

# Minutes

## of a meeting of the

# Council



held on Wednesday, 14 February 2018 at 7.00 pm  
at the The Ridgeway, The Beacon, Portway, Wantage, OX12 9BY

### Open to the public, including the press

#### Present:

Members: Councillors Monica Lovatt (Vice-Chairman in the chair), Alice Badcock, Mike Badcock, Matthew Barber, Eric Batts, Ed Blagrove, Yvonne Constance, Roger Cox, Margaret Crick, Charlotte Dickson, St John Dickson, Katie Finch, Debby Hallett, Robert Hall, Jenny Hannaby, Anthony Hayward, Dudley Hoddinott, Simon Howell, Vicky Jenkins, Bob Johnston, Mohinder Kainth, Sandy Lovatt, Ben Mabbett, Chris McCarthy, Chris Palmer, Helen Pighills, Julia Reynolds, Judy Roberts, Robert Sharp, Janet Shelley, Emily Smith, Henry Spencer, Elaine Ware and Catherine Webber

Officers: Steven Corrigan, Harry Gable, Simon Hewings, William Jacobs, Margaret Reed, Richard Spraggett (Capita) and Mark Stone

Number of members of the public: 20

#### **Co.54 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of councillors Stuart Davenport, Gervase Duffield, Mike Murray and Reg Waite.

#### **Co.55 Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2017 as a correct record and agree that the Chairman sign them as such.

#### **Co.56 Declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest**

None.

#### **Co.57 Urgent business and chairman's announcements**

The Chairman provided housekeeping information.

The Chairman advised that in respect of agenda item 15 (questions under Council procedure rule 33), she would take question 5 on the Oxfordshire Growth Deal prior to agenda item 7, and question 4, which relates to the 2018/19 budget, prior to agenda item 10.

## Co.58 Public participation

- A. Mr Alex Taylor asked the following question of Councillor Roger Cox, Cabinet member for planning:

Why has the Vale of White Horse District Council planning department consistently told us lies and said everything was built as the plans from about 2003 and that there were no breaches of planning for building work reference P00/V0831 for about fourteen years? When a supposedly proper investigation was done (reference 11/00214/UNAUDV 13/10/2011) there obviously were breaches as proven by the information obtained from the council in 2015 and 2017. This stated that conditions 3 and 4 were not met and a Building Control Notice should have been served in 2005 - why was it not served and when did the Blue Ginger extractor become immune from complying with the building conditions laid down in the planning acceptance please? Why has the planning department refused to entertain any more correspondence on this matter since November 2014?

### Answer

The concerns raised have been examined through the council's formal processes, including an independent review, which found the council's investigations satisfactory. We would encourage you to recognise the conclusions of these investigations are valued rather than pursue further unnecessary correspondence, which cannot be entertained.

- B. Mr Mayhew-Archer addressed Council on the Five Councils Partnership.

He referred to an article in the Oxford Mail which stated that the partner authorities hoped to save about £9 million over nine years from the partnership. Following the decision to cancel the contract with VINCI and renegotiate the contract with Capita, a tweet from Councillor John Cotton, Leader of South Oxfordshire District Council, stated that projected savings for the council would be roughly £2.5 million over 10 years. He questioned the reduction in potential savings for the councils and whether the exercise could cost the councils money. He questioned the lack of scrutiny undertaken by councillors of both the Capita and VINCI contracts. He pointed out that the joint scrutiny committee tried asking the right questions but it was told it had no role in the formal governance of the contracts.

## Co.59 Petitions

At its meeting on 13 December 2017 Council received a petition regarding the Kingfisher Canoe Club's efforts to secure a new home to operate from land at Rye Farm. In accordance with the council's petition scheme, which provides for a Council debate if a petition is signed by in excess of 500 people, Council considered the petition.

Mr Surnam addressed Council on behalf of the Kingfisher Canoe Club in support of the petition.

**RESOLVED:** to refer the petition to Cabinet to find a positive solution to secure a home for the Kingfisher Canoe Club.

## **Co.60 Housing and growth deal for Oxfordshire**

### **A. Question from Councillor Debby Hallett to Councillor Matthew Barber, Leader of the council**

“Can the leader please provide a simple list of the explicit benefits to Vale in this Growth Deal, and the explicit costs to Vale (or expectations from Government on Vale)? We are not (yet) a unitary authority, and therefore we are making decisions for the Vale, as opposed to Oxfordshire County in general. I think it’s important that members know exactly what’s promised to Vale, and what’s expected from Vale, before we vote on this deal.”

