

Public Document Pack

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

Held in the Committee Room 1, Council Offices, Woodgreen, Witney, Oxfordshire OX28
1NB at 5.30 pm on **Wednesday, 4 March 2026**

PRESENT

Councillors: Andrew Beaney (Chair), Genny Early (Vice-Chair), Adam Clements, Steve Cosier, Liz Leffman, Nick Leverton, Paul Marsh, Stuart McCarroll, Michele Mead, Ruth Smith, Alex Wilson and Alistair Wray

Officers: Madhu Richards (Director of Finance), Andrew Brown (Head of Democratic and Electoral Services), Georgina Dyer (Head of Finance), Phil Martin (Director of Place), Ana Prelici (Senior Democratic Services Officer), Alison Borrett (Senior Performance Analyst), Chris Hargraves (Head of Planning), Heather McCulloch (Community Wellbeing Manager) and Gemma Moreing (Business Information and Performance Lead)

Other Councillors in attendance: Hugo Ashton, Julian Cooper, Alaric Smith and Rachel Crouch

97 Apologies for Absence and Temporary Appointments

Apologies were noted from Councillor Mark Walker and Councillor Dan Levy.

Apologies for lateness were noted from Councillor Ruth Smith.

98 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

99 Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2026. The approval of the minutes was proposed by Councillor Michele Mead and seconded by Councillor Alistair Wray. This proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2026.

100 Chair's announcements

The Chair explained that he proposed to move the order of agenda items to deal with item 7: National Planning Policy Framework after the other substantive agenda items.

101 Participation of the Public

There was no participation of the public.

I02 Report back on recommendations

The Chair drew the Committee's attention to the Executive's response to the Committees recommendations on Nature Recovery and Mental Health Initiatives.

I03 2025/26 Quarterly Finance Review Q3

This was taken as first substantive item for pre-decision scrutiny.

Councillor Alaric Smith, Executive Member for Finance, introduced the 2025/26 Quarterly Finance Review Q3 report and highlighted:

- The overall underspend of £630k against the profiled budget.
- Development management income was up 70% on the previous year due to the receipt of major applications.
- Trade waste income was up 21%.
- Leisure contract had generated an additional £101k.
- There were no significant overspends.
- Treasury Management investment income was better than the budget due to interest rates being higher than expected.
- There were a number of variances in the capital programme but asset repairs and fleet purchases were expected soon.
- Two temporary accommodation properties had been acquired and a further six were in the pipeline.
- Capital developer contributions of £6m had been paid out.

The Committee asked questions and noted from the responses of the Head of Finance that:

- The purchase of temporary accommodation properties would result in savings in housing benefit, a conservate estimate was £350k per annum.
- The additional leisure income was a result of inflation being higher than expected.
- Money had been set aside for car park improvements, and some work (e.g. new signage) had already been undertaken.

The Chair thanked the Executive Member and officers for their work and time. There were no recommendations to the Executive.

I04 2025/26 Quarterly Service Review Q3

The Committee considered the 2025/26 Quarterly Service Review Q3 report. The Leader introduced the report and highlighted that:

- There was now only one vacant unit at Marriotts Walk and public realm improvements would be coming forward soon.
- The Salt Cross Area Action Plan had been approved by full Council.

04/March2026

- The Woodford Way project was progressing with further plans to come forward in quarter 1 of 2026/27.
- Customer satisfaction was high.
- Shop front improvement grants were on track to be awarded.
- Leisure centre visits remained high.
- Planning applications were being determined in a timely fashion.
- Affordable housing delivery was above target.
- 100% of high-risk food premises had been inspected.
- Missed bin collections were within target.

The Senior Performance Analyst summarised the areas that were below target:

- Processing times for Council Tax change events – this was a cumulative measure which had fallen below target in quarter 1.
- Processing times for housing benefit change of circumstances - the performance was skewed where people had failed to provide the requested documentation.

The Committee asked questions and noted from the responses that:

- Household recycling performance remained strong when compared nationally although there were concerns that the trend was that recycling was down and residual waste was up.
- The Council was looking at further recycling messaging and campaigning and what more could be done to encourage and facilitate recycling and make it simpler for residents.
- Officers would explore whether quality metrics could be included for disability grants, as well as processing times for fast-track applications.
- Council Tax and Business Rates collections needed to be reprofiled for next year to reflect the increase in people switching from 10 monthly payments to 12 monthly payments.
- Officers would consider the impact of Oxford City Council offering free bulky waste collections.
- Officers would consider whether the performance reports could be more prominent on the Council website.

