

Democratic Services

Reply to: Amy Bridgewater-Carnall
Ext: 1522
Direct Line: 01993 861522
Email: democratic.services@westoxon.gov.uk

23 September 2020

SUMMONS TO ATTEND

MEETING: ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
PLACE: TO BE HELD VIA VIDEO CONFERENCING BECAUSE OF SOCIAL DISTANCING REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDANCE (see [note](#))
DATE: THURSDAY 1 OCTOBER 2020
TIME: 2 PM

Members of the Committee:

Councillors: Alaa Al-Yousuf (Chairman), Martin McBride (Vice-Chairman), Richard Bishop, Jill Bull, Mike Cahill, Andrew Coles, Owen Collins, Harry Eaglestone, Ted Fenton, Gill Hill, Liz Leffman, Kieran Mullins, Elizabeth Poskitt and Alex Postan.

RECORDING OF MEETINGS

The law allows the council's public meetings to be recorded, which includes filming as well as audio-recording. Photography is also permitted.

As a matter of courtesy, if you intend to record any part of the proceedings please let the Committee Officer know before the start of the meeting.

A G E N D A

- 1. Minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2020 ([attached](#))**
- 2. Apologies for Absence and Temporary Appointments**
- 3. Declarations of Interest**

To receive any declarations of interest from Councillors relating to items to be considered at the meeting, in accordance with the provisions of the Council's Local Code of Conduct, and any from Officers.

- 4. Participation of the Public**

Purpose:

To receive any submissions from members of the public, in accordance with the Council's Rules of Procedure.

- 5. Petition – Sewage and Sewage Discharges ([copy attached](#))**

Purpose:

To report the receipt of a petition and seek resolutions as to any desired actions.

Recommendations:

- (a) That the contents of the petition be noted; and

- (b) That the Cabinet Member for the Environment be requested to (i) support the lobbying of Thames Water to confirm its plans to combat the widespread problems reported; and (ii) copy Robert Courts MP into this report and advise him that the Council considers legislative changes are required in order to enable an effective solution.

6. Committee Work Programme 2020/2021 (Report from Democratic Services – [copy attached](#))

Purpose:

To provide the Committee with an updated Work Programme for 2020/2021 and request adopting a revised format.

Recommendation:

That the Committee notes the work programme, provides comment where needed and adopts the new style format.

7. Community Recycling – Bring Sites in West Oxfordshire ([copy attached](#))

Purpose:

To update Members on the issues being experienced at the community recycling (bring sites) in West Oxfordshire and to seek approval for their permanent removal.

Recommendation:

- (a) That the risks and financial, and performance related implications of removing the community recycling (bring site) facilities be noted, as set out in this report; and
- (b) That the Committee submits any comments to Cabinet on the request for approval to be given for the permanent removal of the community recycling (bring site) facilities, in a structured and managed way, with effective communication in order to mitigate the issues being experienced with high levels of contamination, fly tipping and misuse.

8. Notice of Motion – Firework Displays

Purpose:

To consider the Motion proposed by Councillor Toby Morris and seconded by Councillor Suzi Coul at the Council meeting held 26 February 2020 ([copy attached](#))

Recommendation:

That the Committee considers the motion and agrees comments / recommendations to be submitted to Council.

9. Notice of Motion – Environmental Awards for Businesses

Purpose:

To consider the Motion proposed by Councillor Duncan Enright and seconded by Councillor Rosa Bolger at the Council meeting held 26 February 2020 ([copy attached](#))

Recommendation:

That the Committee considers the motion and agrees comments / recommendations to be submitted to Council.

10. Cabinet Work Programme (Report from Democratic Services – [copy attached](#))

Purpose:

To give the Committee the opportunity to comment on the Cabinet Work Programme published on 22 September 2020.

Recommendation:

That the Committee decides whether to express a view to the Cabinet on relevant issues in its Work Programme.

11. Start Time of Meetings (Report from Democratic Services – [copy attached](#))

Purpose:

To consider the start time for meetings of the Committee for the remainder of the 2020/2021 municipal year.

Recommendation:

That the Committee agrees the start time of its meetings for the remainder of the 2020/2021 municipal year.