### **Answer**

Councillor Barber responded that that the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal (the Deal) would provide £215 million of additional Government funding for Oxfordshire including £150 million for infrastructure and £60 million for affordable housing which would benefit the residents of the Vale. In addition, it includes a package of planning freedoms and flexibilities including provision for a three-year housing land supply, rather than the current five year requirement.

### **B. Debate on housing and growth deal for Oxfordshire**

Council considered Cabinet’s recommendations, made at its meeting on 9 February 2018, on a Housing and Growth Deal for Oxfordshire.

Council agreed to suspend Council procedure rule 45 insofar as it limits councillors to speaking once.

The majority of councillors supported the Deal. In return for supporting the development of up to 100,000 new homes (the majority of which were included in existing local plans) the Deal would provide much needed funding for infrastructure and affordable housing across Oxfordshire, benefitting residents of the Vale and provide planning freedoms with the application of a three year, rather than the current five-year, housing land supply. Without the Deal the houses would still be required but without the infrastructure funding and support for affordable housing. Councillors noted the conditions recommended by Cabinet, set out in appendix 4 of the report, which outlined matters for clarification and matters which are not negotiable for Vale of White Horse District Council.

Whilst welcoming the funding, some councillors noted that the infrastructure funding would not address the current shortfall in funding.

A number of councillors expressed concern regarding the Deal. The infrastructure funding is insufficient, only addresses roads and there are no details of where the affordable housing would be provided. Others expressed concern regarding the governance arrangements – public consultation was lacking, the Oxfordshire Growth Board lacked transparency and there had been no opportunity to scrutinise the proposed Deal and the decision making process. Scrutiny needed to improve going forward. Others questioned the ability of the Oxfordshire local authorities to work together and whether sufficient resources would be made available to deliver the project.

**RESOLVED:** to

1. agree to the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal (the Deal) (attached as Appendix 1 to the report of the head of partnership and insight to Cabinet on 9 February 2018);
2. agree the Delivery Plan (attached as Appendix 2 to the report of the head of partnership and insight to Cabinet on 9 February 2018) as the basis for the Deal; noting that elements will be updated as detailed work programmes develop;
3. delegate authority to the chief executive, in consultation with the leader and the Growth Board, to make minor changes to the Delivery Plan that may be required to secure agreement with Government;
4. delegate authority to the chief executive, in consultation with the Growth Board, to make non-minor changes to the Delivery Plan that may be required to secure agreement with Government, subject to the agreement of the Cabinet;
5. delegate authority to the chief executive, in consultation with the Growth Board, to agree the Year 1 affordable housing delivery programme, phasing and processes specified in the Delivery Plan, subject to the agreement of the Cabinet;
6. appoint Oxfordshire County Council as the accountable body in respect of the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal;
7. delegate authority to the chief executive, in consultation with the Growth Board, to review the terms of reference of the Growth Board and agree any amendments and any appropriate inter-authority agreements required to support the delivery of the Housing and Growth Deal, subject to the agreement of the Cabinet;
8. agree that the Cabinet will take any other executive decisions arising from agreement to the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal, until the revised terms of reference of the Growth Board are in place;
9. agree to participate in the preparation of a Joint Statutory Spatial Plan (JSSP) for Oxfordshire in accordance with the timescales set out in the Delivery Plan and in accordance with Section 28 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the milestones for progressing the JSSP being contingent on Government delivering the Planning Freedoms and Flexibilities as described in the Delivery Plan; and
10. agree that commencement of work to support and deliver the JSSP is subject to Cabinet being satisfied that the conditions set out at Appendix 4 of the report of the head of partnership and insight to Cabinet on 9 February 2018 have been met.

**Co.61 Treasury management mid-year monitoring 2017/18**

Council considered Cabinet's recommendations, made at its meeting on 9 February 2018, on the treasury management activities for the first six months of 2017/18.

The Joint Audit and Governance Committee had considered the report at its meeting on 29 January 2018 and had not recommended any adjustments to the strategy as a result of the first six months' activities. That committee and Cabinet had concluded

that the treasury management activities had operated within the agreed parameters set out in the approved treasury management strategy.

**RESOLVED:** to approve the head of finance's treasury management mid-year monitoring report 2017/18 to Cabinet on 9 February 2018.

## **Co.62 Treasury management strategy 2018/19**

Council considered Cabinet's recommendations, made at its meeting on 9 February 2018, on the council's treasury management strategy and investment strategy for 2018/19 to 2020/21.

