

# Public Document Pack

## Cherwell District Council

### Executive

Minutes of a meeting of the Executive held at Bodicote House, Bodicote, Banbury, OX15 4AA, on 10 January 2011 at 6.30 pm

Present: Councillor Barry Wood (Chairman)  
Councillor G A Reynolds (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Ken Atack  
Councillor Norman Bolster  
Councillor Colin Clarke  
Councillor Michael Gibbard  
Councillor James Macnamara  
Councillor Nigel Morris  
Councillor D M Pickford  
Councillor Nicholas Turner

Also Present: Councillor Daniel Sames  
Councillor Leslie F Sibley

Officers: Ian Davies, Interim Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service  
John Hoad, Strategic Director - Planning, Housing and Economy  
Liz Howlett, Head of Legal & Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer  
Martin Henry, Chief Finance Officer / Section 151 Officer  
Karen Curtin, Head of Finance  
Gillian Greaves, Head of Housing Services  
Richard McIntyre, Senior Housing Options Officer  
Martyn Swann, Strategic Housing Manager  
Kate Winstanley, Strategic Housing Officer  
James Doble, Democratic, Scrutiny and Elections Manager

#### 95 **Declarations of Interest**

Members declared interests in the following agenda items:

#### 96 **Petitions and Requests to Address the Meeting**

There were no petitions or requests to address the meeting.

#### 97 **Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

98 **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 December 2010 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

99 **Housing in Cherwell and the Current Economic Climate**

The Head of Housing Services submitted a report to:

- Update the Executive on the progress made in implementing the Affordable Housing and the Recession Action Plan approved by Executive in January 2009
- Advise the Executive on the Government's proposed housing policy changes and housing and welfare benefit reform and its potential impact on the Council's housing function in the current economic climate
- Recommend to Executive a Housing & Current Economic Climate Action Plan to steer the Council through these changes until the new Housing Strategy is in place in April 2012.
- Advise Executive on plans to bring forward a new Cherwell Housing Strategy in 2012 that will respond to the new policy context and financial climate
- Endorse a Cherwell District Council response to the Government consultation "Local Decisions: a fairer future for social housing"

In the course of discussion it was noted that there were significant changes to both the terminology and delivery of social housing and Members requested a seminar be arranged to clarify these changes.

**Resolved**

- (1) That the progress and completion of the Affordable Housing and the Recession Action Plan be noted.
- (2) That the Housing and the Current Economic Climate Action Plan for moving forward as set out in the annex to the minutes (as set out in the minute book) be endorsed.
- (3) That the response to the Government consultation paper as set out in the annex to the minutes (as set out in the minute book) be endorsed.
- (4) That the current and proposed housing and welfare benefit changes and the potential impact upon the Housing Service be noted.
- (5) That the plans to bring forward a Cherwell Housing Strategy and approve the structure for Member involvement in the Housing Strategy Programme Board be approved.

**Reasons**

The Coalition Government is proposing changes which will substantially affect the provision of housing services and housing related support. To support

members in understanding the local impacts of these changes, this report outlined the work that was being proposed to ensure the Council is able to continue to respond to its Corporate Plan priorities, and deliver housing services within a value for money context.

## **Options**

- Option One**                      Accept the recommendations contained in this report, thereby endorsing the response to Government housing consultation, instructing officers to implement the Housing and Current Economic Climate Action Plan and approving medium term plans to bring forward a new Cherwell Housing Strategy
- Option Two**                      Accept the recommendations contained in this report subject to any amendments by Members
- Option Three**                      Not to approve plans to bring forward a Cherwell Housing Strategy. This would require new plans being produced for Members, and is not recommended.

100

## **Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document**

The Strategic Director Planning, Housing and Economy submitted a report to consider the Planning Obligations Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and sought approval for the use of the draft SPD as informal guidance with immediate effect.

During the course of the debate members made a number of detailed comments and observations, in light of which it was agreed would be considered prior to public consultation. Therefore recommendation 2 as set out in the report was withdrawn and recommendation 1 amended to enable the timing of the consultation to be at the discretion of the Portfolio Holder.

It was also requested that members of the Executive should be provide with full copies of any documents that they were being asked to consider for public consultation.

## **Resolved**

- (1) That the Planning Obligations Draft Supplementary Planning Document be noted and subject to the consideration of observation raised at the meeting endorsed for public consultation, the timing of which to be at the discretion of the Portfolio holder.
- (2) That the Strategic Director, Planning, Housing and Economy, be authorised in consultation with the Portfolio Holder Planning and Housing, to make any further minor non-substantive changes as are necessary to the draft Supplementary Planning Document prior to the publication for public consultation.

## Reasons

A Planning Obligations Draft Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared to offer more detailed guidance to supplement the policies in the Core Strategy on how the Council (as Local Planning Authority - LPA) will decide what new infrastructure and facilities need to be provided as a consequence of development and assess requirements for "in kind" provision and / or financial contributions towards provision. Existing guidance on the Council's requirements for planning obligations is given in the document 'Interim Guidance on Planning Obligations' approved in April 2007.

## Options

**Option One** To endorse the SPD for public consultation and approve the use of the draft SPD as informal guidance for development control purposes with immediate effect.

**Option Two** To endorse the SPD for public consultation with amendments and to approve the use of the draft SPD as informal guidance for Development Control purposes following amendment.

**Option Three** Not to endorse the SPD for public consultation and not to approve the use of the draft SPD as informal guidance for Development Control purposes.

101

## Recommendations from Overview and Scrutiny Committee- Car Parking Charges Call-in

The Executive considered a referral back to them for reconsideration following consideration of a Call-in by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, as set out below

*We the named Councillors and non-executive members of Cherwell District Council hereby give notice that we wish to call in for further scrutiny the Executive decision's of Monday 6<sup>th</sup> December 2010 regarding the proposals to increase Car Parking Fees, the extension of car parking hours, the introduction of parking fees for Blue Badge Holders and the decision to begin negotiations with regards to Watts Way, Kidlington.*

Councillor Sames, Chairman of the overview and Scrutiny Committee presented the referral as set out below:

*That the proposals of the Executive to increase Car Parking Fees, the extension of car parking hours, the introduction of parking fees for Blue Badge Holders and the decision to begin negotiations with regards to Watts Way, Kidlington be referred back to the Executive and that in reconsidering the decision the Executive should take note of the concerns expressed at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting and the following 5 points:*

1. *Ensure proper consultation on Watts Way, Kidlington*
2. *Request the Executive investigate alternative ways to find funds (e.g. £39k to offset the introduction of evening charges)*
3. *Investigate the feasibility of barrier parking/pay on exit*
4. *Study the economic impact of parking charges*
5. *Investigate the number of disabled bays across the district, the ratio of short to long stay spaces and motorcycle parking availability*

As Labour Group Leader Councillor Sibley addressed the meeting.

In considering the referral, the Executive welcomed the detailed consideration the Committee had given to the issue and noted that there had been the opportunity for all interested parties at the meeting to contribute.

### **Resolved**

- (1) That the decisions of the Executive on 6 December 2010 in connection with the implementation of car parking proposals be reaffirmed , in order to achieve a balanced budget, and for these to be introduced on or as soon after 4 April 2011 as is practicable:
- (2) That the decision of the Executive on 6 December 2010 to begin negotiations with Eames with regard to the covenant for Watt's Way car park, Kidlington be reaffirmed
- (3) That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be requested to take forward in its work programme in 2011/12 further investigation of the following strategic parking issues:
  - The balance and location of long stay/short stay parking in Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington
  - The wider economic impact of Parking Policy on the Districts urban centres
  - The cost benefit of alternative management arrangements for car parks, including 'Pay on Exit'.
- (4) That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be requested to report back to the Executive at the end of 2011 the outcome of its findings from 3 above and any recommendations for change.

### **Reasons**

The Executive consider that on balance taking in to consideration all the evidence presented at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, that their decisions on 6 December 2010 remain justified.

## **Options**

- |                     |                                  |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Option One</b>   | To agree the recommendations     |
| <b>Option Two</b>   | Not to agree the recommendations |
| <b>Option Three</b> | To amend the recommendations     |

102

## **Budget 2011/12 Draft 2**

The Head of Finance submitted a report which provided the second opportunity for the Executive to shape and refine the interaction between corporate plan service plans and financial matters before the final budget is presented to the Council on the 21 February 2011.

## **Resolved**

- (1) That the outcome of the 2011/12 provisional settlement be noted;
- (2) That the draft revenue budget 2be noted in the context of the Council's service objectives and strategic priorities
- (3) That the draft corporate plan for 2011/12 which is currently subject to consultation, be noted;
- (4) That the approach to the overall capital programme and 10/11 expenditure profile set out in the annex to the minutes (as set out in the minute book) be agreed;
- (5) That no further matters be taken into consideration in producing a balanced budget for the next meeting of the Executive at this time ;
- (6) That the Tax Base Report set out in the annex to the minutes (as set out in the minute book) be noted and
  - that, in accordance with the Regulations, as amended, the amount calculated by the Cherwell District Council as its council tax base for the year 2011/2012 shall be 50,337; and
  - the report of the Head of Finance, made pursuant to the Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as amended, and the calculations referred to therein for the purposes of the Regulations be approved; and
  - that the tax base for parts of the area be in accordance with the figures shown in column 13 in the annex to the minutes (as set out in the minute book).
  - the council continue with the discretionary awards that it resolved to give on December 1 2008.

## **Reasons**

The Council has to adopt a budget for 2011/12 as the basis for calculating its level of Council Tax and has to base that budget on its plans for service

delivery during the year, recognising any changes in service demand that may arise in future years.

