

Agenda



Listening Learning Leading

Contact Officer: Ron Schrieber, Democratic Services Officer,

Tel: 01235 422524

E-mail: ron.schrieber@southoxon.gov.uk

Date: 18 November 2016

Website: <http://www.southoxon.gov.uk>

A MEETING OF THE

Scrutiny Committee

WILL BE HELD ON TUESDAY 29 NOVEMBER 2016 AT 6.30 PM

MEETING ROOM 1, 135 MILTON PARK

Members of the Committee:

Richard Pullen (Chair)

Paul Harrison
Elaine Hornsby
Sue Lawson

Jeannette Matelot
Toby Newman
David Turner

John Walsh
Ian White

Substitutes

Joan Bland
Steve Connel
Pat Dawe

Margaret Davies
Stefan Gawrysiak
Imran Lokhon

Anthony Nash
David Nimmo-Smith
Bill Service

Alternative formats of this publication are available on request. These include large print, Braille, audio, email and easy read. For this or any other special requirements (such as access facilities) please contact the officer named on this agenda. Please give as much notice as possible before the meeting.

1 Notification of substitutes and apologies for absence

2 Minutes and actions arising (Pages 3 - 5)

To agree and sign as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 27 September 2016 (attached).

3 Declarations of interest

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests in respect of items on the agenda for this meeting; and of any other relevant interests.

4 Urgent business and chair's announcements

To receive notification of any matters, which the chairman determines, should be considered as urgent business and the special circumstances, which have made the matters urgent, and to receive any announcements from the chair.

5 Statements, petitions and questions from the public relating to matters affecting the Scrutiny Committee

Any statements and/or petitions from the public (notified to the clerk in advance) will be made or presented at the meeting.

REPORTS AND ISSUES FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

6 Draft policy on burial grounds (Pages 6 - 18)

To consider the report of the head of HR, IT and technical services (attached).

7 Work schedule and dates for all South and Vale scrutiny meetings (Page 19)

To review the attached scrutiny work schedule. Please note, although the dates are confirmed, the items under consideration are subject to being withdrawn, added to or rearranged without further notice.

EXEMPT INFORMATION UNDER 100A(4) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

None

MARGARET REED

Head of Legal and Democratic Services

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE

Scrutiny Committee

HELD AT 6.30 PM ON TUESDAY 27 SEPTEMBER 2016

MEETING ROOM 1, 135 MILTON PARK

Present:

Richard Pullen (chairman)

Steve Connel, Margaret Davies, Paul Harrison, Jeannette Matelot, Sue Lawson, Toby Newman and John Walsh

Apologies:

Elaine Hornsby, David Turner and Ian White tendered apologies.

Officers:

Gerry Brough, John Dobson, Simon Hewings and Nicola Meurer

Also present:

John Cotton, Jane Murphy and Elizabeth Gillespie

21 Minutes and actions arising and referral

The committee agreed that the minutes of the meeting held on 12 April 2016 were an accurate record of the meeting and the chairman signed them. There were no outstanding matters arising or referrals.

22 Declarations of interest

None.

23 Urgent business and chairman's announcements

None.

24 Statements, petitions and questions from the public relating to matters affecting the scrutiny committee

None.



Listening Learning Leading

25 Berinsfield improvement programme

John Cotton, leader of the Council and ward councillor for Berinsfield, introduced this item. Also present to answer questions was Elizabeth Gillespie, cabinet member for development/building control, housing and grants and John Dobson, Science Vale development manager.

Chris Wheaton, the consultant team project lead from QUOD provided an overview of the project. He explained that the first stage of the programme; scoping and options, would take one month longer than planned to spend more time on community engagement. He set out the programme and explained the methodology for analysing the issues and opportunities and explained how the project would be evaluated to reach a final proposal.

Dan Knight, the communications lead representing Carmargue, updated the committee on community engagement. He explained that the project had involved an initial desktop study of existing information within the neighbourhood plan and community plan to determine priorities. The consultants have also worked with local community groups and local businesses and employers. The recent consultation event happened over three days using various activities to attract different types of people from across the community. About 180 people attended and the feedback, including over 300 comments at the events, is being analysed.