The Joint Audit and Governance Committee considered the report at its meeting on 29 January 2018 and recommended that the head of finance should consult the co-chair of Joint Audit and Governance Committee before investing in any Non-UCITS Retail Scheme. Cabinet supported the proposed strategy and the amendments as well as the recommendation of the Joint Audit and Governance Committee.

**RESOLVED:** to

1. approve the treasury management strategy 2018/19 set out in appendix A to the head of finance's report to Cabinet on 9 February 2018;
2. approve the prudential indicators and treasury limits for the period 2018/19 to 2020/21 as set out in table 2, appendix A to the head of finance's report to Cabinet on 9 February 2018; and
3. approve the annual investment strategy set out in appendix A (paragraphs 18 to 59), subject to the head of finance consulting the co-chair of Joint Audit and Governance Committee before investing in any Non-UCITS Retail Scheme, and the lending criteria detailed in table 5 to the head of finance's report to Cabinet on 9 February 2018.

## **Co.63 Revenue budget 2018/19 and capital programme to 2022/23**

### **A. Question from Councillor Judy Roberts to Councillor Mike Murray, Cabinet member for Development and Regeneration**

"What funding is allocated in the 2018-19 Vale budget specifically to the Housing Enabler role as outlined in the Joint Housing Delivery Strategy?"

#### **Answer**

Councillor Ware responded to the question in the absence of Councillor Murray. She stated that the 2018/19 funding for the housing enabler role will be found from the existing housing team strength.

#### **Supplementary question/answer**

In response to a supplementary question Councillor Ware stated that requirements for additional resources would be subject to future growth bids.

## **B. Debate on revenue budget 2018/19 and capital programme to 2022/23**

The Chairman referred to regulations that require councils to record the names of those councillors voting in favour, against or abstaining from any vote on the budget, including amendments, and the council tax. In accordance with the regulations she would call for a named vote on each of these matters at this meeting.

The Chairman reminded councillors that they were not entitled to vote on any issue affecting the level or administration of the council tax, or other decisions which might affect the making of any such calculation such as the budget, if they were over two months in arrears with their council tax payments. Where such circumstances applied, councillors were under a statutory obligation to disclose the restriction placed on them and refrain from voting at the relevant meeting. No councillor made any such declaration.

Council noted the report of the chief finance officer on the robustness of the budget estimates and the adequacy of the reserves.

Councillor Sharp, Cabinet member for finance, presented the Cabinet's proposals for the revenue budget 2018/19 and capital programme to 2022/23. On behalf of the council he thanked officers for their part in preparing the draft budget.

Councillor Sharp moved and Councillor Barber seconded a motion to approve Cabinet's recommendations as follows:

1. set the revenue budget for 2018/19 as set out in appendix A.1 to the head of finance's report to Cabinet on 9 February 2018;
2. approve the capital programme for 2018/19 to 2022/23 as set out in appendix D.1 to the head of finance's report to Cabinet on 9 February 2018, together with the capital growth bids set out in appendix D.2 of the report;
3. set the council's prudential limits as listed in appendix E to the head of finance's report to Cabinet on 9 February 2018;
4. approve the medium term financial plan to 2022/23 as set out in appendix F.1 to the head of finance's report to Cabinet on 9 February 2018.

The majority of councillors supported the budget which continued provision for grants to community projects, included provision for a feasibility study for electrical charging points at district council locations, included a fund to improve the look of public areas across the district and provided for a new leisure centre in Wantage. The increase in council tax is prudent to address the long term sustainability of the council by matching revenue against expenditure.

Other councillors spoke against the budget. The fund to improve the look of public areas was not required because the work should already be undertaken by the parish councils, Oxfordshire County Council and existing contractors. The increase in council tax, following previous council tax freezes, illustrated that the council had failed to acknowledge the financial situation it faces. The failure to increase council tax in previous years had led to a loss of revenue which would impact on reserves in future years. Concern was also raised regarding slippage in the delivery of capital projects.