12. Members' Questions

Purpose:

To receive questions from Members relating to the work of the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee. In order to ensure that appropriate information is to hand at the meeting, Members may wish to give notice of any questions through the Committee Officer.

Recommendation:

That Members' questions be dealt with as appropriate.



Giles Hughes
Chief Executive

This agenda is being dealt with by Amy Bridgewater-Carnall, Tel: (01993) 861522;
Email: amy.bridgewater-carnall@westoxon.gov.uk

Note: Councillors will be sent an invitation to the remote meeting via Cisco Webex. Members of the public may view the meeting via [Facebook Live](#). A Facebook account is not required.

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee**
held in Committee Room 1, Woodgreen, Witney, Oxon
at 2.00pm on **Thursday 6 February 2020**

PRESENT

Councillors: Alaa Al-Yousuf (Chairman), Martin McBride (Vice Chairman), Richard Bishop, Jill Bull, Mike Cahill, Andrew Coles, Owen Collins, Harry Eaglestone, Liz Leffman, Kieran Mullins, Elizabeth Poskitt and Alex Postan

Officers in attendance: Group Manager – Commissioning, Service Leader, Resident Services, Senior Officer, Resident Services.

42. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 5 December 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

43. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Gill Hill and Ted Fenton.

44. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest from Members or Officers in matters to be considered at the meeting.

45. PARTICIPATION OF THE PUBLIC

No submissions were received from the public in accordance with the Council's Rules of Procedure.

46. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2019/2020

The Committee was provided with an update on its work programme for 2019/20.

46.1 Flood Prevention, Drainage and Sewerage Infrastructure Issues

Councillor MacRae, Cabinet Member for Environment, attended the meeting to discuss Water Day and other issues with the Committee. He explained that he had met with Matt Kirby, the Business Manager, Environmental Services and asked if the Committee had suggestions on what they would like presented when the event was next held.

Councillor Jill Bull commented that a bigger room was needed as people were standing at the last event. It was explained that the room in which Water Day was held in was the largest room available.

Councillor Leffman suggested that the organisations involved should be invited to hear residents' concerns.

Councillor MacRae indicated that an invitation was being sent to Thames Water. A letter had been sent to the Secretary of State explaining what the Council was doing to help the residents of the district, and he explained that the Council had no legislative powers, apart from those under the Public Health Acts. The Council could put pressure on organisations such as Thames Water and OFWAT, and although OFWAT had declined to be involved, they were looking to commission a report to investigate the situation. There was a lot of

work being done 'behind the scenes', and it was important that residents knew that the Council was doing its very best for the district.

Councillor Leffman felt that other rural areas in Oxfordshire might be in the same position. She appreciated that Philip Dunne MP had raised a Private Members Bill to stop sewerage being released into waterways.

Councillor Postan queried whether companies could be licensed in the way they operated, and Officers explained that licensing powers were limited.

Councillor Al-Yousuf observed that flood prevention was a critical issue, and that reports had been produced by the Audit Office about the relationship between flooding and planning, potentially earmarking sites which were prone to flooding, due to climate change, and he highlighted that the Council had declared a climate emergency.

Councillor MacRae explained that when planning applications were submitted, Thames Water was asked to comment. Laurence King, Shared Principal Engineer and his team worked hard to ensure that everything possible was done to alleviate the risk of flooding throughout the District, keeping ditches clear, although with climate change the frequency of flooding was changing. Councillor MacRae was meeting with RAF Brize Norton, who were creating bunds to protect the base.

It was suggested that an update from Laurence King could be given at the next meeting of Committee on 16 April 2020 and that it would be useful to formulate some specific questions prior to the update.