The headline feedback that came back from the community consultation was as follows:

- priority of having a new crossing to A4074 to access the bus stop;
- improving the shops at Fane Drive;
- car parking around the village;
- education provision;
- avoiding building in the central green area; and
- preventing the loss of community services.

The next step of community engagement will be to follow up the consultation with a letter to remind residents of the web presence to allow them to further contribute to the project. It is proposed that a range of options for investment and development of the villager will be presented to the public in early November 2016.

In response to questions and issues raised by the committee, the following was discussed:

- Although December 2017 is estimated to be the conclusion of the planning application process of the project, the consultants believe that there are earlier delivery options; to bring forward elements of community benefit such as the A4074 crossing.
- Current risks of the project are very local: previous use of the site; archaeological digs; utilities; and road capacity.
- Berinsfield parish council have been engaged with the project so far and have met with the consultants with the following priorities:
 - A4074 crossing;
 - drainage/sewage issues; and
 - the bus service.

- There is a concern for a rise in house prices; the consultants have identified the need for intermediate tenure housing and ensuring local people are able to stay in the area. Another option is to promote self-build opportunities.

26 Revenue and Capital Outturn

Simon Hewings, chief accountant introduced this item. Also present to answer questions was Jane Murphy, deputy leader and cabinet member for finance, legal and democratic services.

The committee considered the head of finance's report on the financial outturn 2015/16. The committee noted the underspend tied up in projects not yet taken forward and discussed the report in detail, asking questions of the cabinet members and officers. The following points were raised:

- It is very difficult to predict planning income and there is a risk, in amending budgets upwards, should the amounts not be achieved.
- Recruitment and retention is still a problem within the planning service.
- The Didcot leisure centre hold-up is due to a lack of space to build, not financial reasons.
- The cabinet members will now take more responsibility for the budgets in their portfolios and will be available for questioning at scrutiny in the future.

27 Work schedule and dates for all South and Vale scrutiny meetings

The work schedule was noted. Committee was advised that the meeting on 31 January 2017 now includes an item on broadband connectivity.

The meeting closed at 7:30pm

Chairman

Date

Scrutiny Committee



Report of Head of HR, IT and Technical Services

Author: Ben Coleman

Telephone: 01235 422158

Textphone: 18001 01235 422158

E-mail: ben.coleman@southandvale.gov.uk

Cabinet member responsible: Robert Simister

Tel: 01491 576352

E-mail: Robert.simister@southandvale.gov.uk

DATE: 29 November 2016



Draft policy on burial grounds

Recommendation(s)

- (a) To note the cabinet's proposed policy on future burial ground provision.
- (b) To offer observations on the proposed policy.

Purpose of Report

1. To inform scrutiny committee of the cabinet's proposed policy on future burial ground provision, including the options that were considered and discounted, and to provide an opportunity to comment before a policy is formally adopted by cabinet.

Strategic Objectives

2. Helping provide services that meet residents' needs

Background

1. Local authorities are defined as burial authorities and given the power to provide cemeteries by the Local Government Act 1972. There is no statutory duty on a local authority (district, parish or town) to provide burial facilities, but if they do the management is governed by the Local Authorities' Cemeteries Order 1977.
2. The council currently provides land for burials in two council owned and managed cemeteries, one in Wallingford, one in Kidmore End. Across the district there is a mix of provision by churches and parish/town councils.

3. In a cemetery, grave space and memorial space for ashes is flexible. If one runs out, space from the other can be used. Memorial plots take up much less space than graves. Not all land is suitable for burials due to the environmental criteria for burial grounds, regarding the height of the water table and geology.
4. Historically, burial was the preferred post funeral option but more recently the trend has been moving away from burial to cremation. In 1960 35% of funerals resulted in a cremation, in 2008 that had risen to 74% which appears to be relatively stable. Clearly cremation reduces demand for burial plots.
5. There are crematoria in Oxford, Reading, Newbury and a new private establishment at Garford just outside Abingdon. All offer memorial plots for ashes. There is also at least one privately operated commercial burial ground in South Oxfordshire, at Rotherfield Greys outside Henley, with capacity of around 5000 plots.
6. A national review by the Ministry of Justice in 2007, 'Burial Law and Policy in the 21st Century – The Way Forward' (BLP: 2007) found that there was growing evidence of shortages of burial space in some areas. It concluded however, that the government would not reform the current regime to create new statutory obligations to provide burial facilities, provide statistical data, or develop new inspection or enforcement arrangements. It stated that it would make legislative changes as and when the need arose and would provide guidance.