In accordance with regulations requiring councils to record the names of those councillors voting in favour, against or abstaining from any vote on the council tax the

Chairman called for a recorded vote, which was carried with the voting being as follows:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstentions</b>
<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>
Alice Badcock	Debby Hallett	Margaret Crick
Mike Badcock	Dudley Hoddinott	
Matthew Barber	Bob Johnston	
Eric Batts	Helen Pighills	
Edward Blagrove	Judy Roberts	
Yvonne Constance	Emily Smith	
Roger Cox	Catherine Webber	
Charlotte Dickson		
St John Dickson		
Katie Finch		
Robert Hall		
Jenny Hannaby		
Anthony Hayward		
Simon Howell		
Vicky Jenkins		
Mohinder Kainth		
Monica Lovatt		
Sandy Lovatt		
Ben Mabbett		
Chris McCarthy		
Chris Palmer		
Julia Reynolds		
Robert Sharp		
Janet Shelley		
Henry Spencer		
Elaine Ware		
Total: 26	Total: 7	Total: 1

**RESOLVED:** to

1. set the revenue budget for 2018/19 as set out in appendix A.1 to the head of finance's report to Cabinet on 9 February 2018;
2. approve the capital programme for 2018/19 to 2022/23 as set out in appendix D.1 to the head of finance's report to Cabinet on 9 February 2018, together with the capital growth bids set out in appendix D.2 of the report;
3. set the council's prudential limits as listed in appendix E to the head of finance's report to Cabinet on 9 February 2018;
4. approve the medium term financial plan to 2022/23 as set out in appendix F.1 to the head of finance's report to Cabinet on 9 February 2018.

**Co.64 Council tax 2018/19**

Council considered the report of the head of finance on the setting of the council tax for the 2018/19 financial year.

In accordance with regulations requiring councils to record the names of those councillors voting in favour, against or abstaining from any vote on the council tax the Chairman called for a recorded vote, which was carried with the voting being as follows:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstentions</b>
<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>
Alice Badcock		
Mike Badcock		
Matthew Barber		
Eric Batts		
Edward Blagrove		
Yvonne Constance		
Roger Cox		
Margaret Crick		
Charlotte Dickson		
St John Dickson		
Katie Finch		
Robert Hall		
Debby Hallett		
Jenny Hannaby		
Anthony Hayward		
Dudley Hoddinott		
Simon Howell		
Vicky Jenkins		
Bob Johnston		
Mohinder Kainth		
Monica Lovatt		
Sandy Lovatt		
Ben Mabbett		
Chris McCarthy		
Chris Palmer		
Helen Pighills		
Julia Reynolds		
Judy Roberts		
Robert Sharp		
Janet Shelley		
Emily Smith		
Henry Spencer		
Elaine Ware		
Catherine Webber		
<b>Total: 34</b>	<b>Total: 0</b>	<b>Total: 0</b>

**RESOLVED:**

1. to note that at its meeting on 13 December 2017 the council calculated the council tax base 2018/19:
  - (a) for the whole council area as 50,451.8 [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 column 1 of appendix 1.
2. that the council tax requirement for the council's own purposes for 2018/19 (excluding parish precepts) is £6,391,739.
3. that the following amounts be calculated for the year 2018/19 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
- (a) £77,514,025 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;
- (b) £67,308,728 being the aggregate of the amounts which the council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act;
- (c) £10,205,297 being the amount by which the aggregate at (3)(a) above exceeds the aggregate at (3)(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) £202.28 being the amount at (3)(c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the council, in accordance with Section 31(B) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year (including parish precepts);
- (e) £3,813,558 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act, as set out in column 2 of appendix 1;
- (f) £126.69 being the amount at (3)(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (3)(e) above by Item T (1(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 relates.
4. to note that for the year 2018/19 Oxfordshire County Council has stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

Band A	£950.79
Band B	£1,109.26
Band C	£1,267.72
Band D	£1,426.19
Band E	£1,743.12
Band F	£2,060.05
Band G	£2,376.98
Band H	£2,852.38

5. to note that for the year 2018/19 the Police and Crime Commissioner for Thames Valley has stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

Band A	£121.52	
Band B	£141.77	
Band C	£162.03	2
Band D	£182.28	
Band E	£222.79	
Band F	£263.29	

Band G	£303.80
Band H	£364.56

6. that the council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in appendix 3 as the amounts of council tax for 2018/19 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings shown in appendix 3.
7. to determine that the council's basic amount of council tax for 2018/19 is not excessive in accordance with principles approved under Section 52ZB Local Government Finance Act 1992.

### **Co.65 Pay policy statement 2018/19**

Council considered the report of the head of corporate services on the adoption of a pay policy statement to meet the requirements of the Localism Act.

**RESOLVED:** to approve the pay policy statement for 2018/19 attached to the report of the head of corporate services to Council on 14 February 2017.

