

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Council



held at 7.00 pm on Wednesday 11 December 2013
at the Guildhall, Abingdon

Open to the public, including the press

Present:

Members: Councillor Mike Badcock (Chairman), Eric Batts (Vice-Chairman), John Amys, Marilyn Badcock, Matthew Barber, Yvonne Constance, Roger Cox, Tony de Vere, Charlotte Dickson, St John Dickson, Gervase Duffield, Jason Fiddaman, Jeanette Halliday, Jim Halliday, Debby Hallett, Jenny Hannaby, Anthony Hayward, Dudley Hoddinott, Simon Howell, Bob Johnston, Bill Jones, Mohinder Kainth, Pat Lonergan, Sandy Lovatt, Sue Marchant, Julie Mayhew-Archer, Aidan Melville, Elizabeth Miles, Gill Morgan, Mike Murray, Jerry Patterson, Helen Pighills, Kate Precious, Judy Roberts, Fiona Roper, Robert Sharp, Val Shaw, Janet Shelley, Andrew Skinner, Alison Thomson, Melinda Tilley, Reg Waite, Elaine Ware, Catherine Webber, Richard Webber and John Woodford

Officers: Steve Bishop, Steven Corrigan, Margaret Reed and Anna Robinson

Number of members of the public: 35

Prior to the meeting Council observed a minute's silence in memory of Nelson Mandela.

Co.41 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of councillors Julia Bricknell, Angela Lawrence, Ron Mansfield and Margaret Turner.

Co.42 Minutes

RESOLVED: to adopt the minutes of the meeting held on 23 October 2013 as a correct record and agree that the Chairman signs them.

Co.43 Declarations of interest

None.

Co.44 Chairman's announcements

The Chairman advised that for the benefit of the public the West Way item would be considered following the public questions. He sought, and received, Council's agreement to suspend standing order 31(1) to require councillors to stand when addressing Council for the items following the West Way petition item.

Co.45 Statements, petitions and questions from the public relating to matters affecting the council.

A. Steven Corrigan, Democratic Services Manager, read out the following question on behalf of Dr Les Clyne to Matthew Barber, Leader of the council.

"Please could the Leader of the Council comment on the following observations and question:

On Wednesday 4 December the Vale Planning Committee ratified a recommendation from officers that the Grove airfield development should go ahead with in the order of 35 per cent affordable housing on the site. When Councillor Hayward queried the term 'in the order of 35 per cent' no clear response was given by the Development Manager. Policy H5 of the Vale states that 40 per cent of dwellings shall be affordable housing. In fact the officers report says that at present the developers are only willing to offer 32 per cent. Whilst it is commendable that the Planning Committee has recommended a minimum of 30 per cent affordable rented in line with Policy H5 and supplementary Vale housing guidance, it is regrettable that;

1. they have not met the 40 per cent overall target for rented and shared ownership;
2. that it was not explained clearly to the meeting in general, and councillors in particular, that the officers recommendation breached the Vale's policies.

Is it possible to instruct the officers to obtain at least 40 per cent via the Section 106 negotiations, or failing that at least 35 per cent, in both cases without jeopardising the 30 per cent minimum affordable rented requirement approved by the committee (in view of the continuing escalation of applicants on the Vale's housing waiting list, up from 1175 in April 2013 to 1272 by 29 November 2013)?"

Councillor Matthew Barber responded that it was not possible to instruct officers to obtain at least 40 per cent. It would be possible to instruct officers to get the highest proportion possible given the viability assessment and the need for other infrastructure, and we will do so. He was happy to say that in the case of 40 per cent or 35 per cent he would wish to maintain the 30 per cent minimum of affordable rented accommodation.

He undertook to provide a written response to Dr Clyne.

B. Question from Dr Peter Harbour to Matthew Barber, Leader of the council

"Will the Leader of the council please join and arrange for discussions between the Pool Friends and senior representatives of recreation and leisure (officers and councillor) to explore how to improve the presentation of the pool, to note the help the Friends have offered and to recognise that the Abbey Meadow is a major attractor as a riverside focus for Abingdon on Thames"?