Burial capacity across the district

7. As of January 2016 the council owned site at Wallingford site had grave capacity until 2040, slightly less for memorial plots. Kidmore End had grave capacity until 2030, again slightly less for memorial plots. See appendices A and B.
8. Officers contacted each parish council and many of the churches in the district to determine the available burial capacity. Figures for about three quarters of the 87 town/parish areas in South Oxfordshire were obtained. A summary of the information obtained is presented in appendix C.
9. Of the 67 parishes/churches who provided information, two currently have no capacity and 12 have stated that they have capacity for 10 years or less. Of these 12, six have plans at various stages of development to supply more capacity. Of the remaining parishes, 22 have capacity that they state will last between 10 and 20 years. At the other end of the spectrum 31 parish areas report having capacity in excess of 20 years.

Uncertainties

10. The data on burial capacity across the district is incomplete. All areas were contacted, but it has not been possible to get data for all of them. Where data has been provided it is usually a best guess from the person who appeared best qualified to provide the information. Also, the capacity stated relates to current demand rates and it does not account for unpredictable events which may significantly increase mortality such as a flu pandemic for example.

11. Current demand predictions do not consider housing/population expansion in the district, nor can they account for ageing populations.

Initial policy options

12. The following four options (A-D) were considered and are presented with an assessment of the potential benefits and risks.

A - Do nothing

13. The council has no legal duty to provide burial sites, so when current capacity in council owned sites is filled they could be closed. If town or parish councils wish to facilitate additional burial capacity they can allocate land through their own neighbourhood plans.
14. Local communities are considered best placed to identify, allocate and acquire land for the communities they serve. Indeed many parish councils, who have limited remaining burial capacity, are investigating and acquiring further land.
15. BLP: 2007 found that there was strong community association with their burial grounds and local competence to plan and deliver future capacity. In the absence of an allocation through district council land allocations or parish neighbourhood plans, communities can apply to change the use of land with a planning application.

Benefits

16. This option requires no further financial commitment from the council beyond maintaining the currently operational sites when they close.
17. Parish councils are considered well placed to provide burial grounds for their communities.

Risks

18. Potential negative feedback/ reputational damage as current facilities close.

B - Allocate land through forward planning process

19. Where it's possible to demonstrate a local need (with evidence), land could be allocated in the emerging local plan and a policy developed to ensure that provision and ongoing maintenance is put in place alongside new developments, potentially utilising S106/developer contributions funding.

Benefits

20. Low capital cost as it only requires officer input to develop policies.

Risks

21. The council will not have to consider reputational damage or adverse reactions to stopping an existing service.

22. The new local plan 2033 is currently being developed and burial capacity policies will need progressing quickly to ensure that they are ready in time.
23. Developer/landowner reluctance to offer sites for uses less lucrative than housing.
24. Land identified needs to be suitable for burials (drainage and height of water table), so requires considerable detailed work at an early stage.
25. Ongoing maintenance and responsibility is secured

C - Make funding available to others

26. The council could incentivise parish councils to develop more burial capacity by offering grants for land acquisition. The council should not offer funding to the church as the council have to take maintenance responsibility when church sites are closed, but don't have to take on parish council sites.

Benefits

27. Depending on how a scheme is constructed, parish councils could contribute to the financial cost, reducing the cost relative to the council developing facilities alone.
28. Parish councils would be responsible for maintaining sites when they were closed.
29. Facilities developed close to and by the communities that use them.