The Chair thanked the Leader and officers for presenting the report and answering questions. There were no recommendations to the Executive.

105 Approach to commissioning 3 year SLA 2027 onwards

The purpose of the report was to outline the principles, application process and timeline for the commissioning of three-year Service Level Agreements for Community Grants covering the period 2027-2030. It was included on the agenda for pre-decision scrutiny.

Councillor Rachel Crouch, Executive Member for Communities, introduced the report which was about sustaining investments into community services. In 2024 the Council had introduced

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

04/March2026

a three-year service level agreement programme for community grants with funding of £396k plus a £167k top up. There were 8 programmes currently being delivered by 7 organisations. The current arrangements were due to end in 2027 so there was a need to prepare for the commissioning process now. No external funding would be available for the 2027-30 programme and it was recommended that the base budget be increased to match that for the previous three-year programme. There was a separate 3-year programme for Citizens Advice.

The Committee asked questions and noted from the responses that:

- The following groups had been supported: Wild Oxfordshire (2 projects), Chipping Norton Theatre, Age UK, Volunteer Link Up, the Low Carbon Hub, Homestart and the Wychwood Forest Trust.
- The programme was aligned with the Local Plan, the Nature Recovery Plan and the county-wide Health and Wellbeing Strategy.
- Food and energy initiatives were expected to come forward but the details of schemes could not be predicated at this stage.
- Supported organisations needed to be of a significant enough scale to handle the investments and manage projects effectively over time.
- Service Level Agreements would novate to a successor authority when new unitary council arrangements take effect and should be honoured. The new organisation(s) would then have time to make an evaluation and put any follow-on arrangements in place.
- Officers would consider how to make improvements in areas where the sustainability impact assessment was grey rather than green.
- There would be a robust procurement process, and officers had experience of working with organisations, setting KPIs and measuring performance.

The Chair thanked the Executive Member and officers. There were no recommendations to the Executive.

106 National Planning Policy Framework: Proposed reforms and other changes to the planning system

The purpose of this item was to consider the Council's response to the Government's consultation on proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other aspects of the planning system. It was included on the agenda for pre-decision scrutiny.

The Chair explained that the annex to the report (the Council's proposed response to the consultation) had been circulated as a later paper. Given the lack of time for members to read through the annex, it was suggested that any comments on it be forwarded to Democratic Services by Friday, for consideration ahead of the following Wednesday's Executive meeting.

The Executive Member for Planning apologised for the lateness of the annex and explained that it was important that the Council adds its voice to the national consultation.

04/March2026

The Head of Planning added that there was a lot of material in the consultation which had taken considerable time to digest but the most salient and impactful points were covered in the report. The proposed changes to the NPPF were quite radical but a lot of it was sensible and supportable. The status of the NPPF as a material consideration would remain unchanged but it would include a series of national policies. There were concerns including around:

- The impacts of new national policies on the ability of councils to set local standards.
- Less effective pre-application engagement.
- Reductions in supporting information provided with applications.
- An overly permissive approach to development, in particular within settlement boundaries.
- The upward push on housing numbers.
- The emphasis on building around railway stations at high density including in sensitive areas (other than in the green belt).
- A permissive approach to medium sized developments of 10-49 dwellings.
- Responsibility for major housing allocations (e.g. new settlements) sitting at a sub-regional level rather than at local plan level.

The Committee made a series of comments and suggestions which are set out in an annex to these minutes, together with the responses of the Head of Planning.

The Committee agreed that its comments and suggestions, plus any additional comments received by Friday, would be submitted to the Executive on Wednesday 11 March 2026.

The Chair thanked the Executive Member and officers for their work on the Council's response and said that the responses demonstrated a very strong understanding of the area and the issues it faces. It was suggested that a covering letter should be published alongside the consultation response to demonstrate the work the Council was doing to represent the interests of the district.

107 Updates from Task and Finish Groups

The Chair drew the Committee's attention to a written response from officers (attached to minutes) to questions about waste and recycling that had been asked at a previous meeting.

The Committee agreed to include an item on its work plan on encouraging recycling.