### **Options**

**Option One** To review draft revenue and capital budget to date and consider actions arising.

**Option Two** To approve or reject the recommendations above or request that Officers provide additional information.

103

### **Culture and Heritage Value for Money Review**

The Interim Chief Executive submitted a report to consider the findings of the Value for Money (VFM) Review of Culture and Heritage report and the recommendations arising from the report

### **Resolved**

- (1) That the overall conclusion of the review that the service is low cost for the Museum but high cost for its Arts service, has high performance in terms of visitor numbers to the museum and is high quality in terms of user satisfaction for the museum be endorsed.
- (2) That improvements in value for money be sought and that the following recommendations for achieving savings of £81,130 in 2011/12 be approved;
  1. Introduce single staffing at Banbury Museum, saving £13,385
  2. Reduce the Museum exhibitions budget and operational costs, saving £15,476
  3. Reduce arts funding by £31,906, ending grant aid support for all provision other than The Mill, Banbury
  4. Reduce Arts Officer hours to 43 per week, saving £15,108
  5. Reduce the operational revenue budget for Arts officers by 26%, saving £5,255
- (3) That core service funding of The Courtyard, Bicester be ceased due to the intended change in use of the facility from a dedicated youth arts centre which, prima facie, negates the operational agreement the Council is party to. However, retain the provision of a dedicated arts officer to the facility to continue support for the remaining youth arts provision. Subject to further negotiation with OCC and the Arts Council Lottery Unit, this will enable further savings of £38,000 in 2011/12.
- (4) That subject to further assessment, it be agreed in principle to transfer the operation of the Museum and Tourist Information Centre (TIC) into a bespoke Trust developed for the purpose from 2013/14, saving an estimated £64,000 in NNDR.

- (5) That officers be requested to bring a detailed report on the creation of a Trust for the Museum and TIC to a future meeting.

### **Reasons**

This review forms part of the Value for Money programme of reviews, which aims to cover all services within the Council and improve the value of services offered to residents of Cherwell. Culture and Heritage was selected as an area for a 'health check' review during 2010/11 along with a number of other services as these had not previously been covered by the VFM programme but account for a high level of expenditure. The aim of such reviews is to quickly identify potential savings using information that is readily available.

### **Options**

- Option One** To make savings of £183,130 as set out in the recommendations, which will significantly reduce the costs of the service, including arts funding, while still retaining a reasonable level of service provision
- Option Two** To make further savings of £66,000 in arts development funding to bring it in line with the average spend of comparator authorities. This would require the loss of two posts and the end of funding to The Mill, putting the sustainability of the service in question.

The meeting ended at 8.55 pm

Chairman:

Date:



**Housing in Cherwell and the Current Economic Climate – Action Plan**

This Action Plan highlights the key tasks that need to be undertaken between January 2011 and March 2012. After this time the forthcoming Cherwell Housing Strategy Action Plan will take effect. The Action Plan is framed around the four key challenges that need to be addressed.

The Action Plan will be monitored each quarter by the Housing Services Management Team, and reported to Corporate Management Team via the Strategic Director (Planning, Housing and Economy). Progress will also be reported via the Performance Plus system which is reported to Executive each quarter.

The context for this Action Plan is the overarching need is to provide a value for money and responsive service for Cherwell residents in fast changing financial, policy and economic environments. Failure to grasp the implications of new policy announcements or new opportunities being offered will result in increased homelessness, soaring costs of temporary accommodation, reduced supply of affordable housing and a breakdown in social cohesion.

In order to provide such a service, we will keep up to date with policy announcements to provide creative locally based solutions. We will use the latest housing intelligence based on current market conditions, and will update housing needs evidence and viability work in the light of government changes, and we will monitor and analyse changing patterns of demand, understanding "hotbed areas" where we will work with partner agencies to respond.

Housing Services have delivered £760,000 worth of value for money savings up to March 2011 - £160,000 higher than the target figure. The need to continue delivering services within a framework of value for money is important now more than ever.

**Challenge 1 – Continuing to build new homes and ensuring a good supply of affordable homes**

Issue	Risk	Action to Mitigate Risk	Resources	Timescale
1.1 Financial viability has led to low levels of new future housing development including strategic sites which would deliver both market and affordable homes	A lack of supply maintaining high house prices, and little affordable housing delivery, hence lack of opportunity to access suitable accommodation for households potentially leading to increased homelessness/ use of TA.	Using the financial viability toolkit to promote the provision of affordable housing with nil grants  Exploring option of 'free serviced land' as an alternative to mixed developments	Updating financial viability toolkit to take account of market and policy changes  Staff time Potential need for consultancy within existing resources	April 2011   March 2011

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Action to Mitigate Risk</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
1.2 Significant reduction in social housing grant from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) affordable housing programme, including an end to the HCA funding social renting and shared ownership schemes	Reduced ability to deliver future targets for affordable homes in coming years– resulting in decrease in affordable housing supply	<p>Work with RP Partners to secure recycled capital grant and other investment, and negotiate increased levels of RP investment in their own stock</p>	<p>Continued support funding to offer capacity building training to voluntary agencies which could attract funding to CDC</p> <p>£500k devolved capital funding to use to attract other resources</p>	Starting immediately
		Model the effects of RPs' increased investment coming from charging 80% market rents as a result of the introduction of affordable rents	Staff time	January 2011
		Negotiate with RPs to secure some of the increased funding is spent on development in Cherwell	Staff time	Immediate and on-going
		Proactive approach to securing capital from alternative HCA funding programmes including 'Places of Change' and empty homes. Staying alert to opportunities to apply for funding e.g. when schemes from other local authorities have slipped	Staff time	Immediate and on-going
		Build capacity within local organisations to secure charitable and private capital investment including Big Lottery	Staff time Small amounts of pump priming funding from existing budget	June 2011
		Pursue alternative forms of affordable housing delivery which have a greater social impact and will therefore have a competitive edge when securing grants - this includes Self Build Housing Schemes (with training element) & community Land Trust.	Staff time Pump priming funding from existing funding	On-going

Issue	Risk	Action to Mitigate Risk	Resources	Timescale
		Use of CDC capital as leverage to attract external investment	Investment as leverage in housing projects to attract inward investment	On-going
1.3 Lack of turnover in existing housing stock	<p>'Stagnation' of choice based lettings with fewer properties available</p> <p>Decrease in supply together with increased demand will result in increasing levels of homelessness and temporary accommodation use</p> <p>Significant risk of budget implications for CDC</p>	<p>Promoting downsizing initiatives through RP partners including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial incentives</li> <li>• Help with organising and small repairs</li> <li>• Promoting partners use of creativity over mutual exchanges</li> </ul>	<p>Shared costs of information bringing together all district information on downsizing</p> <p>CDC funding to provide "extras" in downsizing accommodation e.g. carpeting in communal areas, provision of mobility scooter stores etc</p>	<p>February 2011</p> <p>May 2011</p>
1.4 Scarcity of decent affordable private sector housing for households on low incomes as a result of increased demand and reluctance of landlords to house people in receipt of benefits - heightened by reduction in Local	Increased homelessness Shortage in specialist supported housing	<p>Provision of attractive housing solutions for older people including extra care housing and other housing designed to attract 'downsizers'</p> <p>Intensive work with Private Sector landlords to encourage and incentives the provision of affordable property at LHA Rates</p>	<p>Investment to attract further funding</p> <p>Staff time in negotiation</p> <p>Staff time</p> <p>Increased contributions to cashless deposit bond</p> <p>Potential investment in premises and staff for social lettings agency</p>	<p>Commissioned by May 2011</p> <p>On-going</p>

Issue	Risk	Action to Mitigate Risk	Resources	Timescale
<p>Housing Allowance (LHA - which affects Housing Benefit for new claimants)</p> <p>The situation could be exacerbated by people moving from more expensive areas such as Oxford, West Oxfordshire or even London</p>			<p>Consultancy on build prices</p> <p>Investment in community land trust board</p>	
		<p>Use Landlords Forum and consultation exercises to work closer with landlords to bring forward private sector opportunities and mitigate risks of landlords leaving the market</p>	<p>Staff time</p>	<p>February 2011</p>
		<p>Follow up landlord consultation feedback by offering the help in which landlords would like the Council provide i.e. a managed repairs service</p>	<p>Staff time</p>	<p>June 2011</p>
		<p>Feasibility study on establishing a Lettings Agency either in-house, through an RP or as a Social Enterprise to increase credibility and 'offer' for private sector landlords</p>	<p>Staff time</p>	<p>June 2011</p>
		<p>Offer landlords the opportunity to advertise private rented properties through CBL in return for agreeing to accept tenants on LHA</p>	<p>Staff time</p> <p>Software amendments</p>	<p>September 2011</p>
		<p>Offer those applying for private rented properties a financial assessment to help them judge which properties are affordable</p>	<p>Staff time</p> <p>Training</p>	<p>September 2011</p>
<p>1.5 Housing associations will be able to charge new affordable rents set at up to 80% of market</p>	<p>The money will be invested outside the district</p> <p>There may be a</p>	<p>Partnership work with RPs to ensure that opportunities in the district are maximised</p> <p>Model the effects of the change to affordable tenure and ensure maximum take up of benefits</p>	<p>Staff time</p> <p>Staff time</p>	<p>On-going</p> <p>February 2011</p>

