

**PRINCIPAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4 December 2006**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Learney (Chairman) (P)

Anthony (P)  
Chapman (P)  
Clohosey  
Collin (P)  
Cook (P)  
Evans (P)  
Chamberlain (P)  
Hiscock (P)

Huxstep (P)  
Jefferies (P)  
Macmillan  
Mather (P)  
Saunders  
Rees (P)  
Wood (P)  
Worrall (P)

Deputy Members:

Councillor Spender (Standing Deputy for Councillor Clohosey)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Beckett (Leader and Portfolio Holder for Economy and Tourism)  
Councillor Coates (Portfolio Holder for Housing and Communities)  
Councillor Wood (Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport)

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Allgood (Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources)  
Councillor Verney

---

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Clohosey, Macmillan and Saunders.

2. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman made no announcements.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 16 October 2006, less exempt items, be approved and adopted.

4. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

There were no questions asked or statements made.

5. **DISPOSAL OF VACANT DWELLINGS (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**  
(Reports CAB1336 and PS261 Extract of Minutes of Cabinet refers)

The Committee noted that, at its meeting on 15 November 2006, Cabinet had approved the proposals as set out. Cabinet additionally endorsed the disposal of the three properties identified in the Report.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr A Rickman (TACT) spoke regarding this item.

Mr Rickman referred to TACT's comments, as outlined in paragraph 9 of the Report, and reported that TACT had acknowledged the difficult task facing the Council to achieve the Decent Homes Standard by 2010. This was in addition to other issues that required capital funding in the Housing Revenue Account. However, TACT was concerned that despite their original support for the disposal of up to five properties per annum for the reasons given, this had now increased to ten. Mr Rickman reported that TACT considered that such disposals were only a short-term solution and that the Council should additionally make representation to the Government, regarding the apparent inequities of the loss of subsidy from the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). TACT was also concerned that the properties to be sold on the open market had been undervalued and that loss of revenue from ongoing disposals should continue to be offset.

In introducing the Report and responding to TACT's comments, Councillor Coates stated that the proposals would help fund the extra work required on the HRA properties, in addition to supporting the work of Registered Social Landlord (RSL) partners to achieve affordable housing programmes in the District. He reminded the Committee that the HRA now achieved minimal capital receipts from 'Right to Buy' sales and that the proposals would generate 100% return for reinvestment.

During debate, Councillor Coates and the Director of Communities answered a number of detailed questions.

The Director explained that the proposed threshold for disposal of properties requiring repair or improvement which cost more than £8,000 had been based upon an analysis of void property work undertaken during 2006. The average costs associated with such work were £1,300; however, additional and more substantial works (such as replacement kitchen and bathrooms) could increase this to around £5,000. Consequently, £8,000 was the estimated figure that suggested an investment for more fundamental works.

Further to this, a Member suggested that £8,000 was a reasonable spend to enable the retention of a family home within the HRA. Investment of the capital receipt in other affordable housing schemes from its disposal did not offset this, especially as affordable homes were at a premium in rural areas.

In response, Councillor Coates stated that there was generally less demand for Council housing in rural areas, due to a lack of facilities near by. Investment of capital receipts from disposals could be utilised to promote rural housing where there was demand. The Choice Based Lettings scheme would assist in this process.

The Director referred to paragraph 2.3 of the Report and advised that PricewaterhouseCooper's the Council's Auditor's had certified pooling claims for other authorities with similar policies.

A Member suggested that it might be preferable to limit the programme of disposals to a maximum of five properties (as opposed to the ten) in any one financial year.

Furthermore, the capital sum achieved by those sales should be reinvested in the HRA, to allow for the refurbishment of sub-standard dwellings that otherwise would have been considered for disposal. He was also mindful of the additional impact to the HRA by way of loss of rent revenue. There was also some concern that the processes for Member involvement in decisions upon the reinvestment of capital released by disposals had not been more fully detailed within the Report.

Councillor Coates reported that additional pressures on the HRA (as outlined at paragraph 1.2 of the Report) would cost approximately an additional £1 million outside the current HRA budget. As a consequence, no additional available investment from the HRA in affordable housing schemes could be made. Referring to the loss of rent revenue from disposals, the Director advised that this had been taken into account and was generally offset by incurring improvement costs.

