



URGENT BUSINESS AND SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Council

20 July 2026

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title	Officer Responsible	Reason Not Included with Original Agenda
4.	N/A	Petitions and Requests to Address the Meeting - Petition: The petition organiser (Paul Fennemore) is unable to attend Council so Adrian Langdale, supported by Richard Allen (both representing NORA – North Oxfordshire Resident Action), will introduce the petition to Council. - There are no requests to address the meeting.	N/A	The deadline for requests to address the meeting is after agenda publication
8.	(Pages 3 - 6)	Questions Leader responses to written questions	N/A	In line with the Constitution, responses to written questions are published on the afternoon of the working day before the meeting.
11.	(Pages 7 - 16)	Motions Updated Motions attachment There are no amendments on the motions to be debated by Council. The deadline for amendments has now passed.	N/A	Deadline for amendments to be debated by Council after agenda publication.

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Natasha Clark, Democratic and Elections democracy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk, 01295 221534

This page is intentionally left blank

Council

Monday 20 July 2026

Written Questions

	Question From	Topic
1	Cllr Mark Cherry	Former Garage Site, Bretch Hill
2	Cllr Michael Wilson	Neurodiversity Awareness Training
3	Cllr Edward Reeves	Area Oversight Groups
4	Cllr Paul Jeffreys	Bins

QUESTION ONE

Question From: Councillor Mark Cherry

Question To: Leader of the Council, Councillor Lesley McLean

Topic: Former Garage Site, Bretch Hill

Question

“For over 2 years the former sanctuary housing garage site next to 230 Bretch hill is now on its third owner.

As a consequence, the old garage site has become unsafe dilapidated and prone to antisocial behaviour the Thames Valley neighbourhood police team and community wardens are doing all in their power to tackle this however the whole site needs redevelopment from the new owners and to be made secure.

As the leader of Cherwell District Council can you assure me as a Ruscote ward councillor that you will do all in your power as Cherwell leader to support the Cherwell environmental enforcement team who were trying to get the landowner to move forward with their legal responsibilities and improve the garage site for the local community of Bretch Hill.

Response from the Leader

“I would like to place on record my thanks to the Cherwell District Council Environmental Enforcement Team for their considerable efforts in securing this site. Through the use of a Community Protection Notice, together with sustained engagement and persistence, officers have worked to ensure that the current owners have taken action to address the issues. This has been particularly challenging as the ownership of the site has changed hands on at least two occasions, requiring the enforcement process to be restarted each time. The site has now been sealed at all three entrance points to deter unauthorised access, anti-social behaviour and fly-tipping, thanks in no small part to the excellent work of James Fairweather, the lead case officer.

To address the longer term issue of the site and its future, as leader of the Council and portfolio holder for regeneration I will write to the landowner and invite them to describe their plans to us for redevelopment of the site.”

QUESTION TWO

Question From: Councillor Michael Wilson

Question To: Leader of the Council, Councillor Lesley McLean

Topic: Neurodiversity Awareness Training

Question

“As a councillor with ADHD, I appreciate that the Council provides neurodiversity training through iHasco. Would the council consider offering in person neurodiversity awareness training to further understanding and support for neurodivergent councillors, staff and residents.

Would the Leader agree to investigate the benefits of face-to-face neurodiversity training and report back to councillors on the options available?”

Response from the Leader

“You have already highlighted that neurodiversity training is provided online via iHasco and I do hope that councillors have completed this. Face to face neurodiversity training is already offered to staff so I have asked our Democratic and Elections Team to work with our HR team and their provider to extend this to Members. This is a very important area and something I am committed to taking forward.”

QUESTION THREE

Question From: Councillor Eddie Reeves

Question To: Leader of the Council, Councillor Lesley McLean

Topic: Area Oversight Groups

Question

“Earlier this year, Cherwell District Council agreed to allocate funding for Banbury and other parts of the district to support local development needs. Banbury will have £300,000 allocated through this Fund, for each of the financial years 2026/27 and 2027/28. These funds are to be welcomed.

Area Oversight Groups (AOGs) were set up as consultative, non-decision-making entities, and they are a forum in which to discuss local issues and opportunities and identify possible actions to address these through the development of an Area Priority Plan. Membership includes Cherwell District, Oxfordshire County and Banbury Town Councillors, officers and local stakeholders.

As Deddington ward members, Cllrs Rogers, McLernon and I appear to have been invited to attend meetings of the Banbury AOG. However, there appears to

be no mention of the possibility of any rural expenditure at all in the Council's invitation to participate or its attendant funding criteria.

