

## WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

### CABINET

Record of decisions taken at the meeting of the Cabinet held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Woodgreen, Witney, Oxon on Wednesday 15 November, 2017 at 2.00pm.

### PRESENT

J F Mills (Leader); T J Morris (Deputy Leader); Mrs J C Baker, C G Dingwall and J Haine

#### Also in Attendance

R J M Bishop, P Emery, Mrs L C Carter, J C Cooper, D A Cotterill, Mrs E H Fenton, E J Fenton, Miss G R Hill, H J Howard, P D Kelland and T N Owen

#### 63. NOTICE OF DECISIONS

**RESOLVED:** That the record of the decisions taken at the meeting held on Wednesday 18 October 2017, copies of which had been circulated, be approved and signed as a correct record.

#### 64. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs C E Reynolds and from Mrs M J Crossland, D S T Enright and A H K Postan

#### 65. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Whilst not disclosable interests, Mr Mills and Mr Morris advised that they were members of the Round Table, which organisation was a potential funder of the Madley Park Play Area scheme considered at agenda item No. 11. Mrs Baker advised that she was a member of the steering group overseeing the development of the scheme.

Mr Haine advised that he was the Chairman of the Milton Under Wychwood Village Hall Committee which also had a grant application considered at agenda item No. 11.

There were no declarations of interest from Members or Officers in items to be considered at the meeting at this juncture. Subsequently, whilst not a disclosable interest, Mrs Fenton advised that she was a member of the Board of Citizens Advice, West Oxfordshire, the tenants of The Old Printhouse, Marlborough Lane, Witney, the subject of agenda item No. 17.

#### 66. PARTICIPATION OF THE PUBLIC

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

#### 67. RECEIPT OF ANNOUNCEMENTS

##### 67.1 Housing Workshop

Mrs Baker reminded Members of the Housing Workshop to be held on Wednesday 29 November at the conclusion of the Finance and Management Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

##### 67.2 Carterton Leisure Centre – Phase 2

Mrs Baker advised Members that proposals for the design of phase 2 of the Carterton Leisure Centre were to be on display at that venue from 2.00pm on Saturday 30 December.

### 67.3 Affordable Housing

Mr Dingwall advised that he was meeting with representatives of the Homes and Communities Agency and the Housing Associations operating within the District, together with Savills who acted for the Universities, on Friday 15 December to discuss the question of Affordable Housing. It was also hoped that there would be representation at Ministerial level.

### 68. FURTHER SUGGESTED CHANGES TO THE WEST OXFORDSHIRE LOCAL PLAN 2031

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing which sought consideration of the findings of additional evidence, undertaken to address issues that had arisen during the examination of the draft West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031, and to consider further suggested changes to the draft Local Plan as a result of this work.

In introducing the report, Mr Haine reported receipt of a letter from Ms Rosemary Parrinder, the former Chair, Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, which he read in full. A copy of that letter appears as Appendix A to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Haine went on to summarise the content of the report and outline the suggested further changes to the emerging plan and the rationale underpinning them.

(Miss G R Hill joined the meeting at this juncture)

With regard to the land to the east of Burford, Mr Haine contended that, following the grant of planning permission on appeal in respect of the site to the south of the town, Paragraph 116 of the NPPF now came into play and questioned whether there was a need for further development on the land identified at paragraph 5.9 of the report.

He indicated that he wished these comments to be incorporated into the Council's response but acknowledged the possibility that removal of this site could give rise to legal challenge. Accordingly, he proposed that the recommendation at (a) be approved as, that Officers be requested to seek legal advice on the potential impact of removing the allocation at Land East of Burford and the final decision on that matter be delegated to the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Economy and the Leader of the Council and that, subject to the above, the Cabinet agrees that the suggested further changes to the draft West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 as outlined in Section 5 of the report be submitted to the Local Plan Inspector for his consideration in relation to the 'soundness' of the Local Plan.

The proposition was seconded by Mr Dingwall who stressed that the Council would remain subject to speculative development so long as it did not have a local plan in place. He emphasised the unquestionable need for more affordable housing for young people and key workers and noted that the emerging Local Plan envisaged an increase from the current level of delivery of 92 units per annum to 274.

Mr Cotterill welcomed Mr Haine's proposal, indicating that the site to the east of Burford had a chequered planning history which could make it difficult to sustain as a late addition to the Local Plan. He also welcomed the heritage report but suggested that it contained some errors. It made no mention of the Grade II\* palladian great house set against the site and believed that the photograph in the report had been taken from the wrong part of the footpath as it did not show the setting of the town. Mr Cotterill also considered the invitation to tender to be questionable as he considered the phraseology relating to this site to be prejudicial.