Further to concerns raised, Councillor Coates clarified that it would be very unlikely that disposals would occur in settlement 'clusters' and therefore would not have a detrimental impact on the availability of council housing in a particular area. If voids that were located close together were to be considered for disposal, this would be taken into account as part of the exercise. Proposed consultation, including that with Ward Members, would also have regard to this.

Referring to recommendation 1 (b) of the Report, the Committee was advised that some council houses, depending on their location, size and style, had a higher than average asset value, should they be sold on the open market. Some dwellings also had higher than average maintenance costs. The Director reported that rental income was calculated only according to facilities offered by the accommodation and so was comparable to average housing stock. Therefore it may be beneficial to the HRA to consider their disposal, should they become void.

A Member indicated her support to the concerns raised by Councillor Busher with regard to the Report at the meeting of Cabinet on 15 November 2006. The Member advised that there was a demand for Council housing in the Ward that she represented and was concerned that the policy would release capital from the disposal of family homes in rural areas, for reinvestment in mixed tenure smaller dwellings in more urban locations. She reminded the Committee of the lack of exception sites in rural areas for the development of affordable housing. The Member was also concerned that TACT had apparently not been consulted on the increase in the number of properties that could be disposed of each year.

The Leader indicated that the rural issues raised would form a consideration to be taken into account in determining which properties were suitable for disposal under the policy.

Further to discussion, the City Secretary and Solicitor clarified that the proposals in the Report required endorsement by Council, as it represented a change to the Council's budgetary framework and Housing Investment policies. Principal Scrutiny Committee was therefore being asked to comment on the proposals and recommend to Council on 10 January 2007 accordingly. Council would then make the final decision by way of having regard to the debate of both Cabinet and the Committee. Endorsement of the proposals would also provide guidelines to a subsequent Cabinet report on the Housing Investment Programme.

At the conclusion of debate of the concerns raised, the majority of the Committee agreed to support the recommendations to Council to approve the policy as set out in the Report. The Committee had discussed concerns that disposal of up to ten houses per annum could be excessive and at the detriment to the supply of family

homes in the district (especially in rural areas). The Committee also discussed whether the utilisation of the capital receipt should be more specific in terms of specified programme investment to the HRA. However, on balance, it was generally agreed that the proposals represented a good policy for the management of the Council's housing stock and for the support of partner social landlords, to encourage the development of affordable home throughout the District, where demand was greatest. Members were also satisfied that the intentions for wide consultation with regard to potential disposals as set out in the Report provided an additional safeguard, and that the policy to support up to ten disposals per annum was a maximum figure, which allowed officers to exercise their judgement with regard to the dwellings that may become available.

**RECOMMENDED:**

**1. THAT A SMALL SCALE PROGRAMME OF VACANT DWELLING DISPOSALS BE ESTABLISHED, WITH NO MORE THAN A MAXIMUM OF TEN VACANT PROPERTIES DISPOSED OF IN ANY ONE FINANCIAL YEAR, BEING EITHER:-**

**(A) VOID PROPERTIES WHERE THE ESTIMATED REPAIR/IMPROVEMENT COSTS EXCEED £8,000 OR**

**(B) HIGH VALUE PROPERTIES (NORMALLY NON-STANDARD STOCK) WHICH HAVE A HIGH ASSET VALUE COMPARED TO A RELATIVELY LOW INCOME STREAM DUE TO RENT RESTRUCTURING.**

**2. THAT ALL RECEIPTS GENERATED FROM THE VACANT DWELLING DISPOSALS BE REINVESTED IN THE HOUSING INVESTMENT PROGRAMME ELEMENT OF THE CAPITAL PROGRAMME, WITH 50% OF ALL SUCH RECEIPTS BEING USED TO FUND NEW BUILD PROGRAMMES AND 50% BEING USED TO FUND IMPROVEMENTS AND ENHANCEMENTS TO EXISTING STOCK.**

**3. THAT THE COUNCIL'S CAPITAL STRATEGY, HOUSING STRATEGY AND HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUSINESS PLAN ALL BE AMENDED TO REFLECT THIS APPROACH.**