108 Committee Work Programme

The Chair proposed holding an additional meeting in June to consider the Local Plan separately from the other Executive reports for pre-decision scrutiny. This proposal was agreed by the Committee.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

04/March2026

It was noted that an additional meeting had already been scheduled for 26 March 2026, which would be the final meeting of the current civic year.

109 Executive Work Programme

There were no comments on the Executive Work Programme.

The Chair thanked all attendees and closed the meeting.

The Meeting closed at 19:50

CHAIR

Overview and Scrutiny Committee comments on the on the National Planning Policy Framework: Proposed reforms and other changes to the planning system.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee Comment	Head of Planning response
1. Need to make representations about Cotswold Railway in the context of heritage and conservation.	Heritage policies – default would in future be the NPPF rather than the Local Plan. Local Plan policies on heritage will need to be more locally nuanced. The proposed approach towards high density development near railway stations are considered too permissive, and we are making representations about sensitivities.
2. Need to make a strong case on housing affordability.	Concern shared, covered in Annex with particular reference to social rented housing.
3. Additional chapters on energy, water and flood risk welcome. No need to put weight on consulting with statutory consultees beyond statutory deadlines is a concern.	Concern shared, covered in Annex.
4. Renewable energy – large solar farms, weaker controls and lack of strategic oversight.	Concern that a more permissive approach could override new Local Plan policies, covered in Annex.
5. Mineral development and waste – lots of worry about mineral development and associated traffic on inadequate road networks.	Concerns noted but this is primarily a matter for the Mineral Planning Authority – Oxfordshire County Council.
6. Concerned about loss of local voice. Need ability locally to object to infrastructure failures. Do we need to comment about this?	Principles around making representations won't change. Reduced supporting information is a concern and this is covered in the draft response.
7. Effect of proposals on the Council's statutory duties?	Some things will be elevated to higher (Thames Valley) level of plan making. Doesn't take away the need to produce a local plan but will make it more locally specific.
8. What does the Ministerial Statement being torn up mean for Salt Cross?	Statement will be rescinded. Other than for water and accessibility councils won't be able to set local standards e.g. for energy efficiency. Developers will push back if the Council is out

	of alignment with the NPPF. Agreed that the response to Question 194a on this issue should be clarified with reference to the previous Court of Appeal decision on the Ministerial Statement.
9. Covering letter bullet pointing main concerns?	We will try to do this on an Oxfordshire-wide basis.
10. The Government's standard method for calculating housing growth needs to be looked at due to the scale of building being huge. Can we say that?	This consultation is not specifically on that theme although the suggested draft response to Question 48a does express concern about the further upward pressure on housing targets. This can be further strengthened and augmented.
11. Could the buffer be 20% rather than 10%?	The 20% buffer mentioned relates to the issue of 5 year housing land supply as opposed to overall 10% buffer to the housing requirement which has been suggested through consultation on the emerging local plan to date.
12. Need to ensure that affordable housing will be delivered e.g. rural exception sites, with reference to registered providers.	Good point and can further emphasise this point in the suggested draft response.
13. Viability standards and profit margin of 20% - too high?	The consultation refers to a 20% profit on market housing but a blended average of 17.5% including affordable housing. This is a fairly standard industry assumption. Hard pushed to make the case that that's unreasonable.
14. Active travel - can cycle infrastructure be included in the NPPF, specifically with reference to LTNI/20 for cycle path infrastructure?	Will include suggestion that this is included as a standard requirement of development.
15. Should CIL and S106 be streamlined?	There is no suggestion of combining, replacing or streamlining S106/CIL in this current consultation.
16. Do you believe that this will be read by government, or will they just tell us what's happening?	It is important for the Council to respond to the consultation, not least because of the potential concerns around the delivery of net zero carbon homes. A large number of organisations are submitting strong objections and volume and consistency of responses may influence outcomes.