### **Co.66 Review of membership of the Planning Committee and the political balance on committees**

Council considered the report of the head of legal and democratic on the membership of the Planning Committee and the political balance of committees.

**RESOLVED:** to

1. reduce the size of the Planning Committee from 11 members to nine members;
2. allocate seats to each political group in accordance with paragraphs 8 - 11 of the report of the head of legal and democratic to Council on 14 February 2018;
3. (with no councillor voting against) allocate one of the Conservative Group seats on the Planning Committee to the Liberal Democrat Group to ensure the overall political balance;
4. (with no councillor voting against) allocate one of the Conservative Group's seats on the Corporate Services Joint Scrutiny Committee to the Liberal Democrat Group;
5. appoint councillors and substitutes to sit on the Planning Committee and Corporate Services Joint Scrutiny Committee as follows;

	<b>Planning Committee, 9 Members</b>
<b>Conservative (6)</b>	<b>Liberal Democrat (3)</b>
Anthony Hayward	Jenny Hannaby
Robert Hall	Bob Johnston
Sandy Lovatt (Chairman)	Catherine Webber
Ben Mabbett	
Chris McCarthy	
Janet Shelley (Vice-Chairman)	

	<b>Planning Committee, 9 Members</b>
<b>Conservative (6)</b>	<b>Liberal Democrat (3)</b>
<b>PREFERRED SUBSTITUTES</b>	
<b>Conservative (6)</b>	<b>Liberal Democrat (3)</b>
Mike Badcock	Margaret Crick
Yvonne Constance	Helen Pighills
St. John Dickson	Emily Smith
Monica Lovatt	
Chris Palmer	
Julia Reynolds	

<b>Names</b>	<b>Corporate Services Joint Scrutiny Committee, 2 Members</b>
<b>Conservative (1)</b>	<b>Liberal Democrat Group (1)</b>
Ben Mabbett	Debby Hallett
<b>PREFERRED SUBSTITUTES</b>	
<b>Conservative (3)</b>	<b>Liberal Democrat (3)</b>
Alice Badcock	Helen Pighills
Yvonne Constance	Judy Roberts
Chris Palmer	Emily Smith

6. authorise the head of legal and democratic to make appointments to any vacant committee or panel seat and substitute positions in accordance with the wishes of the relevant group leader.

### **Co.67 Report of the leader of the council**

Council noted that Councillor Eric Batts will continue as the Cabinet member for community safety and the council's representative on both the Safer Oxfordshire Partnership Oversight Committee and the South and Vale Community Safety Partnership.

In accordance with the Cabinet arrangements and procedure rules, Council noted that on 21 December 2017, the Cabinet member for corporate services took an urgent decision to award a contract to purchase a software licence. The agreement of the Scrutiny Committee chairman was sought and received before the Cabinet member made this decision.

## **Co.68 Questions on notice**

### **1. Question from Councillor Catherine Webber to Councillor Matthew Barber, Cabinet member for partnership and insight**

“Residents are asking about the Five Council Partnership deal and why the expectant savings for tax payers of £50 million has now dropped drastically to only £20 million. Can the Cabinet Member help members, and the public, to understand what’s gone wrong by publishing the relevant information? After all, this is public money we’re talking about. The deal seems to be shrouded in secrecy, so anyone seeking information is forced to file a Freedom of Information (FOI) request. Responding to FOI requests is costly to the Council, and frustrating for our residents. How can the administration improve transparency and ensure the public have access to more detailed information about the Five Council Partnership?”

#### **Answer**

Councillor Barber responded that officers are still in negotiation with both Capita over a deed of variation, and VINCI. The discussions are commercially sensitive for all parties and cannot be conducted in public without undermining the council's position. Although final figures will not be known until the negotiations are completed, the council remains confident that the corporate services contracts will provide significant savings to the councils compared with the previous cost of running the services. If required, confidential briefing sessions or meetings of the Scrutiny Committee could be held for councillors. The council would respond to FOI requests but could not divulge confidential information.

### **2. Councillor Debby Hallett to Councillor Matthew Barber, Cabinet member for partnership and insight**

“Whenever a decision is made to outsource public services to an external provider, we outsource the work but not the responsibility. It is Vale that must meet payroll, manage HR issues, keep the IT systems working, and replace batteries in officers’ mobile telephones. Cabinet decided to trust Capita with much of this work.

News of Capita’s fall in share price after profits warnings are of huge concern to this council. Their announced strategic and operational changes raise the question of whether Capita are still willing and able to carry out their performance commitments to us. This council is just a small part of their world, but they are a big part of ours.