Risks

30. Lack of council control, Parish councils may not develop new sites.

D - Buy land and continue to operate site(s)

31. The council could allocate monies to purchase land and develop new burial capacity in one or more locations. Specific costs are not known, but are understood to be in the region of £200,000 a hectare. Current uncertainty about housing land supply may make land more expensive to purchase. Taking account of landscaping areas and access roads, a hectare can accommodate approximately 2500 graves. At current usage rates for both council owned sites (of 40 burials per year) a hectare would last just over 60 years.

Benefits

32. Council can control development and use of the site.

Risks

33. High capital costs.
34. Ongoing management and legacy costs which increase council liabilities.

The policy direction

35. Following consultation with the cabinet portfolio holder, supporting future burial provision using planning policies, option B above, has been investigated in more detail.

District local plan

36. In order to properly consider the issue of future provision in a planning context there are three broad steps: first, consider national policy and guidance; second, gather evidence for the existing burial capacity in South Oxfordshire and third, develop a strategy to deal with any identified issue.
37. There is no statutory guidance or policy for “burial capacity” in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) or Planning Practice Guidance.
38. Information on unmet future demand for burial land across the district is incomplete and the situation varies across the district. Some areas have limited capacity, others have many years of provision.
39. The council could undertake a site selection and allocation process in the same way as for housing (for example). Allocating land would show a commitment to finding a solution to an identified problem, but this is only likely to be the most appropriate course of action where the need is most acute.
40. In the absence of evidence of an acute district wide need we could identify burial capacity as an infrastructure requirement in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), and potentially the Reg. 123 list. We can pursue funding or obligations/Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) derived from development for its delivery. The risk with this approach is the cost of land and the willingness of land owners to accept a cemetery rather than a more valuable land use such as housing.
41. Recognising a mixed burial capacity picture across the district, an alternative solution is that larger scale strategic housing sites have burial capacity identified at an early stage allowing it to be added in to the developments open space allocation. This is likely to be more straightforward to justify because new larger scale developments should include appropriate community facilities. Officers understand that this option is already being considered for the Didcot Garden Town expansion project.

Neighbourhood development plans

42. Neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to manage development in their areas where it aligns with the wider local plan. Neighbourhood planning is a power available to communities, but there is no requirement to develop a plan. Communities might wish to develop a neighbourhood plan, but equally may also feel that it's more appropriate to achieve their ambitions by contributing to the district council local plan. Partnership working between communities and district and parish/town councils is key to achieving community ambitions in the most effective way.

43. The district council is keen to encourage the development of neighbourhood plans in all areas across the district and is assisting communities in developing and adopting these plans. A number of neighbourhood plans are already in place, mainly in the larger towns and villages and more are in development.
44. Communities having identified a need for further/future burial provision could add this in to their neighbourhood plans and encourage delivery of provision in this way.
45. Parish and town councils are burial authorities and where they have a neighbourhood plan in place could buy land when the funds are available. Some of the “meaningful proportion (25 per cent)” of CIL money could be used by parish/town councils to purchase land.
46. Community provision through neighbourhood planning resonates well with national government policy on burial ground provision being done at a community level (BLP:2007), and also with the district council’s aim to encourage communities to develop, and keep under review, their own neighbourhood plans.

Potential policy options around planning policies

47. The following four options have been drafted to assist cabinet in considering how a policy might be worded.

Potential policy one

48. South Oxfordshire District Council will facilitate provision of burial capacity across the district by developing planning policies in the emerging Local Plan 2033.

Potential policy two

49. South Oxfordshire District Council where appropriate will support communities in developing neighbourhood plan policies to support the provision of future burial capacity.

Potential policy three

50. South Oxfordshire District Council will consider the inclusion of burial provision in its open space requirements for larger scale strategic housing sites **and** where appropriate assist communities in developing neighbourhood plan policies to support the provision of future burial capacity.

Potential policy four

51. South Oxfordshire District Council will facilitate provision of burial capacity across the district by developing planning policies in the emerging Local Plan 2033 and will assist communities in developing neighbourhood plan policies to support the provision of future burial capacity.