Councillor MacRae read an e-mail to Members which gave an overview of the work carried out in West Oxfordshire by the shared flood risk management team:

- All planning applications for one new dwelling, up to nine were sent to the team as an internal consultee.
- A small percentage of planned schemes involved the team scrutinising emergency flood plans for sites in flood prone areas.
- Planning work continued even whilst a flooding incident was taking place.
- The team investigated localised flooding from ordinary watercourses, main rivers or land and would make recommendations for other risk management authorities for work to be carried out, or produce designs for schemes which could be delivered or use delegated enforcement powers to persuade landowners to carry out work.
- Since the flooding of 2007, mainly external grants had been used to deliver forty local schemes and interventions to combat flooding in the District.
- A flood engineering resource had been retained by the Council when other local authorities had disbanded their teams.
- The Council was one of the few local authorities which delivered sandbags free of charge - when an Environment Agency flood alert was called the team was automatically made aware where sandbags would need to be delivered, which prompted either further investigation of the source of the flooding or recording of another incident at a known susceptible location. The information greatly assisted with bids for funding for local schemes. The recording of sewer flooding incidents also assisted with monitoring the performance of Thames Water in the area.

Councillor Alaa Al-Yousuf thanked the team for their work on this issue.

Councillor Leffman queried the situation when rainfall was such that drains were unable to cope. Councillor MacRae explained that this could happen when there were cracks in the pipes where the water was entering the system.

Councillor Alaa Al-Yousuf thanked Councillor MacRae for attending Committee and his input into the discussion.

46.2 Open Space Grass Cutting

This would be removed from the work programme. If items were identified which needed discussion, it could be brought back to Committee.

46.3 Implementation of Car Parking Strategy

The Group Manager explained that it was difficult to know how long the process would take. Once analysis of the consultation had been carried out, a meeting with the County Council would take place to put together proposals in order for them to be publicly available. The team was currently focused on re-procuring the Parking back-office ICT software system, which was time critical, but once that was in place the team could refocus on the project. Discussions should take place with the County Council towards the end of March 2020.

Councillor Leffman queried whether electric charging points could be put in local car parks. It was explained that this was included within the cabinet work programme.

46.4 Local Carbon and Environmental Plan – Biodiversity

This had been completed.

46.5 Environmental Regulations

There was a potential risk cause by Brexit and the absence of EU legislation or regulations, there would be elements of the air quality, flood and climate regulations which were no longer applicable. Officers would keep Committee informed of any revised regulations or government guidance.

Councillor Alaa Al-Yousuf questioned how the Committee could add value, perhaps by lobbying MPs.

Councillor Coles highlighted that at this point in time it was important to know about the environmental regulations in relation to air quality, and flood alleviation. Also being aware of the Agricultural Bill, he considered that these were areas where there would be changes and urged Members to be aware. Two Bills had been mentioned in terms of leaving the EU, although the situation would probably not become clearer until 2021.

46.6 Air quality

The monitoring of air quality would be added to the Committee's work programme.

46.7 Flooding

The Lead Shared Flood Risk Management Engineer, Laurence King, would be invited to attend the next meeting. Members were asked to consider any specific issues of concern.

Councillor Coles explained that he would be happy to work with officers to put some paragraphs together relating to Climate Change to present to the next meeting in order to forward to MP's.

46.8 Waste Collection Data

Members discussed the WODC Recycling Tonnages – By Material. The Group Manager – Commissioning explained that this was data which was routinely circulated for each meeting, and was purely for information.

Councillor Leffman queried figures in Q1 2017, as some figures were quite low. It was explained that there was no specific explanation for these figures, and that rates of recycling fluctuated throughout the year, and suppliers were making efforts to reduce the amount of packaging, reducing the amount of glass in bottles by 30%. Councillor Leffman also questioned the figures as the total sum in Q1 was incorrect.

RESOLVED: That progress on the Committee's Work Programme for 2019/2020 be noted and that the additional item referred to above be included within the Committee's Work Programme.

47. AIR QUALITY MONITORING

The Service Leader, Resident Services and Senior Officer, Resident Services had been asked to attend Committee to give an update and answer any questions. A presentation had previously been given to the Committee in June 2019. There had been air quality data collected and the officer requested questions from Members.

Councillor Postan questioned if there were any figures for air pollution in Bridge Street, Witney. Officers explained that when an air quality management area was declared, the calculations of pollution were apportioned to different vehicles through highways data which the county council could provide. The biggest vehicles for air pollution were HGVs, although the percentage of these vehicles on local roads was low. Vehicles were increasing in size and weight, leading to an increase in pollutants.