Issue	Risk	Action to Mitigate Risk	Resources	Timescale
<p>The higher rental income from social housing is designed to encourage the private sector to invest in social housing, and so build more social homes.</p>	<p>disincentive to work due to higher rent levels</p>	<p>Produce a tenancy policy for the district based on up to date market information so we have a clear position on tenure requirements that both maximises delivery and meets needs</p>	<p>Staff time Consultation expenses</p>	<p>To be confirmed following further government announcements On-going</p>
		<p>Investigate joint ventures in more detail, particularly if Free Serviced Land enables Council to set these up</p>	<p>Staff time</p>	<p>On-going</p>
		<p>Use a team approach to housing enabling. The 'affordable housing task force' should continue to determine approach on specific viability issues</p>	<p>Within existing resources – should save staff time</p>	<p>On-going</p>
		<p>Following use of the financial viability tool kit use independent quantity surveying expertise to challenge build costs where they are above the toolkit values</p>	<p>Consultancy fees Training expenses</p>	<p>June 2011</p>
		<p>Explore new models of making housing development viable</p>	<p>Staff time</p>	<p>On-going</p>
		<p>Test proposed affordable housing policy during the SPD consultation period by using the Three Dragons Consultancy</p>	<p>Staff time Consultancy fees</p>	<p>March 2011</p>

**Challenge 2 – Ensuring Housing Benefit reductions are understood, and then applied to housing advice and preventative homelessness services, and used to inform the viability of new housing supply for customers.**

Issue	Risk	Action to Mitigate Risk	Resources	Timescale
<p>2.1 Housing Benefit claimants and particularly those subject to Local Housing Allowance are to face significant changes to the amount of benefit they are entitled to receive</p>	<p>Increase in poverty and associated increase in people affording rent, mortgages and household bills (as per section 7)</p> <p>There are currently 1849 'live' Housing Benefit (LHA) claims throughout Cherwell, including working individuals and families, the unemployed and disabled who could be affected by changes</p> <p>Complication of changes may cause landlords to leave the sector</p>	<p>Set up a joint Housing and Benefits panel to ensure local DHP is targeted appropriately during transition</p> <p>Investigate maximising discretionary housing payments by all concerned Council departments contributing to a pooled budget</p>	<p>Staff time</p> <p>Additional DHP fund £100,000 pa to supplement DHP allocation from National budget</p> <p>Training costs</p> <p>Staff time</p>	<p>May 2011</p> <p>July 2011</p>
		<p>Undertake detailed mapping with Revenue Services of all individuals to be affected by changes and undertake detailed casework with each family to have individual plans to mitigate risk through use of DHP, maximising income, managing personal finances and if necessary secure more affordable housing. Also ensure anyone entitled to increased allowance for overnight carers is accessing this new benefit.</p> <p>Follow DWP guidance in preparing for the changes</p> <p>Work with RP partners to map the impact of LHA in light of changes to tenure</p>	<p>Staff time</p> <p>Staff time</p> <p>Staff time</p>	<p>From January 2012</p> <p>On-going April 2011</p> <p>June 2011</p>

Issue	Risk	Action to Mitigate Risk	Resources	Timescale
		<p>Ensure continuous training on the Benefit changes is provided to all staff</p>	<p>Staff time Training expenses</p>	<p>On-going</p>
		<p>Continue to publicise housing options service to residents of Cherwell District Council</p>	<p>Advertising costs, kept to a minimum by using Council publications and buildings, rural bus etc wherever possible</p>	<p>On-going</p>
<p>2.2 Local Authorities in more expensive areas may commission temporary accommodation in Cherwell as a response to welfare reform and changes in housing resulting from the CSR.</p>	<p>Residents of neighbouring local authorities accessing services and housing in Cherwell. Reducing availability of housing supply and options to Cherwell residents. Contributing factor to increasing homelessness and scarcity of appropriate temporary accommodation. Significant risk of budget impact.</p>	<p>Monitor use of local services by non-Cherwell residents Engage with local landlords to monitor access to private sector housing for non-Cherwell residents</p> <p>Ensure local landlords are fully aware of incentives to support Cherwell residents such as PALS Scheme, grants etc.</p> <p>Liaise at a county level if trends appear – for example for increased funding from Supporting People, Adult Services or Children’s Services</p>	<p>Staff resources</p>	<p>April 2012 on</p> <p>On-going</p>
<p>2.3 Residents of more expensive areas may choose to relocate to Cherwell District Council</p>	<p>There may be fewer options for existing Cherwell District Council residents, especially emerging households</p>	<p>Continue to engage landlords</p>	<p>Staff time</p>	<p>On-going</p>
<p>2.4 Increase in</p>	<p>People living in unsafe</p>	<p>Promote ‘best practice’ in establishing HMOs as they are</p>	<p>Staff time</p>	<p>On-going</p>

Issue	Risk	Action to Mitigate Risk	Resources	Timescale
<p>number of unregulated 'ad hoc' Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) due to people living together in groups for reasons of affordability</p>	<p>housing – increasing housing pressure when comp ASB, complaints to Police/ Councillors</p>	<p>needed in Cherwell but need to be safe and meet legal standards</p>	<p>Premises for meetings and meeting expenses Staff time</p>	
		<p>Increase proactive enforcement work to ensure properties are safe &amp; have adequate amenities</p>	<p>Staff time</p>	<p>On-going</p>
		<p>Encourage landlords to consider conversion suitable of properties to HMOs</p>	<p>Staff time Possible consultancy fees drawing up example plans</p>	<p>December 2011</p>
		<p>RP partners to consider providing and managing HMOs to provide good quality management</p>	<p>Staff time Possible need for funding for leverage</p>	<p>July 2011</p>
		<p>Fully understand supply and demand of this type of accommodation</p>	<p>Staff time</p>	<p>June 2011</p>
		<p>Strategically plan location of new HMO provision to reduce concentrations of potential social problems</p>	<p>Staff time</p>	<p>November 2011</p>



**Challenge 3 – Ensuring Welfare Benefit changes and the role of housing in helping people into employment are understood, and used to inform service provision and changes**

Issue	Risk	Action to Mitigate Risk	Resources	Timescale
3.1 households' ability to access or pay for their housing in all sectors may be affected by unemployment or changes to the welfare benefits system	Increased repossessions – impact on service will be pressure on private rented sector, increase in homelessness and use of temporary accommodation. Significant risk of budget implications for CDC.	Enhanced Housing Options through new software package attached to Abritas (Housing Register Management Software) which will link people into advice and employment support at point of registration on the housing register, offering applicants opportunities to get back into work.	Cost already identified in budget	February 2011
		Promotion of advice and debt counselling services and maximising benefit take up	Staff time Using CLG homelessness prevention funding	On – going
		Continued commissioning of Court Desk (with CAB) to ensure representation at mortgage hearings to reduce repossessions	Funding to CAB	On-going
		Securing funding through second round of mortgage rescue funding (we have a strong case as CDC is viewed as leading local authority in mortgage rescue)	Staff time	February 2011
		Closer working with Jobcentre Plus, Next Steps and Job club to help applicants to be 'work ready' and increase household income. This will include linking to the corporate financial inclusion work and targeting it to people on housing register and people engaging with housing options Team at CDC.	Staff time Using CLG homelessness prevention funding	April 2011
		Ensure customers are advised to access other sources of support such as the Homeowner Mortgage Support and Support for Mortgage Interest changes	Training expenses	On-going

Issue	Risk	Action to Mitigate Risk	Resources	Timescale
		<p>Developing the Foundation Learning Centre/Youth Hub partnership with YMCA</p> <p>Providing skills training opportunities such as self build projects, retro fitting environmental measures, new generation broadband cabling</p> <p>Pilot of 'Pre-Tenancy Qualifications' which will entail a basic course to ensure new social tenants and private sector tenants who are assisted through the Council will demonstrate a basic understanding of tenants' rights and responsibilities including management of personal finances</p> <p>Re-modeling of voluntary sector advice services (in collaboration of re-modeling of customer services centres) to establish three advice and information hubs.</p> <p>Increasing awareness of the housing needs service across all tenures using multi media, and working closely with partner agencies such as the Citizens Advice Bureau to ensure advice is freely available at the right time and in the right place for all residents in the district</p>	<p>£50k per annum revenue funding (from CLG homeless prevention funding )</p> <p>May require funding to kickstart projects though most would be negotiated through partners</p> <p>Funding for training</p> <p>Current allocation of grant funding for voluntary sector advice services is c£250k per annum. Intention is not to increase funding but achieve efficiencies through re-modelling</p> <p>Advertising expenses</p>	<p>Due to open March 2011</p> <p>September 2011</p> <p>On-going January 2011</p> <p>Negotiations underway ~ commissioning timetable to commence August 2011 and new services to commence 2012</p> <p>On-going</p>

Issue	Risk	Action to Mitigate Risk	Resources	Timescale
<p>3.2 Unemployment and changes in benefits system may restrict households' ability to pay fuel costs. This is further impacted as fuel prices rise</p>	<p>Increase in the current level of households fuel poverty, which is currently: The dedicated Warm Front programme will be cut by more than two-thirds. The Coalition government's plans for tackling fuel poverty remain vague, and there may be moves to change the definition and remove the legal targets established by the last government</p>	<p>Continued partnership working with the Cocoon &amp; warm front schemes Promotion of the Flexible Home Improvement Loan for the Over 60s Promotion of energy efficiency grant for landlords Working with OTs to offer energy efficiency advice when assessing for DFGs Retro fitting in social housing – map current activity by RPs Affordable warmth plans to be provided</p>	<p>Staff time Advertising expenses Staff time Staff time Staff time Staff time</p>	<p>On-going April 2011 February 2011 May 2011 August 2011</p>
<p>3.3 Increasing restrictions on eligibility for mortgages including requirement for larger deposits, especially in relation to shared equity/ownership housing.</p>	<p>RPs more reluctant to deliver shared ownership/equity housing (this will also be affected by the expectation that they will be delivered with nil grant) which in turn impacts viability of schemes. The funding for the MyChoice HomeBuy and HomeBuy direct schemes, where properties could be purchased on the open market with an equity loan has now ceased. Young people/ first time buyers unable to enter the owner occupation sector</p>	<p>Discussions with RP partners including the Catalyst Housing Group in relation to RPs developing mortgage/equity products Discussions with lenders/investors in relation to strategic sites (especially regeneration sites such as Orchard Way) and negotiation of mortgage packages Impact report on CDC becoming mortgage lender and/or equity investor targeting strategic sites – this will be considered as part of Cherwell's 2011/12</p>	<p>Staff time RPs Staff time Staff time Staff time</p>	<p>On-going January 2011 May 2011 On-going April 2011 March 2011</p>