Councillor Matthew Barber confirmed that he had spoken to Dr Harbour and was looking to arrange a meeting early in the new year.

Co.46 Urgent business

None.

Co.47 Petition debate - West Way Botley

In accordance with the council's Petition Scheme that provides for a Council debate of petitions containing more than 500 signatures, Council considered the following petition

"We the undersigned petition the council to not allow the current plans for redevelopment of the West Way shopping centre and the surrounding area to proceed and to reopen discussion with the community on a smaller scale redevelopment, in line with the ideas put forward by the Council for consultation in 2012.

We the undersigned object to the current proposals for redevelopment of the West Way shopping centre and the surrounding area on the grounds that the proposed uses, scale and character of development are entirely inappropriate for the local community.

We urge Vale of White Horse District Council not to allow these plans to proceed and to reopen discussion with the community in discussion on a smaller scale redevelopment, in line with the ideas put forward by the Council for consultation in 2012".

Supporters of the petition presented two large scrolls with over 2,000 signatures and unfurled them at the meeting.

Dr Caroline Potter addressed Council on behalf West Way Community Concern in objection to Doric's proposals. Whilst local residents supported the regeneration of the area and would welcome an improved centre the current proposals were not suitable for a suburban neighbourhood. She raised the following points:

- The public consultation had failed to have regard to local views with no changes made to the scheme
- The proposals would turn the shopping centre into an out of town retail park with the loss of independent shops
- The proposals would change the character of the area
- Residents of Field House would be forcibly relocated
- The area would suffer road congestion

Councillor Debby Hallett moved and Councillor Matthew Barber seconded the following motion:

"Council acknowledges the strong local opposition to the proposals outlined by Doric Properties for the redevelopment of the West Way area, Botley, on the grounds that residents feel their scale is inappropriately large and completely out of character for a suburban residential area.

Council urges Cabinet to do all they can to persuade Doric Properties to meet with residents and work in partnership with the local community of Botley to find a way forward."

In moving the motion Councillor Debby Hallett stated that local residents should have a say on the scheme which would have a major impact on their community and lives and as such council should ensure this happens.

In seconding the motion Councillor Matthew Barber acknowledged the scale of concern as shown by the petition and although the council had limited powers to change the detail it could and would encourage Doric to work with local residents.

RESOLVED:

That Council acknowledges the strong local opposition to the proposals outlined by Doric Properties for the redevelopment of the West Way area, Botley, on the grounds that residents feel their scale is inappropriately large and completely out of character for a suburban residential area.

Council urges Cabinet to do all they can to persuade Doric Properties to meet with residents and work in partnership with the local community of Botley to find a way forward.

Co.48 Petitions under standing order 13

None.

Co.49 Questions under standing order 12

1. Question from Councillor Gervase Duffield to the Leader of the council, Councillor Matthew Barber

What effects if any will the sale by Lloyds Bank to Aberdeen Asset Management of parts of their Scottish Widows cluster (ie, the Investment Partnership) have on central Abingdon precinct developments, and will Lloyds discuss with the Council's investment managers any further sales from the cluster which might affect central Abingdon development?

Councillor Matthew Barber responded that there would be no impact on the project.

In response to a supplementary question he confirmed that councillors would be kept informed of any further developments.

2. Question from Councillor Andrew Skinner to the Leader of the council, Councillor Matthew Barber

Will the Leader agree that to reduce the benefits under the Council Tax Reduction Scheme for some of the most vulnerable people in the Vale in order to save less than £20,000 per annum is something which should be avoided at all costs ?

Councillor Matthew Barber responded that savings had to be made and the scheme was fair.

In response to a supplementary question he stated that detail of the savings to the Vale of renting Abbey House would be included in Cabinet's budget proposals.

3. Question from Councillor Jenny Hannaby to the Leader of the council, Councillor Matthew Barber

Please can he outline the timetable for improving the road network in the Wantage Grove area, which, as he is aware, is about to see construction of a large number of new houses and also outline how he expects these vital road improvement to be paid for?

Councillor Matthew Barber undertook to provide a written response.