Councillor Leffman commented that depending on the outcome of the ban on Burford Bridge the air quality through Burford may be improved. She questioned the pollution levels in Chipping Norton as 80% of the vehicles passing through there were cars.

Councillor Al-Yousuf explained that he had received an e-mail question relating to monitoring in Burford and the levels of pollution being found there. The officer explained that the pollution levels were below the health limit with the quantity of nitrogen dioxide being monitored.

It was commented that, when discussion had taken place on the restrictions of HGVs in Burford, there had been concerns that it would lead to more traffic travelling through Woodstock, and it was necessary to be aware of such possible impacts.

Councillor Poskitt queried whether pollution from idling vehicles could be measured, and wondered whether the Council could discourage idling.

Officers explained that there was a legal responsibility to monitor air quality, although it was not required to measure nitrogen dioxide. In a DEFRA report the word 'average' was used, but officers were not sure what constituted an average, as the measuring could sometimes be from diffusion tubes on lampposts, which absorbed pollution and could then be analysed. Nitrogen dioxide levels in Chipping Norton were monitored.

Councillor Coles commented on euro six engines which the bus companies use and did officers feel that there is sufficient equipment for monitoring in Witney to gain accurate information as the outbound traffic could be stationary and inbound is moving. Equipment for monitoring on lampposts, if they were at a height would be giving a different reading to

whether the equipment was lower on the lamppost. He was considering children in push chairs and whether there was guidance which needed to be followed; should the monitors be at a typical person height. It was important to get the balance right as there was a risk to people's lives. Was there an automatic air quality monitoring system as having to wait to receive figures costs money, the monitors cost a lot of install and run, they have been turned off in Witney and Chipping Norton as they have done their job, although there should be continuous monitoring, which he commented was a political decision and some resources should be put into this.

Councillor Postan questioned the average pollutant, how many times and at what times of the day did the pollution go above a certain level. Officers explained that the level of pollution in Chipping Norton and Witney was not high and levels were looked at in order to consider whether or not to monitor against pollution.

Councillor Al-Yousuf thanked Officers for attending the meeting.

Councillor Eaglestone left the meeting at 2.47pm.

48. CABINET WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee received and considered the report of the Head of Democratic Services, which gave members the opportunity to comment on the Cabinet Work Programme published on 14 January 2020.

48.1 Single Use Plastics

The action plan arising from the work of the Single Use Plastics Working Party was due to be considered later at this meeting, and the Committee noted that it would subsequently be referred to Cabinet and Council later in the month.

48.2 Consideration of tenders for the provision of Electric Charging Points and award of contract

The Group Manager – Commissioning explained that a framework had been procured for three different lots and there was good interest from suppliers. Lot 1 was the full costs paid by the Council, Lot 2 the Council would supply some funding and receive some subsidy, Lot 3, suppliers would bear the cost and would take the income. Suppliers had been awarded to this framework and decided which lot to use seeking to achieve some subsidy if possible. With the Framework procurement complete mini tenders were sought for site specific prices and a report was then planned for February Cabinet. Surprisingly no bids had been received. This had not happened before and suppliers had taken the time to bid on the framework and officers did not currently understand why there was no interest at the mini tender stage. The Group Manager highlighted that the Council was a victim of a growing demand in this market and that suppliers could pick and choose. Officers were currently in dialogue with the procurement team to look at a direct funding agreement to procure charging points for some sites, and a further update would be given to Cabinet on 12 February 2020.

Councillor Al-Yousuf suggested that members of the Committee attended Cabinet if at all possible.

Councillor Leffman queried whether the Council could combine with other Councils to carry out the procurement. The Group Manager explained that the Council and Cotswold District Council were already working together on this to try to obtain economies of scale

wherever possible. If the decision was to move to direct purchasing, charging points could be installed and phased throughout the district.

Councillor Postan commented that the original intention and recommendation was from Finance and Management Overview and Scrutiny to trial the charging points, to be ahead of the game, not behind it and he believed the Council has lost the initiative and credibility due to circumstances. He has disappointed as a lot of work had been carried out to arrive at this point. He recommended that senior staff should consider this a first priority to carry out the work and the team be given more resources to do the job.