The draft policy

52. Cabinet members are minded to support a policy along the lines of policy option four above. They have suggested that this draft policy is presented to scrutiny committee for observations before returning to cabinet for confirmation.
53. Cabinet members have also asked officers to approach district councillors to see if they could provide any information on burial capacity in their wards, where no information had been provided to date, and ask for more information on any plans for future burial provision in areas with limited capacity. This process has been started and the further information obtained has been added to the information presented in Appendix C.

Financial Implications

53. The financial implications of the proposed policy are limited. Planning policies need to be evidence based and the current information on burial capacity is incomplete. Collecting an evidence base to support planning policies in the local plan may require some external assistance, the specific costs of which are not known but are likely to be relatively small.
54. The council is already committed to supporting parish and town councils with the development of neighbourhood plans and the additional support regarding this policy area will be deliverable from current resources.

Legal Implications

55. There are no legal implications from the implementation of the proposed policy.

Risks

56. There is a small risk that the proposed burial provision policy may result in a shortage of burial capacity in the district after sites at Wallingford and Kidmore End close. Given the current mix of parish/town council, church and private burial provision, combined with consideration of future planning policies this eventuality is considered unlikely.

Other Implications

57. None

Conclusion

58. The scrutiny committee is invited to note cabinet's proposed policy on future burial provision and to offer its observations.

Background Papers

- Appendix A - Burial capacity in Wallingford, January 2016
- Appendix B - Burial capacity in Kidmore End, January 2016
- Appendix C - Burial capacity survey, October 2016

Oxfordshire Cemeteries Questionnaire - Jan 2016

Name of Cemetery:	Wallingford cemetery
Managing Parish:	South Oxfordshire District Council
Main point of contact and role:	Ian Matten, Shared Parks and Waste Manager
Contact details: Email	ian.matten@southandvale.gov.uk
Telephone No(s)	01235 540373
Alternative Point of Contact and role:	Janette Hinton-Smith
Contact Details: Email	Janette.hinton-smith@southandvale.gov.uk
Telephone No(s)	01235 540544
Normal burial rate (grave) per week:	Total 18 per <u>year</u> (2015) of which 10 were new graves and 8 were reopen. 0 purchased in advance.
Normal burial rate (ashes interment) per week:	Total 12 per <u>year</u> (2015) of which 4 were new ashes graves and 8 were reopen. 0 purchased in advance.
Remaining capacity (no of grave spaces):	275
Remaining capacity (no of ashes plots):	92
Estimated date to reach capacity	2040 for graves and 2034 for ashes plots
Estimated maximum burial rate per week:	5
Contingency Plan for staff shortage?	Yes
Flu contingency plan?	No
Collective burial plan? (Yes/No)	No
Any other comment	

Oxfordshire Cemeteries Questionnaire – Capacity @ Jan 2016

Name of Cemetery:	Kidmore End Cemetery
Managing Parish:	South Oxfordshire District Council
Main point of contact and role:	Ian Matten, Shared Parks and Waste Manager
Contact details: Email	iam.matten@southandvale.gov.uk
Telephone No(s)	01235 540373
Alternative Point of Contact and role:	Janette Hinton-Smith
Contact Details: Email	Janette.hinton-smith@southandvale.gov.uk
Telephone No(s)	01235 540544
Normal burial rate (grave) per week:	Total 12 per <u>year</u> (2015) of which 9 were new graves & 3 were reopen. Plus 4 purchased in advance
Normal burial rate (ashes interment) per week:	Total 2 per <u>year</u> (2015) of which 1 was a new ashes graves & 1 was a reopen.
Remaining capacity (no of grave spaces):	181 (we added 13 new grave spaces in 2015 therefore total number stayed the same as at end of 2014)
Remaining capacity (no of ashes plots):	26
Estimated date to reach capacity	2030 for graves. 2021 for ashes plots but would be able to turn grave spaces into ashes plots.
Estimated maximum burial rate per week:	5
Contingency Plan for staff shortage?	Yes
Flu contingency plan?	No
Collective burial plan? (Yes/No)	No
Any other comment	

Churchyards, cemeteries and burial grounds by parish area

These are operated by the town/parish council, the church or the district council

October 2016 compiled by Ben Coleman

key

	no data
	no current burial capacity
	less than 10 years capacity
	10-20 years capacity
	more than 20 years capacity