4. Question from Councillor Bob Johnston to the Leader of the council, Councillor Matthew Barber

Has the Leader been approached by the Leader of the County Council on the subject of railway electrification, as he seeks an appropriate financial contribution from the Vale to expedite the project in a similar way to that of the East/West Railway?

Councillor Matthew Barber responded that he had not been approached but he had put the issue of bridge works in South Hinksey and Grove on the Oxfordshire leaders' agenda.

In response to a supplementary question he confirmed that he would be happy to consider helping if approached particularly in respect of a new station at Grove/Wantage.

5. Question from Councillor Catherine Webber to the Leader of the council, Councillor Matthew Barber

Is the Leader aware that the Abingdon Arts Festival will not now be happening next year, or for the foreseeable future, purely as a result of his own policies on revenue grants?

Councillor Matthew Barber responded that the Abingdon Arts Festival had not applied for a grant although 19 other festivals had.

In response to a supplementary question he confirmed that the Abingdon Arts Festival could still submit an application.

6. Question from Councillor Debby Hallett to the Leader of the council, Councillor Matthew Barber

In recent months, the major issues affecting this Council have been the proposed move to Crowmarsh, and the future development of Westway, Botley. These issues are ongoing and both have serious implications for the reputation of the Council. The common thread that runs through both these issues, is the feeling that there has been little or inadequate consultation with the public and that their views are being ignored. Please would the Leader comment on this?

Councillor Matthew Barber did not comment and in response to a supplementary question he stated that he did not consider that the council could have improved the consultations.

7. Question from Councillor Jim Halliday to the Leader of the council, Councillor Matthew Barber

Please could the Leader list a) the sum allocated for the festival grants budget in FY 2012/13 and FY 2013/14, b) list all festival grants actually paid out in FY 2012/13 and to date in FY 2013/14 - giving in each case the sum paid, the name of the Festival and the date the grant was paid ?

Councillor Matthew Barber responded that £5,784 had been provided in 2012/13 and £9,335 in 2013/14. He undertook to provide Councillor Jim Halliday with details of the grants paid in writing.

In response to a supplementary question regarding the rejection of the £4,300 grant application for the Abingdon Arts Festival in 2012/13 he confirmed that the council had a clear policy of awarding a maximum of £1,000, that 19 other arts festivals had received funding and that there was no need to apply an exception to this policy.

8. Question from Councillor Pat Lonergan to the Leader of the council, Councillor Matthew Barber

Does the Leader share the frustration of Abingdon councillors about the length of time that it is taking to fill empty units in the Bury Street development and the view that Scottish Widows are being very picky about who they are allowing to rent shops ?

Councillor Matthew Barber responded that he did but it was important to attract suitable tenants.

In response to a supplementary question he confirmed that he had not recently met Scottish Widows although senior officers had.

9. Question from Councillor Richard Webber to the Leader of the council, Councillor Matthew Barber

As the overwhelming majority of questions are being addressed to the Leader, is he aware that the reason for this is that he is perceived to be in charge of finance, grants, major planning, and property issues amongst other responsibilities and hence all decision-making is directly and solely in his hands?

Councillor Matthew Barber responded that all the questions were put to him to allow this question.

In response to a supplementary question he said he did not agree that the Cabinet was short of talent.

Co.50 Recommendations from Cabinet, individual Cabinet members, and committees

Council considered the following recommendations from Cabinet.

A. Delivering Accelerated Housing Growth in Science Vale, Southern Oxfordshire

Council considered Cabinet's recommendations, made at its meeting on 6 December 2013, to approve a project to accelerate housing growth across the Science Vale area of South and Vale and establish budgets to allow the project to proceed.

RESOLVED: to

1. approve a revenue budget to accelerate housing growth in the Science Vale area, in 2013/14 of £500,000 funded from a £1.025 million capacity fund grant;
2. approve a revenue budget, in 2014/15 of £535,000 funded from the second tranche of capacity fund grant.

B. Council tax reduction scheme 2014/15

Council considered Cabinet's recommendations, made at its meeting on 6 December 2013, on a council tax reduction scheme for 2014/15.

Councillor Richard Webber requested that his views be recorded in the minutes. He stated that the council had a duty to the people of Vale and especially the disadvantaged. The scheme proposed would impact on those people least able to afford to pay their council tax.