When Cabinet decided to outsource this work, it appears no one was designated as Contract Manager. Who at Vale is now responsible for managing the contract with Capita? What is the true savings per year for Vale now that we have so many of our senior officers dedicating so much of their time to this outsourcing scheme? What has been the cost of officers in addressing issues arising? And what is the level of service now, compared to what it was before 5CP?

Where can members and the public see what contingency plans Vale has put in place to mitigate the risk of Capita’s services to Vale ceasing?”

#### **Answer**

Councillor Barber responded that from the commencement of the contract there has been a joint client team, shared by all the five council partners and headed by a client relationship director who is clearly designated as contract manager.

Matters relating to the performance of the contractors will be reported to the Scrutiny Committee in the usual way and contingency plans are in place for all contractors.

### Supplementary question/answer

In response to a supplementary question regarding the officer contact Councillor Barber responded that the relationship between the council and the joint client team will now be a responsibility for the head of partnership and insight but individual issues would be addressed by the relevant service.

### 3. Councillor Emily Smith to Councillor Roger Cox, Cabinet member for planning:

“In terms of the Housing Test imposed by Government, here are the targets, as I understand them to be, for house building Vale must achieve, or face consequences in our planning policies or processes:

Year	If housing delivery falls below x% of target	Action
2017	95%	LPAs will need to develop an action plan to address shortfall
2017	85%	LPAs will need to plan for a 20% buffer in their annual housing land supply calculations
2018	25%	The presumption in favour of Sustainable development will automatically apply.
2019	45%	The presumption in favour of Sustainable development will automatically apply.
2020	65%	The presumption in favour of Sustainable development will automatically apply.

I understand the 2020 target is likely to actually be 75%.

Can the Cabinet member explain to Council how we measure and report our figures, how we are doing so far, and what steps are being taken to ensure we do not regress into the situation where we've been for most of the time he's been in charge, where speculative developers have the upper hand?"

### Answer

A new housing delivery test was put forward in the Government White Paper '*Fixing our Broken Housing Market*', however the implementation date has been delayed and no new date specified.

The test is designed to “highlight whether the number of homes being built is below target, provide a mechanism for establishing the reasons why, and where necessary trigger policy responses that will ensure that further land comes forward”<sup>1</sup>.

The test measures housing delivery over a three year period, so for 2017/18 the test would have measured housing completions as an average from 2014/15 to 2016/17, measured against the district's housing need. The housing need for Vale of White Horse will be taken from our up to date Local Plan.

<sup>1</sup> Page 43, '*Fixing our Broken Housing Market*', available from [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/590464/Fixing\\_our\\_broken\\_housing\\_market\\_-\\_print\\_ready\\_version.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/590464/Fixing_our_broken_housing_market_-_print_ready_version.pdf)

Table 1 for year 18/19 to 22/23 shows how Vale would perform against the test.

*Table 1: Housing Delivery Test, Vale of White Horse*

Year	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
HDT requirements	25%- Presumption in favour of sustainable development	45%- Presumption in favour of sustainable development	75%- Presumption in favour of sustainable development	75%- Presumption in favour of sustainable development	75%- Presumption in favour of sustainable development
Vale position (%)	135%	140%	153%	166%	174%

### **Progress against Housing Delivery Test**

Table 1 illustrates that the Vale performance figures exceed the housing delivery test. This is with supply as of 1 October 2017 and trajectories for housing completions updated with survey and developer information from October/November 2017. The annual housing need as stated in the adopted LPP1 is 1028, increasing to 1211 annually from 2019/20, to cover Oxford City's unmet need if LPP2 is adopted.

Again, the table shows that the Vale is expected to pass the test on projected delivery for the next five years.

### **Steps to help housing delivery**

In recognition that it will be a challenge to meet our housing need over the next 14-16 years, a joint Housing Delivery Strategy (HDS) has been produced. This strategy aims to enable housing delivery to be accelerated and to ensure the type and quality of homes delivered are what is required.

### **Co.69 Motions on notice under Council procedure rule 38**

No motions were submitted under Council procedure rule 38.

### **Co.70 Exclusion of the public**

**RESOLVED:** to exclude members of the press and public from the meeting for the following item of business under Part 1 of Schedule 12A Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 and as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006 on the grounds that:

- I. it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1,2 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, and
- II. the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

### **Co.71 Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** to approve the confidential minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2017 as a correct record and agree that the Chairman sign them as such.

The meeting closed at 9.15pm