**4. THAT THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION TO PORTFOLIO HOLDERS IN PART 3 OF THE CONSTITUTION BE AMENDED TO PERMIT THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES TO AUTHORISE DISPOSALS OF UP TO TEN VACANT DWELLINGS IN ANY FINANCIAL YEAR, IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPROVED POLICY AND THE COUNCIL'S HOUSING STRATEGY.**

**6. BUDGET MONITORING AND EFFICIENCY OVERVIEW TO SEPTEMBER 2006**

(Reports CAB1356 and PS261 Extract of Minutes of Cabinet refers)

The Committee noted that at its meeting on 15 November 2006, Cabinet had endorsed the half year financial position of the Council, in addition to requesting regular monitoring reports on the Annual Efficiency Statement and expected efficiency gains.

Councillor Allgood introduced the Report and advised that he was satisfied with the current revenue position of the Council and that the efficiency gains programme was

progressing well. He referred to Cabinet's endorsement of his request for regular monitoring reports on this information.

Responding to a Member's concern, Councillor Allgood advised that appendices to similar future reports would be in a larger font so that they would be easier to read.

Referring to Appendix 1 of the Report, Councillor Wood and the Director of Development responded to questions and gave further detail to the reasons for current budget deficit within the Directorate. It was explained that the largest shortfall of approximately £160,000 was from a reduction in parking income, which was largely due to a fall in season ticket sales. Councillor Wood suggested that this was probably a result of an increase in charges last year and it was unlikely that the shortfall would be reduced by the year-end. Customers had alternatively chosen to utilise the Park and Ride facilities and this was now operating at near full capacity. The Director explained that this was satisfactory in terms of the Council's policies, but that it had caused a negative impact on parking revenue. Therefore, Cabinet would be considering revised proposals for car parking charges in due course.

The Committee referred to an increase in expenditure on concessionary travel and the Director explained that there had been a larger than predicted participation in the scheme. Double the number of free passes had been issued (in comparison to when they were for half price travel) and the Council had to bear this higher cost as a consequence. Despite this, he was satisfied that the associated overspend would remain at a manageable level for the remainder of the financial year. The Director also reported on proposals for a national scheme in 2008 and that the associated subsidy was not yet known.

During further discussion, Councillor Allgood reported that the overall position of the Council's working budget was currently underspent. Despite variances in actual expenditure as detailed in the Report, he was satisfied that the budget at year-end would either balance or be under budget. Further to this, Councillor Allgood reported that the Council's capital programme for this financial year was significant and some slippage should be expected.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the half-year financial position of the Council be noted.
2. **That Cabinet have regard to the comments of the Committee above.**

7. **GENERAL FUND BUDGET 2007/08 – PROPOSALS FOR CONSULTATION**  
(Report CAB1353 and PS261 Extract of Minutes of Cabinet refers)

The Committee noted that at its meeting on 15 November 2006, Cabinet had agreed to hold consultations on the current budget proposals, in the context of the Corporate Strategy and the current projection of the Council's financial position.

During its consideration of the Report, the Committee referred to a revised draft version of the Corporate Strategy for consultation, as approved by Cabinet at its meeting on 11 October 2006 (Addendum, Version 1.2 to CAB1334 refers).

Councillor Allgood updated the Committee with the final Government support grant settlement. This was 2.7% above that for the previous year (approximately an additional £8,000) and accorded with baseline projections. He reported that there

was no information with regard to final settlement of the LAGBI and Planning Delivery Grant awards.

During debate, the Committee raised a number of detailed questions with regard to the content of the Report.

Councillor Allgood explained that opportunities for external consultation on the budget proposals had been arranged for Parish Councils, the Town Forum (representing the non-parished area of the District), representatives of the Council's Local Strategic Partners and also the business community.

Responding to a Member's question, the Chief Executive advised that he was confident that ongoing savings of £150,000 per annum with regard to 'organisational development' would be achieved. He explained the processes which would achieve those savings. He also advised that they would include savings accumulated from ongoing efficiencies (over and above those already identified as Gershon savings), in addition to those from improved processes and reduced overhead costs. There would be no direct implications for frontline services. He referred to a requirement to have more regard to underspends and whether these could be permanently 'converted' to efficiency savings. During further discussion, he confirmed that any associated costs arising from changes to Directorate structures would be balanced accordingly, as part of this process.