In accordance with standing order 29(3), at the request of more than a fifth of councillors present, the chairman asked for a recorded vote. Votes on the recommendations were recorded as follows:

For	Against	Abstentions
Councillors:	Councillors:	None
John Amys	Tony de Vere	
Marilyn Badcock	Debby Hallett	
Mike Badcock	Jim Halliday	
Matthew Barber	Jenny Hannaby	
Eric Batts	Dudley Hodinott	
Yvonne Constance	Bob Johnston	
Roger Cox	Pat Lonergan	
Charlotte Dickson	Sue Marchant	
St John Dickson	Julie Mayhew-Archer	
Gervase Duffield	Aidan Melville	
Jason Fiddaman	Elizabeth Miles	
Anthony Hayward	Jerry Patterson	
Simon Howell	Helen Pighills	
Bill Jones	Judy Roberts	
Mohinder Kainth	Val Shaw	
Sandy Lovatt	Andrew Skinner	
Gill Morgan	Catherine Webber	
Michael Murray	Richard Webber	
Kate Precious	John Woodford	
Fiona Roper		
Robert Sharp		
Janet Shelley		
Alison Thomson		
Melinda Tilley		
Reg Waite		
Elaine Ware		
Totals:		
26	20	0

RESOLVED: to

1. adopt for 2014/15 onwards, the 2013/14 adopted council tax reduction scheme but with the following amendments:

- entitlement for working age claimants will be capped at 91.5 per cent of their council tax liability, except for these protected groups - people with disabilities, war widows and war disabled pension recipients
 - removal of the second adult rebate scheme
 - entitlement for properties in bands F, G and H will be capped to band E council tax levels
 - the current four week “run on” entitlement will be extended for thirteen weeks when a claimant moves into work. Any rules concerning eligibility for the run on remain the same
 - personal allowances and non-dependent deductions for working age claimants will be uprated by one per cent each financial year commencing 1 April 2014
2. establish a hardship fund to assist claimants who may face difficulties meeting their council tax liability.

C. Council tax base 2014/15

Council considered Cabinet’s recommendations, made at its meeting on 6 December 2013, on the council tax base for 2014/15.

RESOLVED:

- (a) To agree that, in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended by the Local Government Finance Act 2012) and the Council Tax (Prescribed Classes of Dwellings) (England) Regulations 2003 (as amended)
- i. from 1 April 2014 the council tax discount to be applied on unoccupied and substantially unfurnished dwellings (Class C in the Regulations) be 100 per cent for one calendar month and zero per cent thereafter. Where an unoccupied and unfurnished dwelling has already received the current 25 per cent discount for more than one calendar month on 1 April 2014, it shall receive zero discount. Where an unoccupied and unfurnished dwelling has received a 25 per cent discount for less than one calendar month on 1 April 2014, it shall receive a 100 per cent discount for the number of days required to reach one calendar month and then zero per cent discount thereafter. In considering whether a dwelling has been unoccupied and substantially unfurnished for any period, any one period not exceeding six weeks, during which it was not unoccupied and substantially unfurnished shall be disregarded.
- (b) To approve the report of the Head of Finance for the calculation of the council’s tax base and the calculation of the tax base for each parish area for 2014/15;
- (c) That, in accordance with The Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, the amount calculated by Vale of White Horse District Council as its council tax base for the year 2014/15 be 46,640.5;
- (d) That, in accordance with The Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, the amount calculated by Vale of White Horse District Council as the council tax base for the year 2014/15 for each parish be the amount shown against the name of that parish in appendix 1 of the report of the Head of Finance to Cabinet on 6 December 2013.

D. Council tax reduction scheme grant for town and parish councils

Council considered Cabinet's recommendations, made at its meeting on 6 December 2013, on the total amount of council tax reduction scheme grant to pass down to town and parish councils for 2014/15, how to calculate the amounts for individual town and parish councils and the actual grant allocations for each town and parish council.