<i>Location</i>	<i>burial capacity in years</i>
Adwell Parish Meeting	15 or so spaces 10 years - privately owned
Aston Rowant Parish Council	not known
Aston Tirrold Parish Council	not known
Aston Uphorpe Parish Council	not known
Beckley And Stowood Parish Council	has 20 spaces and have used five spaces in the last three years so 10-12 years of capacity
Benson Parish Council	Currently have 35 plots expect this to last 3-4 years. Have raised limited capacity with Parish council - not aware of any plans.
Berinsfield Parish Council	sufficient space for 50 years
Berrick Salome	1-2 burials per year. Space for 70 or so further burials. Should have capacity for next 30 years.
Binfield Heath Parish Council	not known
Bix and Assendon Parish Council	church has 50 spaces should last 15 years approx
Brightwell Baldwin Parish Meeting	in the region of 20 spaces should last 7-10 years
Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Parish Council	5 - 10 years worth of space left in the current burial ground and are beginning to make plans for a replacement
Britwell Salome Parish Meeting	have 30 spaces available and only have a couple of burials there a year.
Chalgrove Parish Council	approximately 65 grave spaces, sufficient to last for 6-7 years 10 at the outside
Checkendon Parish Council	in the region of 100 plots should last 25 years
Chinnor Parish Council	approximately 20 years
Cholsey Parish Council	running out of space in current burial ground but has purchased more land that should last 30 years
Clifton Hampden Parish Council	36 spaces 3 per year therefore about 12 years capacity
Crowell Parish Meeting	not known
Crowmarsh Gifford Parish Council	perhaps 5 years
Cuddesdon and Denton Parish Council	quite a lot of space

Culham Parish Council	30-40 years of space available
Cuxham with Easington Parish Meeting	Easington has enough space for at least the next 20 years
Didcot Town Council	sufficient space for 15 years
Dorchester Parish Council	sufficient space for 50 years
Drayton St Leonard Parish Council	20 spaces, anticipate lasting 10 years
East Hagbourne Parish Council	sufficient space for 50 years
Elsfield Parish Meeting	sufficient space for 15-20 years
Ewelme Parish Council	has space for 100 memorial plots and 20-30 graves - expects each to last about 10 years
Eye And Dunsden Parish Council	Dunsden church - 5 burials a year and should last 40-50 years
Forest Hill With Shotover Parish Council	Church yard is full. Parish has 50 or so spaces suitable for the next 20 years or so.
Garsington Parish Council	Joint with the church. Sufficient space for 25 years.
Goring Heath Parish Council	not known
Goring-on-Thames Parish Council	sufficient space for 50 years
Great Haseley Parish Council	Sufficient space for 5 years in current plot and investigating future capacity - have got land, just need planning permission.
Great Milton Parish Council	Have 14 spaces left and have an average of 3 burials per year therefore have 5 years left. Are investigating options to expand capacity but no decisions have yet been taken.
Harpsden Parish Council	not known
Henley Town Council	2000 plots available average rate of 29 burials per year - about 70 years of capacity
Highmoor Parish Council	not known
Holton Parish Council	not known
Horspath Parish Council	not known
Ipsden	in the region of 350 spaces should last 70 years
Kidmore End Parish Council	Owned and managed by South Oxfordshire District Council. 181 spaces, sufficient for 15 years
Lewknor Parish Council	in the region of 80 spaces should last 40 years
Little Milton Parish Council	sufficient space for 25 years
Little Wittenham Parish Meeting	more than 10 years capacity
Long Wittenham Parish Council	more than 10 years capacity
Mapledurham Parish Council	church yard is full and they are considering a formal closure process beginning this December - no plans for further facilities.
Marsh Baldon Parish Council	25 grave spaces left should last 10 years
Moulsford Parish Council	sufficient space for 10 years
Nettlebed Parish Council	50-60 plots should last over 10 years