Mr Emery was pleased to note that the impending consultation would be open to all; not just previous respondents. He considered the evidence provided to be important but did not agree with its conclusions. The west Eynsham sub area had been compared with Long Hanborough and a split site between Hanborough and Eynsham. Mr Emery considered that there were inconsistencies in this and believed a 50/50 split between Hanborough and Eynsham to be the most logical solution. He noted that, in the long term, the plan envisaged a 1,000 space park and ride facility at Eynsham whilst the County Council was now only looking to provide 500 spaces albeit with the scope for 1,000 spaces in the longer term.

Mr Emery expressed concern that the proposals had received insufficient scrutiny and that the route taken by the report had been wrong. He suggested that, following the consultation, the matter should be considered by the Economic and Social Overview and Scrutiny Committee or debated at full Council.

On 30 October the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan had called for a 20 MPH street running north to south. Mr Emery failed to see the need for what amounted to a major spine road and, whilst this had been ignored, he contended that the Sustainability Appraisal suggested that such a route was not required if the scale of development were to be reduced.

Mr Kelland indicated that the proposals for the Eynsham Garden Village had been sent to Government for approval direct from the Cabinet without any further scrutiny. He believed that further debate was required before the proposals were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

Mr Cooper considered that the Council's scrutiny process was flawed and that the matter should have come before the Economic and Social Overview and Scrutiny before consideration by Cabinet. Mr Cooper also made reference to a question he had raised at the last Council meeting in relation to the calculation of Oxford City's unmet housing need.

With regard to development at Woodstock, Mr Cooper suggested that it was not only the impact of traffic on the main road through the town that was relevant, but also the impact on the A4095 through Bladon. He also expressed concern over the relocation of the Under Fives Association from the primary school and the car parking requirements identified by the Council's parking survey. Mr Cooper contended that there were several missing pieces in the Council's analysis.

Mr Howard agreed that the matter should have been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. There were implications for the A40 that needed to be addressed. Whilst reference had been made to the road to the west of Eynsham, including the proposed park and ride, no mention had been made of the fact that the alternative garden village site at South Leigh proposing to include the dualling of the A40 from the end of the Witney Bypass to the Eynsham roundabout.

Mr Dingwall indicated that it was for the overview and scrutiny committees to set their own work programmes and call for reports. In reply, Mr Emery indicated that he had been unaware of the content of the report until it had been published the preceding week. Mr Cooper reiterated his belief that the matter should have been referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The Strategic Director advised Members that the work had been carried out at the request of the Local Plan Inspector and it was the Inspector who would decide whether or not it was adequate to address the concerns he had raised. In many respects, the Local Plan was out of the Council's hands at this juncture.

Mr Haine noted that the Local Plan process was well advanced and had been the subject of significant debate. He indicated that the proposed comments were no more than suggestions to the Planning Inspector and questioned whether consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would bring any benefit at this stage.

Mr Fenton made reference to speculative development in his own Ward and suggested that any delay would be prejudicial in this respect.

Mr Emery stressed that the next four week consultation period would be critical and requested that it be publicised more widely than on the Council's website alone.

The Planning Policy Manager advised that a letter/email would be sent to all those who had engaged in the process to date; those who had made representations on the original proposals and the 2016 modifications numbering around 2,000 individuals. There was a general awareness of the plan and a press release would be issued to advise local residents of the impending consultation.

Mr Mills noted that the consultation would not now start until the legal advice required as a result of Mr Haine's amendment had been received. The Planning Policy Manager confirmed that any delay would be kept to a minimum but that there was a need to assess the potential ramifications on the decision. Accordingly, he anticipated that the consultation would start during the following week.

Mr Morris emphasised that it was for the Planning Inspector to decide on the proposed modifications. Any representations should be made to the Inspector who would take these into account in reaching his decision. Mr Morris was pleased to note that it would be open to all rather than only previous correspondents to submit representations to the Inspector and stressed that the consultation process was important.

The Inspector would review the evidence and accept, reject or amend the proposed amendments as required to present a sound Local Plan. The Plan would then be subject to further consultation and debated by the Council prior to its final adoption. There had already been significant debate and it now fell to the Planning Inspector to determine whether or not the Plan was sound. Mr Morris asked all Councillors to encourage local residents to engage with the consultation process.