RESOLVED: That

1. the total council tax reduction scheme grant to be passed down to town and parish councils for 2014/15 be £160,593;
2. the individual amounts for town and parish councils be calculated based on their relative need after considering the negative impact of the council tax reduction scheme on parish taxbases and the positive impact of additional charges for empty dwellings and second homes; and
3. the individual grant amounts for towns and parishes are as set out in the appendix to these minutes.

Co.51 Councillors' allowances scheme

Council considered the independent remuneration panel's report on the councillors' allowances scheme.

RESOLVED: to

1. increase only the basic allowance for 2014/15, in line with the staff pay increase for 2014/15, up to a maximum of two per cent; and
2. amend the councillors' allowances scheme to allow councillors to claim travel expenses to and from the council's offices, or childcare or dependent carer's allowances, if an officer of the council has invited a councillor to a meeting. When making the claim, the councillor must provide written evidence of such an invitation.

Co.52 Review of the council's constitution

Council considered the report of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services on proposed changes to the council's constitution. The proposed changes, supported by the Constitution Review Task Group, were recommended to come into effect from 1 January 2014 with the exception of the revised budget and policy framework procedure rules and budget setting protocol that would come into effect immediately in preparation of the 2014/15 budget.

Council agreed not to proceed with changes to standing order 31(1) to provide that councillors stand at this time.

RESOLVED: to

1. agree the revised delegation 1.2 to the Head of Economy, Leisure and Property attached as appendix one to the report of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to Council on 11 December 2013 with effect from 1 January 2014;

2. agree the delegation in respect of the national non-domestic rates 1 form (NDR1) set out in paragraph seven of the report of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to Council on 11 December 2013 with effect from 1 January 2014;
3. agree the amendments to the financial procedure rules set out in paragraph 12 of the report of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to Council on 11 December 2013 with effect from 1 January 2014;
4. agree the revised budget and policy framework procedure rules and budget setting protocol set out in appendix two to the report of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to Council on 11 December 2013 with immediate effect;
5. agree the proposed amendment to standing order 29(3) as set out in paragraph 14 of the report of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to Council on 11 December 2013 with effect from 1 January 2014;
6. authorise the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to make the necessary changes to the council's constitution to reflect the changes set out in the report of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to Council on 11 December 2013;
7. authorise the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to make any minor or consequential amendments to the constitution required for clarification, consistency and compliance with the council's style guide.

Co.53 Report of the Leader of the council

Matthew Barber, Leader of council, provided an update on the City Deal negotiations.

Further information would be provided in the information sheet or at the next Council meeting.

Co.54 Notices of motion under standing order 11

1. Having received the consent of Council to alter a motion of which he had given notice, Councillor Gervase Duffield moved and Councillor Tony de Vere seconded the following motion – additional words shown in bold:

“In the light of Thames Water's continuing interest in a major local reservoir this Council welcomes Ofwat's rejection of the recent Thames Water price increase application, and hopes that Ofwat will be specially vigilant on large applications costing vast sums where these can be undercut by reliable cheaper methods. This Council requests the Chief Executive to convey this motion to Ofwat, Thames Water, and the Vale area MPs, and the Water Minister”.

In supporting the motion councillors expressed the view that under current arrangements water companies were encouraged to design and build huge schemes, paid for by customers, to increase their asset base and reduce their tax liability. The interests of the consumer were not currently the primary concern of the water companies. Repairing leaks did not generate income whilst large capital infrastructure projects did. In the case of infrastructure projects more weight should be given to the views of local residents and social and environmental issues.

RESOLVED:

That in the light of Thames Water's continuing interest in a major local reservoir this Council welcomes Ofwat's rejection of the recent Thames Water price increase application, and hopes that Ofwat will be specially vigilant on large applications costing vast sums where these can be undercut by reliable cheaper methods. This Council requests the Chief Executive to convey this motion to Ofwat, Thames Water, and the Vale area MPs, and the Water Minister.

2. In view of his absence, Councillor Ron Mansfield had authorised Councillor Richard Webber to move the motion of which he had given notice. Councillor Tony de Vere seconded the motion

"Council urges the Cabinet to include appropriate sums for maintenance in its proposed capital budget for 2014/15 and subsequent years to permit the Abbey Meadows Swimming Pool to remain open so that Vale residents can continue enjoy this facility".