A Member queried the identification of a revenue saving with regard to the withdrawal of the Council's contribution to the Health Improvement Partnership (HISI). The Director of Finance advised that she would clarify and report back as to whether the ongoing saving to 2011/12 was correct, or if the partnership was funded as part of a three-year programme.

Responding to discussion, Councillor Allgood advised that the actual rate of inflation that a rise in Council Tax could be linked to, was between 2.6% and 3.7% and that it was reasonable to adhere to a mid range approximation of 3%.

During further debate, Councillor Allgood reminded the Committee that the proposals within the Report were at a draft stage for consultation purposes. He was confident that an apparent £200,000 deficit would be addressed as part of the process for setting the budget for 2007/08. Should this deficit still remain following the consultation process, and after notification of all final grant support settlements, then only those growth bids identified as 'category 1' would be permitted.

The Director of Development responded to questions in relation to the funding from the Open Space Fund of the Outdoor Sports Centre at Bar End and the possible use of the General Fund to fund other open space projects within the Winchester Town area. Members also referred to whether it was appropriate for Parish Councils to make a contribution. The City Secretary and Solicitor advised that Cabinet, at its meeting on 15 November 2006, had acknowledged concerns raised by the Town Forum (12 October 2006) and had requested that a report be submitted, responding to the points raised.

The Chairman questioned whether all of the suggested capital growth bids were affordable. Councillor Allgood explained that bids for capital growth (that would otherwise have depleted the Major Investment Reserve) had yet to be prioritised. Consultation with the Scrutiny Panels would provide a firmer indication of a capital programme through the identification of capital and revenue savings and appropriate growth.

Members also asked that a careful assessment should be made of projected uptake of the Concessionary Travel Scheme so that its impact was provided for in the budget proposals.

RESOLVED:

**That Cabinet be asked to have regard to the Committee's discussion on growth and savings proposals, in the context of the draft Corporate Strategy and the current projection of the Council's financial position.**

8. **BUSINESS CONTINUITY PLANNING**

(Report PS260 refers)

The Committee noted that Cabinet was to consider the Report at its meeting on 13 December 2006.

Further to questions, the Director of Development clarified that an occurrence of flooding could impact upon the Council's Emergency Planning capability (as a critical function) to deal with such an incident. A pandemic of avian flu that, over a period of time, gradually impacted on staff numbers had been investigated with regard to its impact on critical functions.

The City Secretary and Solicitor advised that the operation of elections was a critical function, as regardless of the impact of any business critical event, changes to procedure would require legislation – which was unlikely to be forthcoming.

On behalf of the Committee and in recognition of such a Plan as best practice, the Chief Executive thanked officers who were involved in its drafting.

RESOLVED:

That the progress made with Business Continuity Planning be noted.

9. **SCRUTINY REVIEW – BUSINESS PLANS POST IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW**

(Report PS260 refers)

As lead Councillor on the Informal Scrutiny Group, Councillor Rees recommended that the Committee endorse the Report for onward consideration by Cabinet.

The Chief Executive thanked the Informal Scrutiny Group for an excellent piece of work and supported the incremental change to procedures as recommended.

RESOLVED:

**That the content of the Scrutiny Review and Recommendations thereon be recommended to Cabinet for further consideration.**

10. **MEMBERS' CHARTER - REVISION**

(Report CAB1337 and PS261 Extract of Minutes of Cabinet refers)

The Committee noted that, at its meeting on 15 November 2006, Cabinet had agreed to recommend to Council that the Charter be approved, subject to changes as set out in Report PS261 (Extract of Minutes of Cabinet refers).

Councillor Evans reiterated the comments made on her behalf by Councillor Hiscock at the meeting of Cabinet. In response, the Chief Executive agreed that Ward Members should be informed where the Council was requesting a particular issue to be raised at a Parish meeting. In addition to confirming this was within the proposed wording in the Charter, it should also be part of a process of which all officers should be aware.

**RECOMMENDED:**

**THAT THE MEMBERS' CHARTER BE APPROVED AS SET OUT IN REPORT CAB1337, AND AS AMENDED BY CABINET ON 15 NOVEMBER 2006.**

11. **ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE CONSTITUTION**

(Report PS262)

The Committee noted that Cabinet was to consider the Report at its meeting on 13 December 2006.