Councillor Cole shared Councillor Postan's frustration that it had taken a long time to arrive at this point and it was disappointing, this was no reflection on the officers but the Council should have acted sooner, it had now been taken over and left behind.

Councillor Leffman expressed disappointment and commented that she would be unable to plug an electric car into a charging point, as she had to park her car on the street, and putting a few charging points in car parks was not going to solve the problems. There needed to be consideration of the long term consequences. Councillor Leffman also queried the question of how to stop people parking and charging all day.

The Group Manager explained that if contracts were awarded for suppliers to install the charging points, the timescale for installation depended on locations and utility companies for the supply of electricity. The Manager also explained that restrictions could be put in place to stop people parking in the bays all day. Through a Parking Order, times could be controlled. The charging points being considered would take 40 minutes to fully charge, the parking spaces would be for electric vehicles only, but on street charging would currently be an issue. This was a key issue for the Government, which was putting investment into it.

It was suggested that the Council should look holistically at the provision of charging points with different combinations, driving change through planning policies, transport strategies and lobbying the government to influence what they did.

Councillor Postan repeated his view that this project was going to be a flagship project for the Council which had lost out and other organisations had overtaken and asked that this should go straight to procurement. He put a proposal forward to recommend to Cabinet the following:

“The Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee is disappointed with the long delay implementing the installation of electric charging points and request the Cabinet to prioritise this issue.”

This was seconded by Councillor Cahill, who commented that electric charging points should be put in at the Council offices, and that action was needed, not words.

Councillor Poskitt commented that Blenheim had been trying to carry out work on charging points, but needed efficient electricity support. She considered that this could be a future problem as not all sub-stations would be able to take the demand.

It was considered that the Climate Action Group should look at this issue of electrical infrastructure.

Councillors commented that the Government had revised its deadline to phase out fuel vehicles to 2035.

Arising from a question as to where the Council had gone wrong and what lessons could be learnt, the Group Manager explained that the correct process had been followed, this had never happened before, and if it was going to go wrong, she would have expected that to be at the framework stage and not the bidding stage. At the framework stage suppliers were interested enough to put forward tenders, she considered that the suppliers may have thought that there was no money to be made in the locations specified.

It was queried whether the Council should have gone through this process and was it possible to procure points locally. A question was asked whether the process of tendering and procurement needed to be audited, although this was not considered necessary. The Committee -

RESOLVED: That

- (a) That Cabinet be advised that this Committee was disappointed with the long delay in implementing the installation of electric vehicle charging points and be requested to prioritise this issue; and
- (b) That the content of the Cabinet Work Programme published on 14 January 2020 be noted.

49. SINGLE USE PLASTICS (SUPS)

The Committee received and considered the report of the Climate Change Manager, which addressed the briefing note, statement of principles and action plan arising from the work of the Single Use Plastics Working Group, which was due to be reported through to Council, via Cabinet, later in the month.

The Committee congratulated the Chair who thanked Members and staff for their contributions to the action plan which Cabinet would now consider.

Councillor Coles expressed his disappointment that the Council buildings were still using plastic milk bottles for staff and visitors.

Councillor Poskitt queried whether the document would be produced in larger print.

A question was asked about printer cartridges. Councillor Al-Yousuf explained that this issue had been looked at, and there were procurement and technical issues in relation to refills. He would update the Committee at a future date.

Councillor Leffman queried the plastic bottles being used by the cleaning contractors. Officers would speak to the contractors relating to this issue.

Councillor Coles commented that he had visited the zero waste shop in Witney and commended it to Committee Members.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the report be noted;
- (b) That Cabinet and Council be recommended to agree the proposed next steps as described by the SUPs Working Group in its meeting on 5 December 2019;
- (c) That Cabinet and Council be recommended to agree to the WODC Statement of Principles and Action Plan as presented; and
- (d) That the Single Use Plastics Working Group be dissolved.

50. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

A question was asked by Councillor Leffman regarding the amount of rubbish on the verges of the roads, commenting that whilst the leaves were off the trees it was easy to see the amount of rubbish scattered around the villages. She explained that Dorset had a scheme – bin it don't fling it – on road signs advising people to take their waste home with them, and wondered whether it was possible that a similar scheme could be introduced to highlight the issue, such as – we care about our District, please care on our behalf.