In supporting the motion a number councillors paid tribute to the work of the Friends of Abbey Meadows, the importance of the facility in attracting people to the area, the need to protect the capital infrastructure and the relatively low level of support provided by the district council compared to that of the town council.

RESOLVED:

To urge the Cabinet to include appropriate sums for maintenance in its proposed capital budget for 2014/15 and subsequent years to permit the Abbey Meadows Swimming Pool to remain open so that Vale residents can continue enjoy this facility.

3. Motion proposed by Councillor Jim Halliday and seconded by Councillor Julie Mayhew-Archer

"Council urges the Cabinet to allow any monies unspent (as at 31 March 2014) by the four Area Committees - both for Capital Grants and New Homes Bonus Grants - to be carried forward to the next financial year and added to any new allocations that be awarded to the given Area Committee during the 2014/15 budget round".

RESOLVED:

To urge the Cabinet to allow any monies unspent (as at 31 March 2014) by the four Area Committees - both for Capital Grants and New Homes Bonus Grants - to be carried forward to the next financial year and added to any new allocations that be awarded to the given Area Committee during the 2014/15 budget round.

4. Motion proposed by Councillor Dudley Hoddinott and seconded by Councillor Jenny Hannaby

"Council urges the Cabinet to include an appropriate sum in its proposed revenue budget for 2014/15 to allow for the community revenue grants scheme to be re-established in order that community groups and organisations may continue to promote the vitality of the District and the well-being of the community".

Those councillors supporting the motion expressed the view that the current categorisation of grants was unclear and confusing for applicants. The establishment of a community revenue grants scheme specifically for revenue grants to promote the vitality of an area had clear merit.

Those opposing the motion noted that the council currently operated seven grant schemes for different purposes with clear criteria.

On being put the motion was declared not carried (19 votes for and 26 votes against).