Is this an unfortunate case of miscommunication on the Council's part or has a political decision been taken by the administration to expressly exclude rural wards from receiving a fair share of these important funds?"

Response from the Leader

"The Local Area Funds are for each of the three main urban centres and their surrounding areas meaning that the entire district has access to this funding.

Local Area Funds ensure that local ward councillors have the opportunity to be involved in an area framework that allows them to recommend proposals to the Executive to be funded to the benefit of their areas. All councillors are encouraged to bring forward proposals for future funding – initially through discussion with the relevant area officer team.

There is no exclusive list to the possibilities to the requests of the area funding groups, however, each request will be subject to the Council's standard checks on legal and financial implications and the Council's standing orders."

QUESTION FOUR

Question From: Councillor Paul Jeffreys

Question To: Leader of the Council, Councillor Lesley McLean

Topic: Bins

Question

"The Council's policy is that when an existing 240-litre Green Waste Bin becomes damaged or reaches the end of its serviceable life, it is replaced with a smaller 180-litre bin, representing a 25% reduction in capacity.

Whilst residents are encouraged to recycle as much as possible, many common household waste items cannot be placed in the blue recycling bin, including kitchen roll, tissues, bedding, textiles, carrier bags, cling film, sweet wrappers, crisp packets, wet wipes and nappies. These items must therefore be disposed of in the Green Waste Bin.

For larger households, particularly those with young children generating nappy waste, a reduction of 25% in bin capacity can create significant difficulties. At the same time, the annual charge for the Brown Bin garden waste service has increased from £49 to £59 over the last three years. Many residents may be concerned that increasing charges could discourage the proper disposal of garden waste and lead to more waste being placed in Green Waste Bins.

Can the Leader explain what assessment the Council has undertaken of the impact of replacing 240-litre Green Waste Bins with 180-litre bins on larger households and families with young children, whether there are any plans to reduce the size of the Brown Bin from 240 litres to 180 litres, and whether the

Council will consider reducing or removing the Brown Bin charge in order to encourage greater use of the service?"

Response from the Leader

"I want to reassure you that this is not a new policy. It was implemented almost a decade ago, as part of the council's wider drive towards increasing recycling levels in Cherwell, and bins have been replaced steadily as they reach end of life or new bins are requested. Reducing the size of the bins directly increases our levels of recycling. This is better for the environment and better financially for Cherwell.

During the last decade, the Council has only received a very small number of complaints about bin capacity. Data shows that most green bins aren't full when we collect them, and that half of what goes in the green bins could go into recycling. We've continually expanded what we can pick up in the recycling bin over the last two years, and we will be increasing that again in the coming year. We have a long way to go before capacity of the green bins is a challenge for us. I would also stress that larger families do receive the bigger 240L bins from us as standard, as we know how much rubbish a new baby generates!

In terms of the brown bin garden waste, I can assure you that our sampling shows almost no garden waste is being put into the green bins. Our garden waste service is still the second cheapest in Oxfordshire, and almost half the cost of garden waste in Oxford for example, so I think we are still delivering great value for money for our residents.

Almost all councils in the UK charge for garden waste collection, the money raised supports council activities, if we were to lower this charge we would have to substantially reduce our work to make Cherwell cleaner and safer.

We are definitely not planning to change the size of the garden waste bin - that wouldn't help increase our recycling levels, and so would have no benefit. I can assure you that the brown bin will be the same size as it always was under our administration."

Council

Monday 20 July 2026

Motions UPDATED

Changes to the version published with the agenda pack:

- **Secunder added to motions 3, 4 and 6**
- **Minor friendly amendments accepted by the motion proposer in respect of items 3 and 6, which are set out under the respective motion.**
- **Councillor Sibley has advised the Monitoring Officer that he has withdrawn his motion.**

	Topic	Proposer	Secunder
1	Thames Valley Devolution Withdrawal	Cllr Kieron Mallon	Cllr David Rogers
2	The Implications of Designation	Cllr Ian Harwood	Cllr Eddie Reeves
3	Pavement Blocking	Cllr Rebecca Biegel	Cllr Eddie Reeves
4	Councillor Transparency with Public over AI Use	Cllr Kerrie Thornhill	Cllr Dom Vaitkus
5	Two Hours Free Parking at Claremont Car Park – Bicester Motion withdrawn	Cllr Les Sibley	TBC
6	Community Wardens	Cllr Paul Jeffreys	Cllr Eddie Reeves

The Monitoring Officer has confirmed that motions 1 and 2 will be debated by Council due to the district wide significance of the motion topic. Amendments are permitted on these motions. The deadline for Members to submit amendments to motions is noon on Thursday 16 July. No amendments will be permitted after this deadline.