Mr Mills drew attention to paragraph 5.3 of the report 5.3 which indicated that, ultimately it was for the Inspector to determine what was and was not appropriate and what changes may be capable of rendering the Local Plan 'sound' and to recommend any 'main modifications' in due course.

The Strategic Director confirmed that the process as outlined was correct and indicated that all Members would be advised when the consultation period commenced.

In response to a question from Mrs Fenton, Mr Mills confirmed that all town and parish councils would also receive notification of the consultation.

## **DECISIONS:**

- (a) That the Cabinet notes that the Landscape and Heritage Advice, the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Further Addendum Report, Cotswolds AONB Topic Paper and Woodstock Topic Paper will be published for a four week period of public consultation as requested by the Local Plan Inspector in order to help him consider their findings; and

- (b) That Officers be requested to seek legal advice on the potential impact of removing the allocation at Land East of Burford and the final decision on that matter be delegated to the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Economy and the Leader of the Council.
- (c) That, subject to (b) above, the Cabinet agrees that the suggested further changes to the draft West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 as outlined in Section 5 of the report (and as set out in full at Appendix 1) are submitted to the Local Plan Inspector for his consideration in relation to the 'soundness' of the Local Plan.

**REASONS:** The Cabinet considered the proposed amendments to accord with the Council's aim to maintain and enhance West Oxfordshire as one of the best places to live, work and visit in Great Britain.

**OPTIONS:** None appropriate.

69. COMMENTS ON THE SOUTH OXFORDSHIRE AND VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL PLANS

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing which sought consideration of the Council's response to the Local Plan consultations by South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils.

Mr Haine introduced the report. He made particular reference to the figures agreed through the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment and proposed the recommendations set out in the report.

In seconding the proposition, Mr Mills made reference to the issues for West Oxfordshire and noted that the Oxfordshire Strategic Economic Plan concentrated development along the A34 which it termed the knowledge spine. He stressed that access to this area from West Oxfordshire was via the A415 and indicated that this, together with the areas of residential development along that route, was a significant issue for the District.

Mr Mills suggested that the Council's response should also address the need to work with neighbouring authorities to protect and improve that route. The Head of Planning and Strategic Housing confirmed that this could be reflected in the detailed response and undertook to raise the matter with Officers as appropriate.

Mr Cooper reiterated his concern over the efficacy of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny arrangements and expressed his disappointment that it had not been possible to accommodate his request that the matter be considered by the Economic and Social Overview and Scrutiny Committee as the report had not been finalised and that it was now proposed that the Call-in provisions be waived.

Mr Cooper also made reference to paragraph 3.34 of the report which emphasised the need for more affordable housing and suggested that the Council should write to the Chancellor of Oxford University as a significant institutional landowner to promote the alternative housing model devised in conjunction with the Blenheim Estate.

Mr Dingwall advised that, once the policy had been finalised, the Council and representatives of the Blenheim Estate would join forces to speak with other institutional landowners to promote the new housing model.

With regard to Mr Cooper's concerns in relation to overview and scrutiny arrangements, Mr Mills advised that timing was not always at the Council's discretion.

In this case, it had not been possible to finalise a report in time for the last overview and scrutiny committee meeting and, whilst Officers had sought an extension of time in which to submit a response, this had not been granted hence the need to waive the Call-in provisions.

Mr Howard questioned the impact upon West Oxfordshire in the event that South Oxfordshire's Local Plan was approved as drafted. He concurred with Mr Mills in relation to the A415 but noted that the weight restriction at Newbridge and the road layout at points on the A4095 gave rise to difficulties for HGV's crossing the Thames. He also questioned whether it was within the Council's remit to deem South Oxfordshire's Local Plan unsound.

In response to the question of highway issues, Mr Mills reminded Members that the report sought a response to the Local Plan consultations by South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils. The matters raised in this regard were more appropriately addressed through the Local Transport Plan.

Mr Haine advised that, should South Oxfordshire's Local Plan was approved as drafted; the shortfall in terms of Oxford City's unmet housing need would be distributed amongst the other neighbouring districts. However, he believed that it was most unlikely that the Planning Inspectorate would approve the plan in its current form.

Mr Haine also advised that it was perfectly appropriate for the Council to respond to the consultations in the manner proposed.