The meeting closed at 8.20pm

2014/15 council tax reduction scheme grant allocations

Town/parish	A Unadjusted 2014/15 tax base	B Revised tax base after all changes	C Difference (A-B)	D 2012/13 band D council tax	E Council tax "shortfall" (C x D)	F 67% of shortfall
ABINGDON	12,820.2	11,703.2	1,117.0	£106.01	£118,413.17	£79,463
APPLEFORD	159.0	152.7	6.3	£41.76	£263.09	£177
APPLETON WITH EATON	445.2	430.9	14.3	£37.16	£531.39	£357
ARDINGTON AND	215.1	201.8	13.3	£29.08	£386.76	£260
ASHBURY	255.5	236.9	18.6	£13.71	£255.01	£171
BAULKING	46.7	46.7	0.0	£2.15	£0.00	£0
BESSELSLEIGH	36.9	36.9	0.0	£5.23	£0.00	£0
BLEWBURY	734.0	686.3	47.7	£55.64	£2,654.03	£1,781
BOURTON	149.1	139.4	9.7	£23.89	£231.73	£156
BUCKLAND	318.9	314.4	4.5	£19.31	£86.90	£58
BUSCOT	92.3	88.7	3.6	£18.81	£67.72	£45
CHARNEY BASSETT	150.9	146.1	4.8	£26.52	£127.30	£85
CHILDREY	248.0	231.5	16.5	£48.55	£801.08	£538
CHILTON	506.1	486.2	19.9	£32.81	£652.92	£438
COLESHILL	70.7	62.7	8.0	£11.94	£95.52	£64
COMPTON	41.0	40.8	0.2	£0.00	£0.00	£0
CUMNOR	2,800.8	2,676.1	124.7	£32.46	£4,047.76	£2,716
DENCHWORTH	87.7	83.1	4.6	£5.93	£27.28	£18
DRAYTON	968.4	898.8	69.6	£41.75	£2,905.80	£1,950
EAST CHALLOW	289.7	258.3	31.4	£72.47	£2,275.56	£1,527
EAST HANNEY	392.2	368.9	23.3	£0.00	£0.00	£0
EAST HENDRED	542.1	508.5	33.6	£48.90	£1,643.04	£1,103
EATON HASTINGS	34.0	34.0	0.0	£0.00	£0.00	£0
FARINGDON	2,884.4	2,540.5	343.9	£105.37	£36,236.74	£24,317
FERNHAM	116.4	105.8	10.6	£21.56	£228.54	£153
FRILFORD	117.1	116.4	0.7	£43.20	£30.24	£20
FYFIELD AND TUBNEY	247.4	240.0	7.4	£2.06	£15.24	£10
GARFORD	86.0	83.1	2.9	£36.57	£106.05	£71
GOOSEY	66.4	64.2	2.2	£0.00	£0.00	£0
GREAT COXWELL	159.3	153.4	5.9	£21.19	£125.02	£84
GROVE	2,692.6	2,507.3	185.3	£82.36	£15,261.31	£10,241
HARWELL	1,035.6	964.8	70.8	£53.19	£3,765.85	£2,527
HATFORD	49.1	46.6	2.5	£1.61	£4.03	£3
HINTON WALDRIST	157.5	142.1	15.4	£17.46	£268.88	£180
KENNINGTON	1,750.9	1,657.1	93.8	£45.91	£4,306.36	£2,890
KINGSTON BAGPUIZE	995.1	967.5	27.6	£22.86	£630.94	£423
KINGSTON LISLE	112.1	101.6	10.5	£35.80	£375.90	£252
LETCOMBE BASSETT	84.8	81.3	3.5	£5.96	£20.86	£14
LETCOMBE REGIS	380.0	368.3	11.7	£46.23	£540.89	£363
LITTLE COXWELL	77.5	75.2	2.3	£16.02	£36.85	£25
LITTLEWORTH	119.3	116.6	2.7	£6.04	£16.31	£11
LONGCOT	273.4	259.2	14.2	£18.55	£263.41	£177
LONGWORTH	273.8	258.5	15.3	£24.90	£380.97	£256
LYFORD	26.9	26.2	0.7	£0.00	£0.00	£0
MARCHAM	733.3	692.8	40.5	£51.65	£2,091.83	£1,404
MILTON	447.9	415.2	32.7	£44.53	£1,456.13	£977
NORTH HINKSEY	1,761.7	1,658.3	103.4	£36.87	£3,812.36	£2,558
PUSEY	33.7	33.1	0.6	£1.49	£0.89	£1
RADLEY	928.0	864.8	63.2	£54.69	£3,456.41	£2,319
ST HELEN WITHOUT	816.4	807.0	9.4	£19.88	£186.87	£125
SHELLINGFORD	82.1	79.8	2.3	£9.22	£21.21	£14
SHRIVENHAM	1,026.4	975.8	50.6	£50.36	£2,548.22	£1,710
SOUTH HINKSEY	196.1	179.8	16.3	£20.70	£337.41	£226
SPARSHOLT	154.6	150.9	3.7	£26.39	£97.64	£66
STANFORD IN THE	883.4	825.3	58.1	£23.09	£1,341.53	£900
STEVENTON	651.9	604.5	47.4	£35.44	£1,679.86	£1,127
SUNNINGWELL	449.9	440.8	9.1	£37.56	£341.80	£229
SUTTON COURTENAY	1,052.1	962.2	89.9	£45.71	£4,109.33	£2,758
UFFINGTON	346.0	323.1	22.9	£36.64	£839.06	£563
UPTON	213.3	210.1	3.2	£34.72	£111.10	£75
WANTAGE	4,545.3	4,158.1	387.2	£36.91	£14,291.55	£9,591
WATCHFIELD	791.8	752.8	39.0	£28.11	£1,096.29	£736
WEST CHALLOW	96.2	89.6	6.6	£19.17	£126.52	£85
WEST HANNEY	252.1	243.1	9.0	£17.95	£161.55	£108
WEST HENDRED	168.5	160.5	8.0	£38.47	£307.76	£207
WOOLSTONE	78.3	78.3	0.0	£2.05	£0.00	£0
WOOTTON	1,238.0	1,151.9	86.1	£30.50	£2,626.05	£1,762
WYTHAM	76.7	74.1	2.6	£72.33	£188.06	£126
Total	50,133.8	46,640.5	3,493.3		£239,309.84	£160,593