Issue	Risk	Action to Mitigate Risk	Resources	Timescale
		investment strategy.		
		Self build/ community land trusts	Staff time HCA	March 2012
		Changing the expectations of people overcrowded or still living at home by advising them of other options, including use of the advanced housing options toolkit	Staff time	June 2011

**Challenge 5 – Ensuring the needs of vulnerable people are addressed so they are not at risk of homelessness and other unsatisfactory housing conditions**

Issue	Risk	Action to Mitigate Risk	Resources	Timescale
5.1 History shows us that vulnerable adults are most at risk of homelessness during a recession	Decrease in supply together with increased demand will result in increasing levels of homelessness and use in temporary accommodation.	Ensure Supporting People funded housing support is targeted at vulnerable adults	Staff time	On-going
		Build capacity in Vulnerable Adults Multi-Agency Casework Group to ensure complete 'buy-in' from adult services, probation services and health. Re-model this group to become a 'panel' for supported housing provision for vulnerable adults to ensure appropriate targeting of resources	Staff time Partners	December 2011
		Ongoing commissioning of targeted interventions with partners such as the Beacon Centre to engage vulnerable adults at risk of rough sleeping.	Staff time Partners	Ongoing
		Continued use of small 'returning home fund' to enable a quick response to issues which may prevent a vulnerable adult remaining at home.	Existing Resources	March 2012
		Ongoing liaison with faith groups and churches who are likely to be approached by vulnerable adults for support Impact report on CDC becoming mortgage lender and/or equity investor targeting strategic sites	Staff time Voluntary Sector	Ongoing
		Ongoing liaison with police and street wardens to ensure all agencies 'flag up' individuals identified as rough sleepers to ensure early intervention	Staff time Existing Partnerships	June 2011



**Local Decisions: A Fairer Future for Housing”: Draft Response to the Government’s Housing Consultation Response**

	Question	Answer
<p><b>Q1</b></p>	<p>As a landlord, do you anticipate making changes in light of the new tenancy flexibilities being proposed? If so, how would you expect to use these flexibilities? What sort of outcomes would you hope to achieve?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question for Registered Providers (Housing Associations)</li> <li>• As a local authority, we would support the move to affordable rents to be set at a maximum of 80 per cent of local housing markets to try and support the financial viability of future affordable housing. However, we believe social rents may still be applicable given individual personal circumstances and when responding to the need to ensure affordable housing supports the agenda for getting people back into the employment market.</li> <li>• However, it is clear that more work is needed to look at how an up to 80 per cent of market rent offer will work in practice. A model is required that provides a stable platform for tenants, lenders and landlords. There is a need to provide a rental product that fits with the government’s ambitions around controlling housing benefit costs.</li> <li>• We need to find a way of ensuring that additional money raised is used for new supply and not for paying for more land.</li> <li>• We accept that some shorter term tenancies may be appropriate for some people, but we believe that flexible tenancies should importantly continue to provide a stable platform for people to put down roots in a community, find work and get on with their lives.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q2</b></p>	<p>When, as a landlord, might you begin to introduce changes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question for Registered Providers (Housing Associations)</li> <li>• Although a non stock holding authority we still have considerable statutory and strategic responsibility for housing and therefore would expect to be fully consulted on any changes by RPs operating in Cherwell. We would expect to be fully engaged with RPs and their plans to implement changes in the way they undertake their housing</li> </ul>

## Appendix C

		responsibilities in Cherwell.
Q3	As a local authority, how would you expect to develop and publish a local strategic policy on tenancies? What costs would you expect to incur?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given the enhanced options proposed for customers, we would want the strategic role of CDC to be strengthened to exert more influence over RPs, so that local issues and priorities can be addressed.</li> <li>• The removal of the TSA and in its incorporation into the HCA presents a risk of reduced monitor of RP performance – this means LAs need to be able to influence their services. For example, the service failure of a local RP would need to be addressed urgently and locally.</li> <li>• The likelihood of further RP mergers risks undermining localism by making local services more remote, and providing LAs with increased ‘fallout’ from ineffective housing management arrangements</li> <li>• Could a local strategic policy be included within LA housing strategies? We are assuming local allocations (or properties) policies would sit under the local strategic policy.</li> <li>• The local strategic policy would be a major project to resource at senior level between RPs and CDC, and would involve extensive joint working.</li> </ul>
Q4	Which other persons or bodies should local authorities consult in drawing up their strategic tenancy policy?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents, RPs, Statutory and Voluntary agencies working with vulnerable people, and a full range of other partners.</li> </ul>
Q5	Do you agree that the Tenancy Standard should focus on key principles? If so, what should these be?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We strongly support the proposals for a Tenancy Standard, and as a strategic housing authority have recently established our own development and housing management standards with RPs. We offer this practice as something which the government may wish to understand more about, and reiterate the importance of the LA having a driving role in ensuring the delivery of housing does not undermine wider community strategy objectives.</li> </ul>



## Appendix C

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We strongly believe that the local housing authority should be party to local monitoring of RPs should take place to mitigate against poor performance of RPs and to maximise the contribution to localism.</li> <li>RPs work across many Districts, so it is more difficult for them to understand local priorities without having strong contact with the LA.</li> <li>Key principles focussed upon should include supporting and working with vulnerable groups, tenancy support, the environment, antisocial behaviour and so on.</li> </ul>
Q6	Do you have any concerns that these proposals could restrict current flexibilities enjoyed by landlords? If so, how can we best mitigate that risk?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LAs have different requirements to RPs, but we believe – in the context of localism – that RPs should be using Tenancy Standards that are flexible and respond to the needs of individual local residents.</li> </ul>
Q7	Should we seek to prescribe more closely the content of landlord policies on tenancies? If so, in what respects?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landlords should develop their tenancy policies in conjunction with the Local Authority strategic tenancy policy to meet local need. We do not see a need for over-prescription.</li> </ul>
Q8	What opportunities as a tenant would you expect to have to influence the landlord's policy?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question for tenants</li> <li>However, CDC as a non-stock holding authority already works closely with tenant representatives and would expect to work with representatives on our policy development in this area.</li> </ul>
Q9	Is two years an appropriate minimum fixed term for a general needs social tenancy, or should the minimum fixed term be longer? If so, how long should it be? What is the basis for proposing a minimum fixed term of that length? Should a distinction be drawn between tenancies on social and affordable rents? If so, what should this be?  Should the minimum fixed term include any probationary period?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We support the introduction of a more flexible approach to tenancies. We believe that security and stability should be the key starting point but we also recognise that the affordable housing sector is the home to a very diverse range of people with different needs at different times in their lives.</li> <li>We accept that some shorter term tenancies may be appropriate for some people, but we believe that flexible tenancies should importantly continue to provide a stable platform for people to put down roots in a community, find work and get on with their lives.</li> </ul>

## Appendix C

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We would want this to be a choice tenants have rather than the only form of tenure on offer. We would also like a choice of rolling tenancies.</li> </ul>
<p>Q10</p> <p>Should we require a longer minimum fixed term for some groups? If so, who should those groups be and what minimum fixed terms would be appropriate? What is the basis for proposing a minimum fixed term of that length? Should a distinction be drawn between tenancies on social and affordable rents? If so, what should this be?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important to consider the needs of some groups over a longer period e.g. vulnerable people to be determined by the strategic housing authority to reflect local needs.</li> <li>Tenants/applicants could be re-assessed on reaching their retirement to see if their needs are sufficiently met in a cost effective way.</li> <li>The range of terms in place means increased workloads for both RPs and LAs, given the regular review and management this will necessitate. This should be acknowledged.</li> <li>We would expect Local Housing Allowances (LHA) to cover Affordable Rents and Social Rents, and highlight the importance of tenants having to pay service charges, believing that the rent and leasehold charges combined should always be below LHAs.</li> <li>Our own local modelling suggests the new affordable rents (at 80%) will be much too close to the LHA.</li> </ul>
<p>Q11</p> <p>Do you think that older people and those with a long term illness or disability should continue to be provided with a guarantee of a social home for life through the Tenancy Standard?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, subject to the home meeting the tenant's requirements</li> <li>It is not cost effective to move people when expensive adaptations have been built out using public money.</li> </ul>
<p>Q12</p> <p>Are there other types of household where we should always require landlords to guarantee a social home for life?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We believe that security and stability should be the key starting point but we also recognise that the affordable housing sector is the home to a very diverse range of people with different needs at different times of their lives.</li> <li>Homes for life could be considered for those for whom social housing is not a "springboard" either because of age or some other reason or who could not be expected to find accommodation in the private sector e.g. extra care, very highly adapted properties for physically</li> </ul>