Newington Parish Council	not known
North Morton Parish Council	not known
North Stoke Parish Council	50 spaces in the region of 15 years
Nuneham Courtenay	10 years capacity
Pishill With Stonor Parish Council	100 spaces should last at least 50 years
Pyrton Parish Council	use about 1 space a year and have 40 to 50 spaces
Rotherfield Greys Parish Council	Church has 25 spaces which should last 5 years. Also has woodland burial ground - separate private facility - 5600 burial plots expect it to last 25 years.
Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council	not known
Sandford On Thames Parish Council	37 spaces left - expects it to last 15 Years
Shiplake Parish Council	not known
Shirburn Parish Meeting	not known
Sonning Common Parish Council	no capacity
South Morton Parish Council	almost full
South Stoke Parish Council	space for quite some years
Stadhampton Parish Council	almost full, considering purchasing adjacent land
Stanton St John Parish Council	not known
Stoke Row Parish Council	in region of 150 spaces should last 50 years
Stoke Talmage Parish Meeting	in the region of 35 spaces should last 20 years
Swyncombe Parish Council	35 Burial Plots available. At a rate of 27 per ten years they estimate we have enough burial space for about 12-13 years.
Sydenham Parish Council	not known
Tetsworth Parish Council	in the region of 20 spaces, should last 10 years
Thame Town Council	6-8 plots are available which should last to the end of the year. They are in the process of acquiring more land from the town council which should last another 10 years or so.
Tiddington With Albury Parish Council	not known
Toot Baldon Parish Council	The PCC have recently bought some additional land to increase the cemetery at St Lawrence's to meet future needs for upwards of 100 years
Towersey Parish Council	not known
Wallingford Town Council	Owned and managed by South Oxfordshire District Council. 275 spaces, sufficient for 25 years
Warborough Parish Council	10 years burial space
Waterperry With Thomley Parish Council	not known
Waterstock Parish Meeting	has sufficient space for a number of years

	In Watlington the overall assessment is that there is plenty of space. They started reburying in one part of the churchyard some time ago and will probably work towards the same in another part in coming years.
Watlington Parish Council	
West Hagbourne Parish Council	sufficient space for 50 years
Wheatfield Parish Meeting	has 10 spaces should last 20 years
Wheatley Parish Council	Only have 2-4 years capacity then church yard will be closed - parish council are aware of situation and are in the early stages of trying to find more land.
Whitchurch Parish Council	in the region of 1000 plots should last 250 years
Woodcote Parish Council	in the region of 15-200 plots should last 30 years
Woodeaton Parish Meeting	5-10 spaces should last 5-10 years

Schedule for Scrutiny Committees 2016/17

(further items to be added to schedule as required)

Meeting date and venue	Type and chair	Agenda items	Cabinet members	Head of Service
Thurs 26 Jan	Vale	Leisure Provision Strategy Broadband connectivity	Charlotte Dickson Matt Barber	CK ADo
Tues 7 Feb	Vale	Review of Final Draft Budget	Robert Sharp	WJ
Thurs 9 Feb	South	Draft Local Plan Broadband connectivity Review of Final Draft Budget Policy for individual councillors' grant decisions	John Cotton John Cotton Jane Murphy Elizabeth Gillespie	AD WJ ADo CK
Thurs 9 March	Joint	Community Safety Partnership	Anna Badcock/Eric Batts	MR
Thurs 30 March	Vale	Council Tax Reduction Scheme Review Future Work Programme	Robert Sharp All	WJ All
Tues 4 April	South			

Item for future Scrutiny Committees (date to be determined)

Vale

Consultation (*may be Joint*)

S106 Supplementary Planning Document

South

Joint

Commuted sums & affordable housing

Corporate services contract

Temporary accommodation strategy

Unitary status

The Cabinet work programmes can be accessed via the following links:

South

<http://democratic.southoxon.gov.uk/mgListPlans.aspx?RPId=121&RD=0>

Vale

<http://democratic.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/mgListPlans.aspx?RPId=507&RD=0>

Heads of Service

GB = Gerry Brough AD =Adrian Duffield ADo = Andrew Down

CK =Clare Kingston WJ =William Jacobs MR =Margaret Reed

Meeting Start times: Joint: 6:30; South: 6:30; Vale: 7.00