#### **DECISIONS:**

- (a) That the Cabinet welcomes the positive steps being taken by Vale of White Horse District Council to address the issue of Oxford City's unmet housing need through Part 2 of its Local Plan
- (b) That the Cabinet raises concerns over the approach of South Oxfordshire District Council in its emerging Local Plan to not follow the Growth Board agreed apportionment for meeting Oxford City's unmet housing need.
- (c) That the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to prepare and submit representations on the two consultations, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning, taking into account the points included in paragraph 5.1 of the report and the comments made in relation to the protection and improvement of the A415.
- (d) That, for the reasons set out in paragraph 3.38 of the report, and in accordance with the provisions in the Overview and Scrutiny Rules in Part 4 of the Constitution, the ability to call-in this item for further consideration be waived.

**REASONS:** The Cabinet considered the proposed response to accord with the Council's aim to maintain and enhance West Oxfordshire as one of the best places to live, work and visit in Great Britain.

**OPTIONS:** None appropriate.

#### 70. REVIEW OF PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Head of Democratic Services which provided an update in relation to the review of parliamentary constituencies and invited Members to consider whether they wished to make representations to the Boundary Commission for England.

In proposing the recommendations, Mr Mills advised that the Boundary Commission's proposals were based upon population figures taken in 2015 and that planning applications approved since that time could not be taken into account.

In seconding the proposition, Mr Morris considered it to be sensible for the Parliamentary Constituency to remain co-terminus with the District boundary and noted that a further review could take place in the future should demographic changes require.

**DECISIONS:**

- (a) That the report be noted.
- (b) That the Cabinet expresses its support for the proposals insofar as they relate to the Witney Constituency.

**REASONS:** Not applicable.

**OPTIONS:** None appropriate.

(Mr Emery and Mr Kelland left the meeting at this juncture)

71. DISCRETIONARY DISABLED FACILITIES GRANTS

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Group Manager for revenues and housing support regarding inclusion of a discretionary award within the Disabled Facilities Grants scheme.

Mrs Baker indicated that she was pleased to be able to bring this report forward and propose the recommendation which would enable the Council to offer further assistance to those whose needs exceeded the financial ceiling set by the mandatory scheme. In seconding the proposition Mr Dingwall concurred.

Mr Howard enquired whether there was any scope to assist those who might have difficulties but did not qualify for mandatory grant aid. In response, Mr Dingwall advised that the mandatory scheme was required to operate within defined parameters. However, Cottsway Housing also operated a scheme with fewer constraints. He also noted that the Council operated a further scheme to undertake small works.

Mrs Baker invited Members aware of any specific cases to refer their concerns to the Council's Officers.

**DECISION:** That the Group Manager for Revenues and Housing Support be authorised to award discretionary disabled facilities grants of up to £30,000 on the basis set out in the report.

**REASONS:** The Cabinet considered the provision of discretionary disabled facilities grants to accord with the Council's priorities to meet the current and future needs of residents and to provide efficient value for money services whilst delivering quality front line services.

**OPTIONS:** None appropriate.

72. HOUSING PROPERTY PURCHASE

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Group Manager for revenues and housing support regarding the purchase of a property for use as emergency housing accommodation.

Mr Dingwall stated that he was delighted to be able to propose the recommendation. The Council spent significant sums on the provision of emergency accommodation which was often outside the District. The acquisition of a property for use as emergency housing accommodation would provide the Council with a valuable addition to the ways in which it was able to address homelessness.

In seconding the proposition, Mrs Baker stressed that this would give the Council the ability to provide more suitable emergency accommodation.

Mrs Carter welcomed the proposal, indicating that the impact of having to relocate out of the District was particularly severe upon children. She expressed the hope that the scheme could be extended and drew attention to the current call for proper affordable housing and demands for councils to build social housing.

Mr Howard enquired whether it would be possible to secure a second property for this purpose as it appeared likely that the Council would be under-spent on the current budget. In response, Mr Dingwall suggested that the Council should approach the project one step at a time and advised that this was not the only initiative under consideration. Discussions were ongoing with Cottsway Housing with a view to providing a further nine properties for emergency use and meetings were being arranged with other registered social landlords. As there were a variety of differing needs, it was necessary to secure a range of properties to address them. The project would develop as time went on.

Mr Morris noted that the acquisition of an additional property would require a revision of the capital programme through Council. West Oxfordshire had a range of housing initiatives and Mr Morris made reference to the success of the Local Authority Partnership Purchase mortgage scheme which might also require additional funding. He also indicated that, in addition to providing assistance to those in need, the proposed purchase presented a sound financial decision on the part of the Council.