## Appendix C

		disabled people
Q13	Do you agree that we should require landlords to offer existing secure and assured tenants who move to another social rent property a lifetime tenancy in their new home?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This suggestion is good in principle as market stagnation could be caused if tenants did not move for fear of their tenancy status being “demoted”. As a minimum, tenants could be offered a lifetime tenancy if downsizing.</li> </ul>
Q14	Do you agree that landlords should have the freedom to decide whether new secure and assured tenants should continue to receive a lifetime tenancy when they move?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They should be guided by the LA tenancy policy because the LA has the strategic responsibility and can take an over view of the whole area and respond to what the community wants</li> </ul>
Q15	Do you agree that we should require social landlords to provide advice and assistance to tenants prior to the expiry of a fixed term tenancy?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, this is essential to ensure their longer term housing needs are met in a sustainable way</li> </ul>
Q16	As a landlord, what are the factors you would take into account in deciding whether to reissue a tenancy at the end of the fixed term? How often would you expect a tenancy to be reissued?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CDC not landlord, but our view would be: how the tenants conducted their tenancies e.g. their willingness to pay rent, and the impact for the tenant on whether finding a new home is a viable option.</li> </ul>
Q17	As a local authority, how would you expect to use the new flexibilities to decide who should qualify to go on the waiting list? What sort of outcomes would you hope to achieve?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of the local authority’s role is to understand housing needs – this helps in being pro-active in tackling housing need and homelessness. The LA Housing Register has always been an excellent source of information, and has been used to find appropriate accommodation – including intermediate options such as shared ownership. In this context, we would want to encourage local people in need to be included on the register.</li> <li>By not allowing an open register customers could attempt to get registered in any event taking up officer time etc... It would be much easier to allow residents to apply and assess according to needs.</li> <li>Applicants in low bands (on the housing register) are still in housing need.</li> </ul>

## Appendix C

Q18	In making use of the new waiting list flexibilities, what savings or other benefits would you expect to achieve?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We would need to invest more in providing customers with personal information, advice and support</li> <li>The Enhanced Housing Options Service being developed at CDC could assist in providing more flexible and comprehensive support.</li> <li>We would still need to protect and develop housing support, and people in housing need require advice to mitigate against the risk of homelessness and hence higher costs to local authorities.</li> </ul>
Q19	What opportunities as a tenant or resident would you expect to have to influence the local authority's qualification criteria?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question for tenants and residents</li> <li>The Council would expect tenants and residents to be encouraged to comment on local authority policies. Cherwell DC as a strategic housing authority already does this via its Residents' Panel where residents from RPs across the District come together to work with the authority.</li> </ul>
Q20	Do you agree that current statutory reasonable preference categories should remain unchanged? Or do you consider that there is scope to clarify the current categories?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We support the Government conclusion that these categories have broadly worked.</li> <li>We need to be especially mindful in homelessness terms about single people (locally) and the needs of vulnerable adults as identified in our homelessness strategy</li> </ul>
Q21	Do you think that the existing reasonable preference categories should be expanded to include other categories of people in housing need? If so, what additional categories would you include and what is the rationale for doing so?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The principle of good rehabilitation is very important for both the individual and customers</li> </ul>
Q22	As a landlord, how would you expect to use the new flexibility created by taking social tenants seeking a transfer who are not in housing need out of the allocation framework? What sort of outcomes would you hope to achieve?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a local authority, we do not support this proposal. The Council's Allocation framework should be a common gateway for all customers ensuring a consistent approach to re-housing - we believe it is much preferable for them to have their needs assessed, following which they it could be better for them to move into other tenures.</li> </ul>

## Appendix C

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would not want to see Registered Providers making decisions around such allocations, when affordable homes should be used to meet District housing need.</li> <li>• Factors may include costs, and fear of housing tenants without knowing their full background.</li> <li>• Landlords may not choose subscribe to a mutual exchange service as the legislation is already very clear on this matter and providing the tenants meet the requirements set out in the Act they may proceed with a mutual exchange. Often they do not go ahead because there are either outstanding arrears or damage etc... to the property or the property is the wrong size.</li> </ul>
Q23	What are the reasons why a landlord may currently choose not to subscribe to a mutual exchange service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question for tenants</li> <li>• As a local authority, we have found that tenants require advice and support on their mutual exchange plans – the opportunity to talk through their situation is helpful to them, as they sometimes feel uncertain about certain aspects of the process.</li> </ul>
Q24	As a tenant, this national scheme will increase the number of possible matches you might find through your web-based provider but what other services might you find helpful in arranging your mutual exchange as well as IT-based access?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We use the private sector as one of the main homelessness prevention tools and have difficulty securing enough private sector properties so welcome this proposal.</li> <li>• We would like legislation for a minimum of twelve months, as would like the possibility of utilising the accommodation for other priority cases should household personal circumstances improve.</li> </ul>
Q25	As a local authority, how would you expect to use the new flexibility provided by this change to the homelessness legislation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ability of the private rented sector to meet the demand for rented accommodation particularly for those clients with complex or higher support needs will need to be carefully monitored and proactively resourced. An underestimation of this area of work will result an increase in homelessness and poor outcomes.</li> <li>• We require more tools to develop the private rented sector, and</li> </ul>
Q26	As a local authority, do you think there will be private rented sector housing available in your area that could provide suitable and affordable accommodation for people owed the main homelessness duty?	

## Appendix C

		<p>require more supply and are concerned at the economic downturn's effect on supply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The change in benefit rules increasing the age for single room allowance from 25 to 35 will increase the demand for Houses in Multiple Occupation.</li> <li>• We believe that twelve months would be manageable, but think two years would be more desirable, and safeguard measures are needed.</li> <li>• Landlords would need an incentive especially if the tenant is in receipt of LHA</li> </ul>
Q27	<p>Do you consider that 12 months is the right period to provide as a minimum fixed term where the homelessness duty is ended with an offer of an assured shorthold tenancy?</p> <p>If you consider the period should be longer, do you consider that private landlords would be prepared to provide fixed term assured shorthold tenancies for that longer period to new tenants?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of overcrowding, and the responses a local authority makes as a result, are currently subject to 3 different approaches: the Bedroom Standard, the Statutory Overcrowding Provisions (Part 10 Housing Act 1985) and to the Housing Health &amp; Safety Rating System. These approaches are not inter-related and produce different conclusions. Consequently, judgements about overcrowding are confused, confusing and subject to challenge.</li> <li>• There are currently 2 routes to enforcement in relation to overcrowding in dwellings (and others in relation to HMOs according to whether or not they are subject to a licence). There is a pressing need for simplification of approach, preferably through a single set of enforcement provisions for dwellings in single-occupation, which should include minimum floor-space standards along the lines of those that already exist in the 1985 Act. (We consider that legislative overcrowding provisions for HMOs are currently adequate.)</li> </ul>
Q28	<p>What powers do local authorities and landlords need to address overcrowding?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We judge that the Housing Act 1985 provisions are no longer satisfactory in their entirety. The positives in the current provisions</li> </ul>
Q29	<p>Is the framework set out in the 1985 Housing Act fit for</p>	

## Appendix C

	purpose? Are any detailed changes needed to the enforcement provisions in the 1985 Act?	<p>are that they allow for objective determination of overcrowding and also include floor-space standards which are conspicuously absent elsewhere (and which we regard as absolutely essential to any proper assessment). The 1985 provisions are however inadequate in 3 major respects: 1) the requirement that all habitable rooms are assessed as being available for sleeping purposes, 2) that children aged under 10 are counted as half-people and 3) that it is deemed appropriate to assume that adult couples could sleep apart from each other so as to share with same sex children and thereby avoid the need for children of opposite sex to have to share a room.</p>
Q30	Should the Housing Health and Safety Rating System provide the foundation for measures to tackle overcrowding across all tenures and landlords?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The HHSRS provisions already apply to all tenures other than council-owned accommodation. As Cherwell DC is an LSVT authority, all residential accommodation is already subject to the HHSRS. The difficulty with applying the HHSRS, particularly in relation to the assessment of housing need, is that the omission of any reference to minimum floor-space standards means that it cannot be sufficiently objective. Although it includes a 'bedroom-standard' this can, in the absence of floor-space standards, be no more than an indication of the extent of overcrowding. We strongly contend that whilst overcrowding can be influenced by a variety of issues (most of which are touched upon in the HHSRS Operating Guidance), it must fundamentally be an assessment of the floor space available and of the ability to properly separate household on the basis of their age, sex and relationships.</li> </ul>

Questions in red, not specifically directed at local authorities.

### Capital Programme 2011/12

- 1.1 A total of 27 bids were received of which 3 were deleted at appraisal stage. This leaves 24 bids for consideration and these are analysed according to consultation priority below:

Priority	No. of bids
1 Refuse collection & recycling, housing (needs, strategic & private sector), anti-social behaviour	6
2 Economic development & regeneration	2
3 Sports facilities, local, community & leisure development, safer communities, health promotion	2
4 Cleansing, local transport & concessionary fares, environmental protection, conservation & urban centres, arts, rural areas, car parking, estates	1
5 Building control & engineering, public protection, enforcement	0
6 Planning control, diversity & equality	0
7 Landscape, Banbury museum, tourism, licensing	0
<b>Corporate</b> Revenue & benefits, democratic services, chief executive office, member services, corporate charges, communications, treasury, improvement, community planning, elections, land charges	13
	<b>24</b>

- 1.2 The draft capital proposals to date for 2011/12 are shown in Appendix 3a these bids totalling £3,893,980 still need to be considered in the context that they must meet with the Council's priorities. Each scheme is supported by an appraisal and these have been scored according to priority by the Capital Investment Delivery Group.
- 1.3 At least one third of the capital bids can be categorised as spend to save initiatives and generate positive revenue implications which if considered for inclusion in the final 2011/12 capital programme will contribute to the financial challenges ahead.
- 1.4 The new capital bids have been scrutinised by the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board and their recommendations are detailed in Appendix 3a.
- 1.5 The Capital Strategy for 2011/12 has a direct impact on the Treasury management revenue budget in terms of the opportunity cost of reduced cash balances from the use of capital receipts and reserves. Decisions on the future capital programme will need to take into account the overall priorities and affordability in revenue as well as capital terms.
- 1.6 Capital balances are expected to reduce to less than £17m in 2014/15 and a detailed forecast is shown in appendix 3c. The balances are further reduced as a result of the recent capitalisation approval from CLG of £3.231M for the Icelandic bank losses.
- 1.7 In late October 2010 the Council made a request to the government to capitalise the impairment loss of £4.615m which we had invested in Iceland's Glitnir bank. In early December we had confirmation that the government has



agreed that £3.231m can be treated as capital expenditure and spread the cost over 20 years. Therefore this will reduce the capital receipts by £3.231m in 2010/11 but will be replenished by £0.16m each year from revenue over the 20 year cycle.