The Committee discussed whether limiting time for questions before debate to 15 minutes was too prescriptive (Recommendation 1 (ii)) or whether the Mayor as Chairman should restrict unnecessary discussion.

In response to questions, the City Secretary and Solicitor confirmed that the rule requesting Members to stand if they wished to speak would have appropriate provision to allow for any Councillors unable to stand due to disability.

**RECOMMENDED:**

**1. THAT THE BEST USE OF QUESTIONS ON RECOMMENDED MINUTES IS AN ISSUE WHICH SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WITHIN THE GROUPS.**

**2. THAT GENERAL GUIDANCE BE INTRODUCED THAT QUESTIONS BEFORE DEBATE SHOULD GENERALLY BE LIMITED TO NO MORE THAN 15 MINUTES, BUT AT THE MAYOR'S DISCRETION TO ALLOW MORE TIME IF NECESSARY GIVEN THE NATURE OF THE PARTICULAR ISSUE.**

**3. THAT THE EXISTING RULE THAT MEMBERS WISHING TO SPEAK SHOULD INDICATE BY STANDING (UNLESS THEY HAVE A DISABILITY), BE RE-ENFORCED, SO THAT OTHER MEMBERS CAN ALSO SEE LIKELY INTEREST IN SPEAKING ON A PARTICULAR TOPIC.**

**4. THAT MEMBERS BE REMINDED OF THE EXISTING NOTE OF FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ON COUNCIL MEETING PROCEDURES – AS SET OUT IN APPENDIX 2.**

**5. THAT CABINET, GROUP LEADERS AND THE CHAIRMAN OF PRINCIPAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE GIVE CONSIDERATION TO BRINGING FORWARD SUITABLE KEY ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AT COUNCIL WHERE THIS COULD BE A USEFUL AID IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY.**



6. THAT A GENERAL DISCUSSION PROCEDURE OF UP TO 20 MINUTES, WITH A MINUTE OF POINTS RAISED (SIMILAR TO THAT CONTAINED IN COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 15(6) FOR INITIAL DISCUSSION OF PETITIONS) BE CONSIDERED AS AN OPTION FOR SUCH ITEMS OUTLINED IN (V) ABOVE, THOUGH THE COUNCIL COULD ALSO USE ITS NORMAL DEBATE PROCEDURES IF IT SO WISHED.

7. THAT CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN IN THE 2008 ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE CONSTITUTION AS TO WHETHER ANY FORMAL CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION SHOULD BE MADE IN LIGHT OF EXPERIENCE FROM THE MATTERS ARISING ABOVE

RESOLVED:

1. That the other issues raised in Report CAB1288 be noted.

2. That it be noted that further proposals for developing the Portfolio Holder individual decision-making process and an update of the Planning Protocol are to be brought forward in due course.

12. **DEPOT SERVICES CONTRACT – HALF YEAR REVIEW**

(Report PS258 refers)

The Committee noted that Cabinet was to consider the Report at its meeting on 13 December 2006.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr T Stephens (Operations Director, SERCO Winchester) and Mr T Davey (Senior Operations Manager, SERCO Winchester).

Following debate, the majority of Members resolved that the Exempt Appendix 3 to the Report should be dealt with in open session. It had been confirmed that since the publication of the Report, the contractor had endorsed the action recommended by the Authorised Officer of the Depot Contract.

In introducing the Report, the Director of Communities advised that officers were satisfied that, in general, operational performance met the required contract performance level. This was with the exception of void property reinstatement works and, as a consequence, the arrangements for the use of alternative contractors as set out at Appendix 3 to the Report had now been recommended.

The Committee asked a number of questions regarding the performance information in the Report. During discussion, the Director acknowledged that tenants who had received poor service with regard to the repairs contract might have chosen not to complain to the Council. However, despite acknowledging that the number of complaints received may not be an accurate measure of performance, he was generally satisfied that this area of the contract was performing satisfactorily. With regard to street cleansing, he reminded the Committee that the standard of cleanliness to be achieved by the contract differed throughout the District and that SERCO's service to achieve this had largely met the terms of the relevant part of the contract.