Mr Mills endorsed the project, indicating that it was good to be able to assist local residents at a difficult time in their lives.

**DECISION:** That approval be given to purchase a property for use as emergency housing accommodation using funds already approved within the capital programme.

**REASONS:** The Cabinet considered the decision to accord with the Council's priorities to meet the current and future needs of residents and to provide efficient and value for money services, whilst delivering quality front line services

**OPTIONS:** None appropriate.

### 73. COMMUNITIES FACILITIES GRANTS – 2ND ROUND 2017/2018

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Head of Leisure and Communities regarding applications for grant aid from the Community Facilities Grant scheme.

Mrs Baker was delighted to support the applications, which were subject to a thorough evaluation process, and to propose the recommendation. She thanked Members for promoting the scheme and encouraging applications. Mrs Baker indicated that she was proud that the Council had been able to maintain its grants budget at the current level.

In seconding the proposition, Mr Dingwall congratulated Mrs Baker on the success of the scheme and noted that every £1.00 provided by the Council released £3.31 in match funding.

Mr Morris indicated that the retention of the Community Facilities Grant scheme was a testament to the Council's sound financial management and the development of shared working.

Mr Cooper was pleased to note that the grants awarded covered a wide geographical area and a range of activities.

Mr Mills expressed his support for the proposals and considered that it would be interesting to learn how much additional financial benefit was brought into the District by organisations that the Council supported such as the Chipping Norton Theatre.

**DECISION:** That grants be awarded in accordance with the recommendations set out in the Appendix to the report.

**REASONS:** The Cabinet considered the applications and recommendations to accord with the approved criteria for the Community Facilities Grant. The awards also supported the Council's aim to maintain and enhance West Oxfordshire as one of the best places to live, work and visit in Great Britain and the specific priorities to meet the current and future needs of residents and to provide efficient, value for money services, whilst delivering quality front line services.

**OPTIONS:** None appropriate.

74. 2017/2018 BUDGET AND PERFORMANCE MONITORING – QUARTER 2

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Group Manager Go Shared Services in respect of performance and risk against financial and operational targets for the period 1st April to 30th September 2017.

In proposing the recommendation, Mr Morris noted that there was a current under spend of some £734,000 but that it was likely that there would be further commitments in the second half of the year. He drew attention to paragraph 3.1 of the report and explained that the format of the report would change in the future. He advised that it was unlikely that the Council would need to draw on its reserves and noted that the Business Rates Pool provided an income that drove an under spend year on year.

The proposition was seconded by Mr Dingwall and on being put to the vote was carried.

**DECISION:** That the Quarter 2 2017/18 financial and operational performance be noted.

**REASONS:** The Cabinet considered effective budget monitoring to accord with the Council's objective to provide efficient value for money services whilst delivering quality front line services.

**OPTIONS:** None appropriate.

75. POLICY FOR DISPOSAL OF AMENITY LAND

The Cabinet received and considered the report of Frank Wilson which sought consideration of a co-ordinated approach to requests for release of amenity land for household use.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Haine and seconded by Mr Dingwall.

Mr Howard questioned whether adoption of such a policy would preclude the Council from disposing of areas of land which it no longer wished to retain. In response, Haine explained that the policy was intended to relate to areas of amenity land secured through section 106 agreements and Mr Mills advised that, whilst there would be a general policy against disposal, individual exceptions could be made by the Council.

**DECISION:** That the Cabinet approves a policy that amenity land as described in Section 106 agreements be retained and not sold or transferred to households except where an obvious drafting error has been made in those agreements or in the implementation of them by a developer.

**REASONS:** The Cabinet considered the proposals to accord with the Council's aim to maintain and enhance West Oxfordshire as one of the best places to live, work and visit in Great Britain and its priority to protect the environment whilst supporting the local economy.

**OPTIONS:** None appropriate.

76. APPOINTMENT OF A MEMBER TO SERVE ON THE OXFORDSHIRE JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Head of Democratic Services regarding the appointment of a Councillor to serve on the Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the period until May 2018.

Mrs Baker wished to put on record her thanks to Mrs Doughty for her work as the Council's representative to the Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee during a particularly difficult period over the past 18 months.

It was proposed by Mrs Baker and seconded by Mr Morris that Mr T N Owen be appointed as the Council's representative to the Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the period until May 2018.

