

Council

Monday 20 July 2026

Motions

	Topic	Proposer	Second
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	TBC
4	Councillor Transparency with Public over AI Use	Cllr Kerrie Thornhill	TBC
5	Two Hours Free Parking at Claremont Car Park - Bicester	Cllr Les Sibley	TBC
6	Community Wardens	Cllr Paul Jeffreys	TBC

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 Seconded: 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 Seconder: TBC

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 FOUR (referral to Executive)

Motion Proposer: Councillor Kerrie Thornhill

Motion Seconder: TBC

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 FIVE (referral to Executive)

Motion Proposer: Councillor Les Sibley

Motion Seconder: TBC

Topic: Two Hours Free Parking at Claremont Car Park - Bicester

Motion

"That the Executive investigates the introduction of up to two hours of free parking in the Council owned Claremont Car Park in Bicester.

Provide for motorists to purchase an additional one hour of parking after the initial two-hour free period, subject to the applicable parking fee and time restrictions.

Prepare a report outlining the financial, operational and economic impacts of implementing the proposed parking arrangement, including any required changes to parking infrastructure, payment systems, signage and enforcement.

Consider the initiative as a means of supporting local businesses, increasing footfall to the town centre, improving accessibility for residents and visitors, while maintaining parking turnover and generating appropriate revenue from extended stays.

As part of the investigation, assess the feasibility of managing the Claremont Car Park through its single entry and exit points using CCTV with Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) technology, reducing the need for physical enforcement while maintaining compliance with parking limits and payment requirements.

Receive the report at the Executive for consideration and determination."

MOTION SIX (referral to Executive)

Motion Proposer: Councillor Paul Jeffreys

Motion Seconder: TBC

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.”