17. How do we encourage infrastructure first?	Sub-regional plan (Spatial Development Strategy) will have to address infrastructure issues at a strategic, sub-regional level including where funding will come from. Local Plan will cover more local needs, phasing and how it will be delivered for specific sites/locations. Infrastructure first is very challenging, need to have it phased as early as possible or forward-funded. Viability and cashflow issues don't support infrastructure-first. The Council is working hard on ensuring adequate sewage treatment capacity e.g. Grampian conditions.
18. Social housing 50% on large sites and half of that social rent? Why don't we build what we need?	Social rent is the only truly affordable tenure and this is reflected in the consultation response which suggests that where on-site affordable housing is provided, 50% of provision should take the form of social rented housing.
19. CNL having the highest status of protection? Add something about CNL in the context of railways.	There is no direct weakening of the protection currently afforded to the CNL but it is agreed that the sensitivity of the CNL could be more strongly highlighted in the context of the proposed approach towards new development near railway stations.
20. Need to list more than just social housing from developer contributions. Can we strengthen and list categories e.g. transport, education, health, nature recovery.	Agreed that it would be sensible for Policy PM12 to refer to other forms of infrastructure provision. The draft response can be amended to suggest this with specific examples given e.g. nature recovery, waste water etc.
21. Produce a covering letter to be submitted with the Council's response to the consultation and share the letter with public and parishes to show the work the Council is doing on their behalf.	The Council's communications team are working on a media release so that all stakeholders including Town and Parish Councils are aware of the position being taken by the District Council on these key matters.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report on WODC Recycling Measurement and Stream Performance

This report details the findings and performance data following the Committee's inquiry into how recycling is measured, calculated, and communicated within the district.

- 1. What steps could be taken to improve communication with the service users regarding recycling. There was a useful pdf document on the Council website, which could be presented differently.**
 - a. While the comprehensive instructional document exists on the Council website, alternative formats are being considered to improve user engagement. Feedback and suggestions are welcomed.
- 2. Despite high performance in national benchmarking, local recycling rates have remained static. As this was the case could improvements be investigated?**
 - a. To address this, the Oxfordshire WES Programme is investigating improvements centred on circular economy principles, focusing on preventing waste at the source and maximising reuse. Performance is also expected to be influenced by external nationwide factors such as Extended Producer Responsibility (pEPR) and Deposit Return Schemes (DRS).
- 3. It would be useful if measurements could be separated for garden and general waste in order to get a truer picture of performance trends.**
 - a. Total municipal waste has seen a reduction of 5.19%, falling to 34,150.61 tonnes. This was primarily driven by a 4.63% decrease in household waste and a 14.12% drop in non-household waste.
 - b. Waste Management Methods Summary:
 - i. Recovery: 43.69% (largest stream by tonnage, primarily processed at Ardley ERF).
 - ii. Composted: 32.21%.
 - iii. Recycled: 23.73%.
 - iv. Landfilled: 0.37%
 - v. The combined recycling, composting, and reuse rate for this period was 55.94%, representing a decline from the 58.03% recorded in the previous year.
 - c. Detailed Recycling Stream Analysis: Individual material streams exhibited high volatility during the 2025-26 period.
 - i. Paper and Cardboard: Paper saw exceptional growth of 135.22%, while card increased by 15.99%.
 - ii. Plastics: Mixed plastics and HDPE grew by 24.71% and 55.98% respectively, though PET declined by 27.26%.

- iii. Glass and Metals: Mixed glass experienced a sharp decline of 38.34%. Steel and aluminium cans also saw significant drops, while "Other Scrap Metal" grew by over 586%.
- iv. Specialised Streams: Composite food and beverage cartons increased by 282.09%. Conversely, small domestic WEEE (electricals) fell by 100%.

4. With the falling garden waste rate had there been a noticeable increase in use of the local tip?

- a. Total composting tonnage declined by 13.14%. This was largely attributed to a 17.03% reduction in green garden waste, a trend driven by a dry summer rather than a shift to other disposal methods like the local tip.

5. What was the verification process for plastic recycling.

- a. The process involves a multi-layered system to ensure material meets re-processor specifications:
 - i. Pre-sort: Manual removal of non-recyclables and contaminants.
 - ii. Mechanical Separation: Using trommel screens and ballistic separators to divide items by size and shape.
 - iii. Optical Sorting: Utilizing near-infrared (NIR) spectroscopy to identify and verify specific resin types like PET and HDPE.
 - iv. Manual Inspection: A final human quality check to remove incorrectly sorted items.
 - v. Quality Assurance: Systematic sampling and testing of bales to meet Environmental Permitting Regulations.

6. The Committee discussed the merits of a separate Task and Finish Group for this area of Waste. It was noted that such work could be included in an expanded remit for the existing Waste Transformation Task and Finish Group. The Committee expressed a preference for expansion of the existing remit of the current Group."

- a. The Environmental Services & Waste team will provide information to whichever forum is preferred.