**DECISIONS:**

- (a) That Mr T N Owen be appointed as the Council's representative to the Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the period until May 2018.
- (b) That Mrs E H Fenton remain as the Council's Standing Deputy.
- (c) That, for the reasons specified in paragraph 3.5 of the report, and in accordance with the provisions in the Overview and Scrutiny Rules in Part 4 of the Constitution, the decision be implemented immediately.

**REASONS:** The Cabinet considered that the appointment of representatives to outside bodies offered the Council the opportunity for involvement in community and other organisations, and in the case of the Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee it also presents an opportunity to present and take forward issues of interest and concern to residents of the District.

**OPTIONS:** None appropriate.

77. NOTICE OF INTENTION TO APPLY FOR THE CLOSURE OF A CHURCHYARD – ST MICHAELS AND ALL ANGELS, LEAFIELD

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Head of Democratic Services regarding the Council's response to the Notice of Intention to apply for the closure of the Churchyard at St Michael and All Angels Church, Leafield.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Morris.

In seconding the proposition, Mr Mills noted that, following the closure, the local council would assume responsibility for the future maintenance of the churchyard but had the opportunity to transfer that responsibility to the District.

Accordingly, he suggested that the Council's response should be subject to confirmation that the churchyard was in good order. Mr Morris concurred.

**DECISION:** That, subject to confirmation that it is in good order, the Council raises no objections to the closure of the churchyard.

**REASONS:** Not applicable

**OPTIONS:** None appropriate.

78. TREASURY MANAGEMENT ADVISORY SERVICES

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Group Manager Go Shared Services regarding the results of the tendering exercise for the Council's treasury management advisory services to be effective from 1st December 2017.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Morris and seconded by Mr Dingwall.

Mr Howard considered that the report should have been submitted to the Finance and Management Overview and Scrutiny Committee prior to consideration by the Cabinet. Mr Mills advised that a report on the procurement process had been considered by that Committee at its last meeting when it had been explained that the Council had intended to take part in a joint procurement for the service with various other councils.

However, it had been concluded that the joint procurement route would not have provided sufficient flexibility over the award of the contract and decided that a separate procurement exercise with Cotswold District Council would be carried out. As the current contract was to conclude at the end of November, it was imperative that a new contract was put in place.

**DECISION:** That the Council awards the treasury management advisory services contract to Company A for a 3 year period from 1 December 2017, on the terms indicated in the report and with options to extend the contract for a further two years.

**REASONS:** The Cabinet considered the proposals to accord with the Council's priority to provide efficient value for money services whilst delivering quality front line services.

**OPTIONS:** None appropriate.

79. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

**RESOLVED:** that the Cabinet being of the opinion that it was likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, that if members of the public were present during the following items of business there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting.

80. LEASE RENEWAL – THE OLD PRINTHOUSE, MARLBOROUGH LANE.

(Whilst not a disclosable interest, Mrs Fenton advised that she was a member of the Board of Citizens Advice, West Oxfordshire, the tenants of the property under consideration)

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Group Head of Land, Legal and Property Services containing exempt information regarding the renewal of a lease of the Old Printhouse, Witney, to Citizens Advice West Oxfordshire.

**DECISION:** That the grant of a renewal lease be approved on the terms set out in the report.

**REASONS:** The Cabinet considered its decision to accord with the Council's priorities to support the economy and provide efficient, value for money services, whilst delivering quality front line services.

**OPTIONS:** None appropriate.

81. LAND AT TALISMAN BUSINESS CENTRE, BICESTER – COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER COMPENSATION

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Group Head of Land, Legal and Property Services containing exempt information regarding the negotiated Compulsory Purchase settlement for the land at the Talisman Business Centre, Bicester.

**DECISION:** That the Cabinet approves the compulsory purchase settlement figure set out in the report.

**REASONS:** The Cabinet considered its decision to accord with the Council's priorities to support the economy and provide efficient, value for money services, whilst delivering quality front line services.

**OPTIONS:** None appropriate.

82. LICENCE TO OCCUPY – UNITS AT TALISMAN BUSINESS CENTRE, BICESTER

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Group Head of Land, Legal and Property Services containing exempt information regarding the grant of a Licence to Occupy units at the Talisman Business Centre, Bicester

**DECISION:** That the Cabinet approves the Licence to Occupy on the terms set out in the report.

**REASONS:** The Cabinet considered its decision to accord with the Council's priorities to support the economy and provide efficient, value for money services, whilst delivering quality front line services.

**OPTIONS:** None appropriate.

The meeting closed at 3:45 pm

Leader of the Council