The remaining impairment loss of £1.384m will have to be charged in its entirety to the General Fund reserve in 2010/11 as the rules state that any losses need to be realised in the year to which they relate. This is a better position for the Council than we had originally planned for as it puts less pressure on our revenue finances.

However, this is purely an accounting requirement and does not mean that the deposits are lost. The Council continues to work with Bevan Brittan and LGA to seek full recovery of the £6.5m invested. Should the deposits be repaid in full as priority creditor status then the accounting entries would be reversed.

- 1.8 The Executive has agreed that 21 capital schemes which were approved as part of the 2010/11 budget process but which work has been delayed until 2011/12 will also be delivered in 2011/12 and these are detailed schedule in Appendix 3b.
- 1.9 A summary of the draft capital programme and recommended financing is summarised below:

	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	<b>2011/12 Profile</b>
Schemes approved and slipped from 2010/11 (Appendix 3b)	<b>£7,012,000</b>	£6,762,000
Schemes approved in 2010/11 profiled for 2011/12 and beyond (Appendix 3d)	<b>£6,245,184</b>	£1,245,184
Proposed programme (Appendix 3a)	<b>£5,912,314</b>	£3,893,980
<b>Total Capital Programme to be Financed</b>	<b>£19,169,498</b>	<b>£11,901,164</b>
<b>Financed by:</b>		
Capital Receipts	<b>£14,062,448</b>	£8,317,164
<i>Housing Reserves</i>	<b>£2,987,000</b>	£2,987,000
	<b>£17,049,448</b>	<b>£11,304,164</b>
<b>Government Grants</b>		
<i>£375k per annum Governmental Grant Funding towards Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants</i>	<b>£1,500,000</b>	£375,000
<b>Use of Reserves</b>		
<i>Wheeled Bins Reserve</i>	<b>£15,000</b>	£15,000
<i>Vehicle Replacement Programme</i>	<b>£605,050</b>	£207,000
	<b>£19,169,498</b>	<b>£11,901,164</b>

## Further Document Information

---

Appendix No	Title
Appendix 3a	New Capital Bid Proposals
Appendix 3b	Schedule of capital schemes slipped from 2010/11
Appendix 3c	Analysis of Capital Reserves
Appendix 3d	Spend approved in 2010/11 profiled for 2011/12

**Capital Bids 2011/12 by Score**

Bid No.	Consultation Priority	Capital Scheme	Service Head	Service	Capital Bid Score	Total Estimated Capital Cost	Estimated Capital Cost for 2010/11	2011/12	
								Revenue Costs / (Savings)	
24	1	Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs)	Gillian Greaves	Housing Services	45	£860,000	£860,000		
19	4	Vehicle Replacement Programme	Ed Potter	Environmental Services	44	£2,186,000	£207,000		
9	C	Extended Contract for Website Hosting	Pat Simpson	Customer Service & Information Systems	40	£59,000	£19,666		
5	C	Photovoltaics at Bodicote House and Banbury Museum	David Marriott	Economic Development & Estates	39	£350,000	£350,000	(£20,186)	
20	C	Solar Photovoltaics at Thorpe Lane Depot	Ed Potter	Environmental Services	39	£100,000	£100,000		
21	C	Solar Photovoltaics at Sports Centres	Paul Marston Weston	Recreation & Health	39	£785,000	£785,000	(£61,500)*	
14	C	Uniform & Corporate Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Database & Application Upgrades	Pat Simpson	Customer Service & Information Systems	38	£15,000	£15,000		
22	1	Delegated Affordable Housing Capital Pot	Gillian Greaves	Housing Services	36	£500,000	£500,000		
23	1	Discretionary House Condition Grants	Gillian Greaves	Housing Services	36	£325,000	£325,000		
6	1	Orchard Way Refurbishment	David Marriott	Economic Development & Estates	34	£250,000	£250,000	0**	
8	3	CC.TV Internet Protocol Transmission	Chris Rothwell	Urban & Rural Services	34	£100,000	£100,000		
17	1	Mini MRF (Materials Recovery Facility)	Ed Potter	Environmental Services	34	£29,000	£29,000		
18	1	Recycling Bins Programme	Ed Potter	Environmental Services	34	£15,000	£15,000	(£1,000)	
4	2	Fees of Future Regeneration Schemes	David Marriott	Economic Development & Estates	31	£50,000	£50,000		
1	C	Replacement Voicemail Service	Pat Simpson	Customer Service & Information Systems	29	£10,000	£10,000		
3	C	Highfield Depot Improvements	David Marriott	Economic Development & Estates	29	£10,000	£10,000		
11	C	Virtual Server Infrastructure Expansion	Pat Simpson	Customer Service & Information Systems	29	£30,914	£30,914	£2,212	
12	C	Storage Area Networks (SAN) Expansion	Pat Simpson	Customer Service & Information Systems	29	£41,900	£41,900	£1,700	
13	C	Core Business System Integration	Pat Simpson	Customer Service & Information Systems	28	£52,500	£52,500		
16	3	Corporate Bookings System	Ian Davies	Environment & Community	23	£50,000	£50,000		
7	C	Community Intelligence Hub	Chris Rothwell	Urban & Rural Services	21	£20,000	£20,000		
27	2	Kidlington Pedestrianisation	David Marriott	Economic Development & Estates	18	£50,000	£50,000		
10	C	SMS Text Messaging Functionality	Pat Simpson	Customer Service & Information Systems	17	£13,000	£13,000		
15	C	Contact Centre Call Recording	Pat Simpson	Customer Service & Information Systems	12	£10,000	£10,000		
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>							<b>£5,912,314</b>	<b>£3,893,980</b>	<b>(£17,274)</b>

C = this service was not consulted on as part of the public consultation exercise

\* Awaiting confirmation. Will be confirmed in the final version of the budget.

\*\* This had original savings of £216,000 but is a possible replacement for a 2010/11 bid. Therefore if this goes ahead, the savings from 2010/11 will be slipped.

APPENDIX 3b

**2010/11 APPROVED BIDS SLIPPED INTO 2011/12**

<b>Bid No.</b>	<b>Capital Scheme</b>	<b>Service Head</b>	<b>Strategic Priority</b>	<b>Score given 2010/11</b>	<b>Slippage agreed as at 1st Nov 2010*</b>
P/Y 1	Funding for Mollington & Hornton Rural Exception Sites	Gillian Greaves	District of Opportunity	30	£ 60,000
P/Y 2	Purchase of Temporary Accommodation Bryan House Bicester & Edward Street Banbury	Gillian Greaves	District of Opportunity	31	£ 330,000
P/Y 3	Kidlington Pedestrianisation	David Marriott	District of Opportunity	19	£ 20,000
P/Y 4	Fees for Future Regeneration Schemes	David Marriott	District of Opportunity	17	£ 50,000
P/Y 5	Climate Changes Initiatives Fund	Ed Potter	Cleaner, Greener	Pre 10/11	£ 16,000
P/Y 6	Bicester Cattle Market Car Park Phase 2	David Marriott	District of Opportunity	Pre 10/11	£ 94,000
P/Y 7	Old Bodicote House	David Marriott	Accessible Value for Money	Pre 10/11	£ 371,000
P/Y 8	Land at Claypits Lane Bicester	David Marriott	District of Opportunity	Pre 10/11	£ 187,000
P/Y 9	Orchard Way Banbury Redevelopment	David Marriott	District of Opportunity	Pre 10/11	£ 1,100,000
P/Y 10	Financial Ledger - Agresso 5.5	Karen Curtin	Accessible Value for Money	Pre 10/11	£ 50,000
P/Y 11	Budget Module	Karen Curtin	Accessible Value for Money	Pre 10/11	£ 15,000
P/Y 12	Fleet Management System	Ed Potter	Accessible Value for Money	27	£ 28,000
P/Y 13	Village Hall, Recreation Play Grants	Paul Marston-Weston	Safe & Healthy	Pre 10/11	£ 19,000
P/Y 14	South West Bicester Sports Village	Paul Marston-Weston	Safe & Healthy	Pre 10/11	£ 270,000
P/Y 16	Urban Centres Improvements	Chris Rothwell	District of Opportunity	Pre 10/11	£ 7,000
P/Y 17	Replacement Cabling Infrastructure for CCTV	Chris Rothwell	Safe & Healthy	Pre 10/11	£ 55,000
P/Y 19	Online Service Provision via Forms	Pat Simpson	Accessible Value for Money	Pre 10/11	£ 20,000
P/Y 21	Banbury Pedestrianisation	David Marriott	District of Opportunity	Pre 10/11	£ 20,000
P/Y 23	Thorpe Lane Depot	David Marriott	District of Opportunity	Pre 10/11	£ 50,000
P/Y 24	Bicester Town Centre Development	David Marriott	District of Opportunity	33	£ 4,000,000
					<b>£ 6,762,000</b>

\*There will be further slippage requests in Q3 Finance Report of approximately £100,000 which relate primarily to SW Bicester Sports Village, Banbury Football Development and various ICT projects.