Any amendments submitted will be published as a supplement to the agenda on the afternoon of Friday 17 July. Amendments for motions will be dealt with in the order submitted.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 4.18, as the detail of motions 3, 4, 5, and 6 falls within the remit of Executive, no amendments are permitted and there will be no Council debate on these motions.

The proposer of the motion will propose the motion, the seconder will confirm, the Leader of the Council will respond and the motions will stand referred to Executive for consideration.

**** Please note that motions are on individual pages to assist viewing ****

MOTION ONE (Council debate due to district wide significance)

Motion Proposer: Councillor Kieron Mallon

Motion Seconder: Councillor David Rogers

Topic: Thames Valley Devolution Withdrawal

Motion

“Council notes that:

1. The decision by Oxfordshire County Council's Liberal Democrat administration to withdraw support for the proposed Thames Valley Foundation Strategic Authority has effectively halted the current devolution process for Oxfordshire, Berkshire and Swindon.
2. Government ministers had described a Thames Valley devolution deal as a significant opportunity to secure additional powers, investment and strategic influence over transport, infrastructure, housing and economic growth.
3. The withdrawal raises serious questions regarding the impact on residents, businesses and communities across Cherwell, including the potential loss of future investment opportunities, reduced influence over regional decision-making and reputational damage to Oxfordshire as a strategic partner.
4. The Government has made clear its intention that all areas should ultimately be covered by devolved strategic authorities, creating a risk that future arrangements could be imposed with less local influence if consensus cannot be achieved locally.

AND

asks the Leader of the Council to provide a member briefing setting out:

- (a) the financial and officer costs incurred by Cherwell District Council in pursuing the devolution process to date;
- (b) the implications of the withdrawal for Cherwell residents and businesses;
- (c) the process by which the withdrawal decision was reached;
- (d) the risks of future Government intervention or imposed arrangements; and
- (e) the options available to restore progress towards a locally agreed devolution settlement.”

MOTION TWO (Council debate due to district wide significance)

Motion Proposer: Councillor Ian Harwood

Motion Seconder: Councillor Eddie Reeves

Topic: The Implications of Designation

Motion

“This Council notes with concern that:

1. Cherwell District Council has recently been designated by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government for its performance in determining planning applications.
2. This is the first time that Cherwell District Council has been subject to designation.
3. Designation means that certain planning applications may be submitted directly to the Secretary of State, reducing the Council's role in determining development within the district.
4. This represents a significant reputational setback for the Council and may undermine public confidence in the integrity, effectiveness and timeliness of the local planning system.
5. The loss of planning application fee income and associated revenues may have financial implications for the Council at a time of continuing budgetary pressures.
6. This designation raises concerns regarding the effectiveness of the Council's planning performance management and the adequacy of measures taken to address known issues.

This Council therefore resolves to:

- (a) Reaffirm its commitment to a planning service that is efficient, transparent, accountable and capable of maintaining the confidence of residents, applicants and local communities and committed to continuous improvement.
- (b) Request that Full Council asks Overview and Scrutiny to include this matter on its work programme and to examine the factors leading to designation, the financial and operational implications, lessons to improve planning performance and the actions being taken to secure removal of the designation.”

MOTION THREE (referral to Executive)

Motion Proposer: Councillor Rebecca Biegel

Motion Second: Councillor Eddie Reeves

Topic: Pavement Blocking

Motion

“Vehicles parking inconsiderately on pavements is a growing problem across Cherwell. Blocked pavements create significant difficulties for pedestrians and especially wheelchair users, people with pushchairs and those with visual impairments, who are forced to go into the road to pass. This unacceptable situation reduces accessibility for vulnerable residents and creates safety issues for all.

The Government has announced plans to give local highway authorities more powers to prevent unnecessary pavement parking and intervene more quickly wherever pavement obstruction creates safety or accessibility risks. Oxfordshire County Council will be able to introduce wider pavement parking restrictions in problem areas while still allowing exemptions where pavement parking is genuinely necessary or unavoidable.

Although Cherwell District Council does not have legal responsibility for highways, it has an important role to play in identifying areas where pavement blocking is a significant issue. Such information can be used to work with other agencies to tackle this problem, increase public awareness of the safety and accessibility issues caused by pavement blocking and finally to feed into any proposals for new pavement parking restrictions which may be considered by the county council.