The Group Manager explained that it would be the Highway Authority who would be able to put signs on the highway. Ubcio would be able to do a clean-up. A request could be made to the County Council.

It was suggested that Councillor Leffman could put a motion to Council and the Committee was asked whether it would be willing to support such a motion.

Councillor Postan asked whether this was an initiative which could be a competition for schools, sponsored by companies which supplied the waste people were throwing on the verges. It was considered that this could be a cross party motion.

Councillor Poskitt highlighted that there were a lot of signs on the roads and the Area of Outstanding Beauty did not need to be cluttered with more signs.

Councillor Coles was frustrated that planning had been given for a drive through facility in Witney, which he considered could lead to more waste being thrown on to verges and queried whether conditions could be imposed to seek ensure this did not happen.

The Group Manager explained that when it came to planning there were specific criteria on which conditions could be imposed. Members asked that the team was made aware of issues such as this.

The Group Manager would give an update to Committee once information had been obtained from the highway authority.

The meeting closed at 4.02 pm

CHAIRMAN



WEST OXFORDSHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Name and date of Committee	Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Thursday 1 October 2020
Report Number	Agenda Item No. 5
Subject	Petition: Sewage and Sewage Discharges
Wards affected	All
Accountable member	Cllr Norman MacRae, Cabinet Member for Environment Email: norman.macrae@westoxon.gov.uk
Accountable officer	Phil Shaw Business Manager- Development Management Tel: 01993 861687 Email: phil.shaw@publicagroup.uk
Summary/Purpose	To report the receipt of a petition and seek resolutions as to any desired actions.
Annexes	Annex 1 – Text of covering letter with petition Annex 2 – Text of the petition
Recommendations	(a) That the contents of the petition be noted; and (b) That the Cabinet Member for the Environment be requested to (i) support the lobbying of Thames Water to confirm its plans to combat the widespread problems reported; and (ii) copy Robert Courts MP into this report and advise him that the Council considers legislative changes are required in order to enable an effective solution.
Corporate priorities	N/A
Key Decision	N/A
Exempt	No
Consultees/ Consultation	None

I. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. A petition relating to sewage and sewage discharges has been submitted to the Council. As the petition contains more than 750 signatures it has been referred to this Committee for consideration.
- 1.2. The Committee's role is to consider the content of the petition and to make a recommendation as to what, if any, action should be taken by the Council. That recommendation will be to Cabinet, although Council approval could also be needed if, for example, the proposed actions have budgetary implications.

2. MAIN POINTS

- 2.1. The text of the covering letter and of the petition itself are included at [Annex 1](#) (page 4); and at [Annex 2](#) (page 5) respectively. The covering letter refers to the intention to "give West Oxfordshire District Council a mandate from residents to demand the best in their environmental and planning interactions with Thames Water"; and highlighted in [Annex 2](#) are the specific requests which the petition makes of the Council.
- 2.2. Looking at the sentiment behind the report your Officers are aware of the reports of the increase in incidents of untreated sewage discharging to the river and would concur with the concerns being raised at the consequent harms to its quality and its role as an ecosystem. In this regard there is no material difference between the parties that there is an increase in the incidents and consequences of unauthorised discharge and how undesirable that is for humans and wildlife. Similarly the extent to which the actions of TW and subsequently the Environment Agency in ensuring/monitoring the quality of the water environment are well understood having been raised in considerable detail by local residents and action groups in the context of the successful "Water Day" events that the Council has hosted over the last few years. Thus 'the problem' is recognised
- 2.3. As part of the solution proposed in the petition a greater degree of coordination of development and sewerage infrastructure is encouraged. However it is difficult to see what more could actually happen in that regard. Before any sites are allocated as part of the Local Plan process Thames Water are consulted such that they can advise as to any deficiencies in the current network and make bids for infrastructure improvements on the back of new development occurring. Similarly when planning applications are received there is a consultation protocol with Thames Water as to what level of planning applications they wish to be consulted upon and, when they have been consulted, their suggested conditions are subsequently imposed on any decision issued. In the absence of a recommendation for refusal from either Thames Water or the Environment Agency (EA) there would be no locus to withhold planning permission and the Council would bear any costs of seeking to defend what would be considered an unreasonable refusal reason. In that regard there is thus already close liaison such that integration is not seen as an issue- it is more the matters causing concern largely fall outside the planning/regulatory control of the Council.
- 2.4. These remaining points appear to largely involve enforcement of the legislation that falls outside the remit of the Council in its role as Local Planning Authority and where, as such, the Council does not have a regulatory or enforcement role. That duty falls to the EA and your Officers have some concerns that if encouragement were to be given to directing complaints to WODC it may give the impression that this would give rise to some form of action being taken- but without the teeth to undertake that action. However our experience is that notwithstanding that WODC does not have a regulatory role, residents will still contact WODC members and