Capital Reserves Analysis

APPENDIX 3c

Opening balance at 1st April 2010 £s	Expected capital exp in 2010/11 £s	Iceland Capitalisation 2010/11 £s	Expected spend in 2011/12 £s	Expected spend in 2012/13 £s	Replenishment from interest 2012/13 £s	Expected spend in 2013/14 £s	Replenishment from interest 2013/14 £s	Expected spend in 2014/15 £s	Replenishment from interest 2014/15 £s	Closing Balance £s
<u>46,289,674</u>	-8,325,388	-3,230,500	-11,304,164	-5,703,667	250,000	-598,667	250,000	-966,000	250,000	<u>16,911,288</u>

CAPITAL RECEIPTS FORECAST



## APPENDIX 3d

### Capital expenditure approved in 2010/11 profiled for 2011/12

	Profiled 2011/12 spend	Profiled 2012/13 spend
Bicester Town Centre Redevelopment	0	5,000,000
Car Park Refurbishments	5,000	0
Microsoft Licensing Agreements	110,184	0
South West Bicester Sports Village	1,130,000	0
	<b>1,245,184</b>	<b>5,000,000</b>

## **COUNCIL TAX BASE FOR 2011/12**

**10 January 2011**

### **Report of Head of Finance**

#### **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To consider the calculation of the council tax base for 2011/12

This report is public
-----------------------

#### **Recommendations**

---

The Executive is recommended:

- (1) To approve the report of the Head of Finance, made pursuant to the Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as amended, and the calculations referred to therein for the purposes of the Regulations;
- (2) To resolve that, in accordance with the Regulations, as amended, the amount calculated by the Cherwell District Council as its council tax base for the year 2011/2012 shall be 50,337; and
- (3) To resolve that the tax base for parts of the area be in accordance with the figures shown in column 13 of Appendix 4b.
- (4) To resolve to continue with the discretionary awards that it resolved to give on December 1 2008.

#### **Executive Summary**

---

##### **Introduction**

- 1.1 The Council is required to calculate its tax base for each financial year in advance of the start of the year and notify its major precepting authorities and local precepting authorities accordingly.
- 1.2 The background information forming part of this report provides all the necessary calculations together with an explanation of how each has been arrived at.
- 1.3 There are various powers contained within the Council Tax, Housing Benefit



and Business Rates legislation, all of which are reviewed annually.

- 1.4 Any resolution to amend a discretionary power relating to Council Tax must be made before the Council Tax for the next financial year is set. Similarly, with Business rates, it is important to establish the criteria that will apply for all classes of discretionary relief prior to the annual billing process.

### **Proposals**

- 1.5 To consider the calculation of the council tax base for 2011/2012 as set out in the background information and decide whether to vary the estimated figures of adjustments for changes in property information during the year, e.g. new properties or discount changes, as well as the collection rate used in the attached Appendix 4a to this report.
- 1.6 It is proposed that no variations are made to either the estimated adjustments or the collection rate used in Appendix 4a. The estimated adjustments have been made to take into account the potential slow down in the building of new properties resulting from the change in the economic climate. The role of inspector has now been deleted and there is no role responsible for carrying out the estimate of new properties. However, the Service Assurance Team will work in conjunction with other internal and external partners to carry out this annual task. The collection rate remains unchanged from 2010/11 to reflect the possible fall off in collection that may occur if the recession has a serious effect on jobs in the district.
- 1.7 There are no proposals to amend any of the discretionary powers in relation to the council tax, business rates or housing and council tax benefit from those agreed by the Executive in December 2008.

### **Conclusion**

- 1.8 The attached background information and Appendices provide the most up to date view of the tax base and the adjustments that have been made to allow for changes during 2010/2011 are based on the current understanding of the effects the recession is likely to have on properties. On this basis the Executive is invited to approve the recommendations set out at the beginning of this report.

## Background Information

---

### COUNCIL TAX BASE CALCULATIONS FOR 2011/12

#### Valuation Banding and Notification to Preceptors

- 2.1 The billing authority is obliged to notify major precepting authorities of the tax base set, by 31 January 2011. In practice, it is important that they, and the local precepting authorities, are given more time to determine their precepts, in order that they are able to levy them on this Council in time for the council tax level to be considered at the Executive meeting to be held on 7 February and for the Council to set the council tax at its meeting on 21 February 2010.
- 2.2 To give all precepting authorities (including parish and town councils) sufficient time to determine their precepts it would seem appropriate to notify all precepting authorities of their proposed tax bases following this meeting of the Executive.

#### The Requirements of the Tax Base Calculation

- 2.3 The Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) Regulations 1992 (S.I. No 612 of 1992) as amended by S.I. 1742 and S.I. 2943 (both of 1992), S.I. 3123 and 3437 (both of 1999) and S.I. 3012 of 2003 set out the necessary calculations and it is a clear intention that the Council should be seen to perform a series of calculations, which follow.
- 2.4 The first step is to establish the relevant amount (band D equivalents) for 2011/12. Regulation 5AA provides the following formula:

**the relevant amount for a valuation band = (H-Q + J) x F/G**

Where -

- H is the number of chargeable dwellings
- Q is a factor to take account of the various discounts
- J is an amount of adjustments for changes in property information during the year e.g. new properties or discount changes
- F is the proportion relevant to the band e.g. 6 for band A
- G is the number relevant to band D i.e. 9

- 2.5 Appendix 4a to this report shows a summary of the information resulting in the following totals:

58,820 properties on the list  
51,144.band D equivalents (the relevant amount)

- 2.6 Appendix 4b to this report provides the calculation of the tax base for each town and parish
- 2.7 Regulation 3 of The Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992 provides for each billing authority to determine a collection rate. It requires the authority to estimate the amounts, which are likely to be paid, expressed as a proportion of its estimate of what should be paid. It is estimated that in accordance with the calculations under regulation 3, the Collection Rate for this authority should be 98%.

- 2.8 Because there is a need to calculate the tax base at individual town and parish level the Collection Rate has been applied to the net band D equivalents in Appendix 4b and the MOD property added back to arrive at a tax base of 50,337 compared to 50,113 in the current financial year

#### **Calculation of the Tax Base for a Part of the Area**

- 2.9 Regulation 6 requires that the tax base be determined for each local precepting area. Appendix 4b provides this for the 78 distinct parts of the District's area.
- 2.10 Column 1 shows the band D equivalents of properties in each part net of exemptions, disabled relief and discounts. The Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 1999 (Statutory Instrument No 3123 of 1999) provide for disabled relief to be allowed on properties in band A. Instead of being charged at 6/9 of band D they are charged at 5/9 of band D
- 2.11 Column 2 adds in MOD property to arrive at the 'relevant amount', which totals to 51,144.0 in column 3
- 2.12 Columns 4 to 7 deal with any adjustments expected during the year. It is almost impossible to predict changes to discounts and reductions in property numbers but an estimate has been included of additional properties. The figures in column 4 have been taken from Inspectors' records and have been converted to an estimated band D equivalent. In all cases properties have been assumed to be billed for a half year only. Columns 4 and 6 also take into account the movement of any properties (at band D equivalent) between parishes and any properties to be demolished
- 2.13 Column 8 provides a sub-total
- 2.14 Column 9 takes the MOD property back out again to give the net figure again in column 10
- 2.15 Column 11 applies the Collection Rate. This has been maintained at 98%, the same figure used for the current year. This is considered reasonable given the 98.5% collection rate achieved in 2007/08, whilst also allowing for any shortfall that may arise if the recession results in local residents finding it difficult to meet all their financial commitments and falling into arrears with their council tax payments
- 2.16 Column 12 adds back the MOD property and column 13 shows the tax base for billing purposes for 2011/2012
- 2.17 Column 14 shows the tax base for 2010/2011 for comparison purposes

#### **Key Issues for Consideration/Reasons for Decision and Options**

---

- 3.1 The Collection Rate to be used in the tax base calculation is a best estimate of the percentage of the total amount due for 2011/2012 that will be collected.

It is based on the level of in-year collection achieved in previous years. Over recent years the in-year collection rate has increased each year, from 95.75% in 2000/01 to 98.5% last year. The Collection Rate was last increased, from 97 to 98%, in the tax base calculation for 2007/08. Actual in-year collection for 2009/10 was 98.3% and it is on target to achieve the same for 2010/11 financial year.

- 3.2 The issues that affect the collection rate estimate centre around the ability to pay. With a recession beginning there will be a number of local residents whose ability to pay their council tax will be affected over the next year and these residents may not qualify for help through council tax benefits, in which case they may find it difficult to maintain their outgoings.
- 3.3 Given the unknown factors that will arise from the current economic situation in the next year it is to be recommended that the collection rate used in the tax base calculation remain at 98%.
- 3.4 The estimate of adjustments applied to take account of new properties likely to become available during the next year could also be varied. The adjustments made, on the basis of the information obtained by the council tax inspector, take into account known planning applications and the progress that is to be made on them during the remainder of this year and next.

The following options have been identified. The approach in the recommendations is believed to be the best way forward

**Option One** The majority of figures used in the calculation are obtained from the billing system for council tax and as such are a matter of fact. The Executive could vary the estimated figures of adjustments for changes in property information during the year e.g. new properties or discount changes as well as the collection rate used in this report.

**Option Two** The Council may vary the discounts for second homes and long-term empty dwellings this report proposes that the rates for 2011/12 continue unchanged from those approved for 2010/11 as approved by the Executive at its meeting on 1 December 2009

## **Consultations**

---

None

## **Implications**

---

**Financial:** The tax base determines the potential income from each £1 of council tax set. If the tax base, as calculated in column 13 of Appendix 5b, were to be set, it would result in £50,337 being raised per £1 of council tax set (for budget purposes).

(Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 applies to decisions taken on matters contained in this

report and any Member affected by it is obliged to disclose the fact and refrain from voting.)

Comments checked by Karen Muir, Corporate System Accountant 01295 221559

**Legal:**

The calculations required to be undertaken by the Council in order to arrive at its council tax base are set out in the legislation referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3.1 of this report. Failure to set a council tax base for 2011/12 would result in the Council being unable to set its council tax for 2011/12

Comments checked by Liz Howlett, Head of Legal and Democratic Services, 01295 221686.