This council therefore resolves to

1. identify areas where pavement blocking is a significant issue by collating evidence submitted by local members, residents, affected groups and others
2. use this local evidence-based information to
 - liaise with other agencies to tackle this issue and
 - provide feedback to Oxfordshire County Council
3. support and promote publicity and education campaigns to discourage inconsiderate pavement blocking”

Motion with friendly amendments from Councillor Reeves – words deleted struck through / words added in italics

“Vehicles parking inconsiderately on pavements is a growing problem across Cherwell. Blocked pavements create significant difficulties for pedestrians, and especially wheelchair users, people with pushchairs and those with visual impairments, who are *often* forced to go into the road to pass. This unacceptable situation reduces accessibility for vulnerable residents and creates *unnecessary* safety issues for all.

The Government has announced *welcome* plans to give local highway authorities more powers to prevent unnecessary pavement parking and intervene more quickly wherever pavement obstruction creates safety or accessibility risks. Oxfordshire County Council will, *if a proactive approach is taken*, soon be able to introduce wider pavement parking restrictions in problem areas while still allowing exemptions where pavement parking is genuinely necessary or unavoidable.

~~Although Cherwell District Council does not have legal responsibility for highways,~~ it has an important role to play in *supporting Oxfordshire County Council in* identifying areas where pavement blocking is a significant issue. Such information can be used to ~~work with other agencies to~~ tackle this problem, increase public awareness of the safety and accessibility issues caused by pavement blocking, and ~~finally to feed into any proposals for new pavement parking restrictions which may be considered by the~~ *into Oxfordshire County Council.*

This Council therefore resolves to

1. identify areas where pavement blocking is a significant issue by collating evidence submitted by local members, residents, affected groups and others
2. use this local evidence-based information to
 - liaise with other agencies to tackle this issue; and
 - provide feedback to Oxfordshire County Council
3. support and promote publicity and education campaigns to discourage inconsiderate pavement blocking”; and
4. *request that Oxfordshire County Council takes pavement blocking and highways management with greater seriousness.”*

CLEAN VERSION

“Vehicles parking inconsiderately on pavements is a growing problem across Cherwell. Blocked pavements create significant difficulties for pedestrians, especially wheelchair users, people with pushchairs and those with visual impairments, who are often forced into the road. This unacceptable situation reduces accessibility for vulnerable residents and creates unnecessary safety issues.

The Government has announced welcome plans to give local highway authorities more powers to prevent unnecessary pavement parking and intervene more quickly wherever pavement obstruction creates safety or accessibility risks. Oxfordshire County Council will, if a proactive approach is taken, soon be able to introduce wider pavement parking restrictions in problem areas while still allowing exemptions where pavement parking is genuinely necessary.

Cherwell District Council has an important role to play in supporting Oxfordshire County Council in identifying areas where pavement blocking is a significant issue. Such information can be used to tackle this problem, increase public awareness of the safety and accessibility issues caused by pavement blocking, and feed any proposals for new pavement parking restrictions into Oxfordshire County Council.

This Council therefore resolves to

1. identify areas where pavement blocking is a significant issue by collating evidence submitted by local members, residents, affected groups and others
2. use this local evidence-based information to
 - liaise with other agencies to tackle this issue;
 - provide feedback to Oxfordshire County Council
3. support and promote publicity and education campaigns to discourage inconsiderate pavement blocking”; and
4. *request that Oxfordshire County Council takes pavement blocking and highways management with greater seriousness.”*

MOTION FOUR (referral to Executive)

Motion Proposer: Councillor Kerrie Thornhill

Motion Seconder: Councillor Dom Vaitkus

Topic: Councillor Transparency with Public over AI Use

Motion

“The use of AI (Artificial Intelligence) programmes for generating written and visual communications is increasingly common. Some elected representatives, including Councillors at Cherwell District Council, have chosen to use AI-generated written updates, AI visual materials, and even AI-generated videos, to communicate with the public.

Some AI authored content can undermine transparency. Visual materials imitating public works, or official news sources, have the potential to be misleading. Furthermore, there are serious issues of transparency if AI content is published without clear information on authorship.

Members of the public have a right to know at first glance if a text, image, or video made by their elected Councillors is machine-generated or not.

This Council therefore resolves to:

1. Require that Councillors clearly label material has been wholly or substantially generated using artificial intelligence, in any content published in the public domain, which relates to Council business, campaigning, or their role as a Councillor.
2. Ask the relevant committee to consider whether a policy, written guideline, or training on the transparent use of AI in public communications would be appropriate and report back.”