The Committee was generally in agreement that the contractor, with the exception of void housing reinstatement, was performing to an acceptable standard and within the terms of the contract. The Committee supported the recommendation to invoke the terms of the contract and place void reinstatement work as soon as possible with the Council's existing back up contractors, until the end of the contract in 2011.

Responding to questions, the Director of Communities advised that the action proposed would not generate additional work for the client. He advised that compensation had addressed loss of rent to the HRA, but not to tenants inconvenienced by delay to their allocations. The Director also confirmed that he was confident that the back up contractors would provide an improved level of service compared to the current arrangements.

Referring to concerns raised at the meeting of the Social Issues Scrutiny Panel on 23 October 2006 with regard to the ongoing profitability of this area of the contract (Report CAB1351 refers), the Director advised that the same cost structures would still apply. He was satisfied that the back up contractors performance would continue to be within the agreed parameters. He advised that re-tendering of appropriate elements of the contract would result in a more expensive outcome for the Council.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Stephens and Mr Davey responded to questions. Mr Stephens advised that he was satisfied that, by having this element of work removed from the contract, he was able to give assurances that performance of other areas of contact would be met. He reported that a dedicated manager for the depot services contract was now in post which would be an improvement upon the previous arrangements. Mr Davey stated that a continued shortage of tradesman had been a major factor in failing to achieve the required performance in void work.

In conclusion, the Committee agreed that assurances must be given that robust methods of performance monitoring were in place to ensure that void property reinstatement by the back-up contractors, and the other areas of the SERCO contract, did not slip behind performance targets. It was agreed therefore that this be reported upon in six months time. However, if either the Portfolio Holder or Director had concerns about performance then the report should be brought at an earlier stage.

**RESOLVED:**

**1. That Cabinet be advised that areas of adequate or improved performance by SERCO under the Contract were welcomed, the Committee remained concerned that there were areas that were capable of and needing further improvement.**

**2. That the action of the Authorised Officer of the Depot Contract in relation to Void Housing performance, as set out in Appendix 3 of the Report, be endorsed.**

**3. That performance of the backup contractors be monitored alongside SERCO's performance by this Committee and Cabinet upon a six monthly basis, but if either the Portfolio Holder or Director had concerns about performance then the report should be brought at an earlier stage.**

13. **SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME (REPORT PS259 REFERS), DECEMBER 2006 FORWARD PLAN AND ITEMS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION**

RESOLVED:

That the Scrutiny Work Programme and Forward Plan for December 2006 be noted.

14. **MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANELS**

The Committee noted that, at its meeting on 15 November 2006, Cabinet had received the minutes of the Panels as follows:

- (i) Environment Scrutiny Panel held 17 October 2006  
(Report CAB1349 refers)
- (ii) Local Economy Scrutiny Panel held 18 October 2006  
(Report CAB1350 refers)
- (iii) Social Issues Scrutiny Panel held 23 October 2006  
(Report CAB1351 refers)
- (iv) Resources Scrutiny Panel held 25 October 2006  
(Report CAB1352 refers)

During consideration of the minutes of the Social Issues Scrutiny Panel, the Committee noted that it had referred to the concerns of the Panel and TACT with regard to contractor performance, as part of its discussion of Report PS258, elsewhere on the agenda.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Environment Scrutiny Panel held 17 October 2006, Local Economy Scrutiny Panel held 18 October 2006, Social Issues Scrutiny Panel held 23 October 2006 and Resources Scrutiny Panel held 25 October 2006, be received and the recommendations therein be noted.

15. **EXTRACT OF MINUTES OF CABINET - 15 NOVEMBER 2006**  
(Report PS261 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

16. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

RESOLVED:

1. That in all the circumstances, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

2. That the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business because it is likely that, if members of the public were present, there would be disclosure to them of



19. **DISPOSAL OF VACANT DWELLINGS (EXEMPT APPENDIX)**  
(Report CAB1336 refers)

The Committee considered the information contained in the exempt appendix detailing the property valuations for the three vacant Council dwellings listed in the Report.

RESOLVED:

That the information contained in the exempt appendix be noted.

The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and concluded at 9.45pm.

Chairman