**Risk Management:**

The adjustments made, in columns 4 and 6 of Appendix 4b, to the data supplied by the council tax system, to allow for new and demolished properties occurring in 2011/12, is an estimate based on existing planning permissions. There is a risk that new properties will not be built or may not sell and become occupied as soon as the builders expect, this estimate is therefore reduced by 50% to allow for possible delays in these new properties being built and occupied in 2010/11

Comments checked by Karen Muir, Corporate System Accountant 01295 221559

**Wards Affected**

---

All

**Corporate Plan Themes**

---

An Accessible, Value for Money Council

**Executive Portfolio**

---

Councillor Macnamara  
Portfolio Holder for Resources and Communication

**Document Information**

---

<b>Appendix No</b>	<b>Title</b>
Appendix 4a&b	Council Taxbase Calculations
<b>Background Papers</b>	
Reports RRV708 and RKC 023D from the Northgate Revenues computer system	
<b>Report Author</b>	Karen Curtin, Head of Finance
<b>Contact Information</b>	01295 221551 Karen.curtin@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

ADJUSTMENTS	COUNCIL TAX BASE CALCULATIONS										Appendix 4b			
	2011/12										2011/12			
	column 1	column 2	column 3	column 4	column 5	column 6	column 7	column 8	column 9	column 10	column 11	column 12	column 13	column 14
Band D Equivalents	MOD in Band D Equivalents	Band D Equivalent Sub Total	Full Year Equivalent Of Additional Properties	Reduction In Discounts	Reduction In Properties	Increase In Discounts	Adjusted Band D Equivalents	in Band D Equivalents	Net Band D Equivalents	98% Tax Base	MoD Class O Properties	Tax Base For	Tax Base For	
Parish/Town							Parish/Town							
Aderbury	1194.8		1194.8	16.9			Aderbury	1211.7	1212	1188		1188	1188	
Ambrosden	357.5	236.6	594.1	0.9			Ambrosden	595.0	388	351	237	588	589	
Ardley	265.0		265.0				Ardley	265.0	265	260		260	260	
Arncott	295.4	1.8	297.2	10.9			Arncott	308.1	-2	300	2	302	284	
Banbury	14850.9		14850.9	54.3			Banbury	14905.2	14905	14607		14607	14502	
Barford	265.8		265.8	0.4			Barford	266.2	266	261		261	267	
Begbroke	362.9		362.9	5.8			Begbroke	368.7	369	362		362	362	
Bicester	10473.1		10473.1	-2.9			Bicester	10470.2	10470	10261		10261	10248	
Blackthorn	143.4		143.4	1.2			Blackthorn	144.6	145	142		142	144	
Bletchington	340.7		340.7	5.9			Bletchington	346.6	347	340		340	341	
Bloxham	1354.2		1354.2	29.4			Bloxham	1383.6	1384	1356		1356	1329	
Bodicate	848.5		848.5	2.5			Bodicate	851.0	851	834		834	839	
Bourton	291.3		291.3	8.6			Bourton	299.9	300	294		294	293	
Broughton	130.8		130.8				Broughton	130.8	131	128		128	129	
Bucknell	112.4		112.4				Bucknell	112.4	112	110		110	110	
Caversfield	415.0	1.7	416.7				Caversfield	416.7	-2	407	2	409	413	
Charlton on Omoor	202.5		202.5	0.8			Charlton on Omoor	203.3	203	199		199	198	
Chesterton	352.4		352.4				Chesterton	352.4	352	345		345	345	
Claydon	138.8		138.8				Claydon	138.8	139	136		136	138	
Cottisford	74.2		74.2				Cottisford	74.2	74	73		73	74	
Cropredy	315.9		315.9				Cropredy	315.9	316	310		310	308	
Deedington	930.6		930.6	2.6			Deedington	933.2	933	914		914	916	
Drayton	92.1		92.1	1.6			Drayton	93.7	94	92		92	94	
Duns Tew	225.8		225.8				Duns Tew	225.8	226	221		221	218	
Epwell	141.5		141.5	0.9			Epwell	142.4	142	139		139	139	
Fenoot and Murcott	130.1		130.1				Fenoot and Murcott	130.1	130	127		127	125	
Finmere	218.2		218.2				Finmere	218.2	218	214		214	213	
Fringford	269.9		269.9	0.5			Fringford	270.4	270	265		265	265	
Fritwell	288.2		288.2				Fritwell	288.2	288	282		282	282	
Godington	21.0		21.0				Godington	21.0	21	21		21	20	
Gosford and Water Eaton	558.6		558.6	7.3			Gosford and Water Eaton	565.9	566	555		555	535	
Hampton Gay and Poyle	74.4		74.4				Hampton Gay and Poyle	74.4	74	73		73	73	
Henwell	130.9		130.9				Henwell	130.9	131	128		128	129	
Hardwick with Tusmore	36.8		36.8				Hardwick with Tusmore	36.8	37	36		36	35	
Hethe	119.4		119.4				Hethe	119.4	119	117		117	117	
Hook Norton	942.4		942.4	1.6			Hook Norton	944.0	944	925		925	924	
Horley	160.5		160.5	0.2			Horley	160.7	161	158		158	162	
Horton	159.6		159.6				Horton	159.6	160	157		157	159	
Horton cum Studley	251.7		251.7				Horton cum Studley	251.7	252	247		247	246	
Islip	322.1		322.1				Islip	322.1	322	316		316	318	
Kidlington	5038.4		5038.4	10.2			Kidlington	5048.6	5049	4948		4948	4935	
Kirlington	447.5		447.5	6.1			Kirlington	453.6	454	445		445	439	
Launton	504.7		504.7				Launton	504.7	505	495		495	492	
Lower Heyford	225.7		225.7	0.6			Lower Heyford	226.3	226	221		221	221	
Merton	138.3	5.0	143.3				Merton	143.3	-5	135	5	140	140	
Middle Aston	62.2		62.2				Middle Aston	62.2	62	61		61	64	
Middleton Stony	150.7		150.7	0.9			Middleton Stony	151.6	152	149		149	153	
Milcombe	225.7		225.7	1.2			Milcombe	226.9	227	222		222	220	
Milton	119.9		119.9	0.5			Milton	120.4	120	118		118	121	
Mixbury	117.6		117.6				Mixbury	117.6	118	116		116	115	
Mollington	216.2		216.2	0.9			Mollington	217.1	217	213		213	219	

					Appendix 4b			2011/12		2011/12		Appendix 4b
<b>ADJUSTMENTS</b>							<b>BILLING TAX BASE</b>					<b>COUNCIL TAX BASE CALCULATIONS</b>
	column 1	column 2	column 3	column 4	column 5	column 6	column 8	column 9	column 10	column 11	column 12	column 14
	Band D Equivalents	in Band D MoD Equivalents	Band D Equivalent Sub Total	Additional Properties	Reduction In Discounts	Full Year Equivalent Of Reduction In Properties	Adjusted Band D Equivalents	in Band D Equivalent Sub Total	Net Band D Equivalents	98% Tax Base	MoD Class O Properties	column 13 Tax Base For 2010/11
Parish/Town Newton Purcell	44.8		44.8				44.8		45	44		45





**COUNCIL TAX BASE CALCULATIONS**

**PART 1 - FOR THE DISTRICT AS A WHOLE**

	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Properties on the list *	5,175	14,734	16,075	10,107	7,051	3,181	2,273	224	58,820
LESS									
Exemptions	-337	-623	-355	-384	-128	-75	-42	-7	-1,951
<b>ADJUSTMENTS</b>									
Sub Total	0	4,838	15,720	9,723	6,923	3,106	2,231	217	56,869
Less Disabled Relief	-11	-44	-77	-55	-38	-15	-13	-12	-265
Add Disabled Relief	44	77	55	38	15	13	12		265
Sub Total	11	4,871	15,698	9,706	6,900	3,104	2,230	205	56,869
Discounts (25%)	-5	-2,780	-4,733	-2,365	-1,216	-456	-268	-19	-17,538
Discounts (50%)	-53	-81	-51	-45	-30	-7	-28	-14	-309
2nd Home Discounts (10%)	-10	-33	-36	-53	-34	-32	-47	-14	-259
No of properties without discount	6	2,028	8,334	7,243	5,620	2,609	1,887	158	38,763
Total equivalent value after discounts	9.80	4,148.50	12,676.20	14,485.70	9,087.00	6,577.60	2,144.30	191.90	52,304.10

	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total			
BAND D EQUIVALENT	5.4	2,765.7	12,876.2	9,087.0	8,039.3	4,309.2	3,573.8	383.8	50,899.7
MOD Property	0	222	39	36	0	0	1	0	298
Add MOD Property at band D	0.0	0.0	172.7	34.7	36.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	245.1
<b>TAX BASE AS AT 1 DECEMBER 2010, adjusted for all discounts</b>									<b>51,144.8</b>

\* This represents properties on the valuation list net of demolished properties and known adjustments required.

	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18	
Proportion										
Single Person Discounts (25%)	-5	-2,754	-5,570	-4,596	-2,306	-1,159	-432	-253	-19	-17,094
Disregard Discount (25%)		-26	-126	-137	-59	-57	-24	-15	0	-444
2nd Home Discounts (50%)		-9	-19	-4	-7	-6	-4	0	-1	-50
Disregard Discount (50%)		-14	-21	-10	-7	-7	-3	-20	-12	-94
Empty Property Discounts (50%)		-30	-41	-37	-31	-17	0	-8	-1	-165
2nd Home Discounts (10%)		-10	-33	-36	-53	-34	-32	-47	-14	-259
Value of above discounts	-3.8	-2,120.5	-4,342.2	-3,607.7	-1,844.0	-957.6	-374.3	-257.3	-33.9	-13,541.1

**Analysis of Discounts**