MOTION SIX (referral to Executive)

Motion Proposer: Councillor Paul Jeffreys

Motion Seconded: Councillor Eddie Reeves

Topic: Community Wardens

Motion

“Anti-social behaviour (ASB) has a significant impact on residents' quality of life, mental health, community cohesion, and perceptions of safety, with the Home Office recognising that ASB can lead to anxiety, depression, avoidance behaviours, and a loss of trust in public institutions.

Vulnerable adults, older residents, and those living alone are often disproportionately affected by persistent ASB and benefit from a visible uniformed presence providing reassurance and early intervention.

Investment in prevention is more cost-effective than dealing with the downstream consequences of ASB, crime, environmental damage, and community decline.
Financial Case

A full-time Community Warden typically costs £45,000 to £48,000 per year including salary, pension, equipment, and training.

An additional team of 4 wardens would cost around £200,000 annually, while a volunteer Special Community Warden scheme could operate for £8000- £20,000 per year for training, uniforms, and supervision. This modest investment would deliver visible deterrence, reassurance, intelligence gathering and earlier intervention, helping to reduce the far greater social and financial costs of anti-social behaviour on residents, businesses, and public services.

We ask that that the Executive.

- Develop a business case for increasing the number of Community Wardens across Cherwell. Report back within six months with costs, funding options, and implementation plans.
- Explore external funding opportunities, including the Police and Crime Commissioner, government community safety grants, and local partnerships.
- Establish a pilot Special Community Warden Scheme, recruiting and training volunteers in a model similar to Special Constables, working alongside existing wardens, Police and community safety partners.”

Motion with friendly amendments from Councillor Reeves – words deleted struck through / words added in italics

“Anti-social behaviour (ASB) has a significant impact on residents' quality of life, mental health, community cohesion, and perceptions of safety, with the Home Office recognising that ASB can lead to anxiety, depression, avoidance behaviours, and a loss of trust in public institutions.

Vulnerable adults, older residents, and those living alone are often disproportionately affected by persistent ASB and benefit from a visible uniformed presence providing reassurance and early intervention.

Investment in prevention is more cost-effective than dealing with the downstream consequences of ASB., ~~crime, environmental damage, and community decline.~~
~~Financial Case~~

A full-time Community Warden typically costs £45,000 to £48,000 per year including salary, pension, equipment, and training *at today's prices*.

An additional team of 4 wardens would cost around £200,000 annually *in the current financial year*, while a volunteer Special Community Warden scheme could operate for £8000- £20,000 per year for training, uniforms, and supervision. This modest investment, *albeit rising annually with inflation*, ~~would~~ deliver visible deterrence, reassurance, intelligence gathering and earlier intervention *and helping* to reduce the ~~far greater social and financial costs of anti-social behaviour~~ ASB on residents, businesses, and *other* public services.

We ask that that the Executive.

- Develops a ~~business case comprehensive policy~~ for tackling ASB, which could include developing a business case to increaseing the number of Community Wardens across Cherwell. ~~Report back within six months with costs, funding options, and implementation plans.~~
- Explore external funding opportunities, including *from* the Police and Crime Commissioner, government community safety grants, and local partnerships.
- Establish a pilot Special Community Warden Scheme, recruiting and training volunteers in a model similar to Special Constables, working alongside existing wardens, Police and community safety partners.
- *Report back on the above within six months"*

CLEAN VERSION

"Anti-social behaviour (ASB) has a significant impact on residents' quality of life, mental health, community cohesion, and perceptions of safety, with the Home Office recognising that ASB can lead to anxiety, depression, avoidance behaviours, and a loss of trust in public institutions.

Vulnerable adults, older residents, and those living alone are often disproportionately affected by persistent ASB-

Investment in prevention is more cost-effective than dealing with the downstream consequences of ASB.

A full-time Community Warden typically costs £45,000 to £48,000 per year including salary, pension, equipment, and training at today's prices.

An additional team of 4 wardens would cost around £200,000 annually in the current financial year, while a volunteer Special Community Warden scheme could operate for £8000- £20,000 per year for training, uniforms, and supervision. This modest investment, albeit rising annually with inflation, could deliver visible deterrence, reassurance, intelligence gathering and earlier intervention and help-to reduce the greater costs of ASB on residents, businesses, and other public services.

We ask that that the Executive.

- Develops a comprehensive policy for tackling ASB, which could include developing a business case to increase the number of Community Wardens across Cherwell.
- Explore external funding opportunities, including from the Police and Crime Commissioner, government community safety grants, and local partnerships.
- Establish a pilot Special Community Warden Scheme, recruiting and training volunteers in a model similar to Special Constables, working alongside existing wardens, Police and community safety partners.
- Report back on the above within six months”

This page is intentionally left blank