certain staff if they do not obtain a response/solution from TW or the EA in monitoring licences that never appear to be breached by quality or volume. Therefore, on balance, perhaps WODC should be seen to encourage the reporting of frequent problems to WODC (as already happens really, whether formally or informally) to assist in the recording of the scale of the problem but noting that the regulatory bodies do not answer to WODC and that enforcement actually sits with the EA. WODC could then flag up any concerns with them as the regulatory body as a means to raise the profile of the concern and hopefully encourage them to deliver meaningful outcomes.

- 2.5. Furthermore, in that the solutions do lie outside of the WODC remit and basically require tighter national legislation as well as comprehensive work to combat the ingress of groundwater into the network and the dislocation of storm water sewers from foul or combined systems that have a history of frequently surcharging into rivers, it is also suggested that the local MP be advised of the need for legislative amendments if the problems are to be properly resolved.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1. This report has no financial implications.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1. None although the Planning system is not enabled to intervene where other statutory regimes exist to control or protect the environment i.e. it cannot duplicate alternative statutory processes

5. ALTERNATIVES/OPTIONS

- 5.1. N/A

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 6.1. None

Text of covering letter

Petition cc'd to
richard.aylard@thameswater.co.uk CVO
ian.marchant@thameswater.co.uk Interim CEO
customer.feedback@thameswater.co.uk
OfWat, CCW, with covering letter and petition totals sent to the EA and WASP

Dear Mr Butler,

There have been raw sewage discharges near Witney Sewage works into Colwell Brook, part of the River Windrush catchment. Other stretches of brooks and the river in Witney have changed their appearance beyond recognition from clear water to brown-grey.

Trust between the public and Thames Water is broken, so long as 'storming' overflows happen in normal wet weather.

The factual and meticulous campaigning of Windrush Against Sewage Pollution has alerted the town to Thames Water's practices. The petition enclosed was drawn up to give a voice to Witney residents in parallel to WASP's campaign. It is addressed to Thames Water, as sewerage undertaker, and to West Oxfordshire District Council as local overseer of environmental problems and Local Planning Authority. The petition had a West Oxfordshire focus.

The intention is to inform Thames Water of the strength of feeling locally and to give West Oxfordshire District Council a mandate from residents to demand the best in their environmental and planning interactions with Thames Water.

The petition ran online from 2 March to 2 May 2020 and was also made available locally in paper form.

Insist that Thames Water Improves West Oxfordshire's Sewerage

Total signatures gathered: **1700**

1610 e-signatories; 90 paper signatories

Of which

1182 are residents of West Oxfordshire

1550 are Thames Water customers (with 214 residents of Cotswold District Council and 154 other)

150 from outside the Thames Water supply and sewerage area (including 25 from Gloucestershire, 16 from Warwickshire and several from Wiltshire, Northamptonshire and Buckinghamshire, to name flanking areas.)

In accordance with the petition's stated data protection policy, the 150 signatures from outside Thames Water are not included.

The grand total is therefore for Thames Water customers only: **1550**.

Sincerely, with hope for a vastly-improved way forward,

Ruth Smith.

Text of the petition

The online petition stated:

West Oxfordshire's combined sewerage system is unable to cope with the current volume of foul and surface water. Untreated sewage has been released into our rivers and waterways on a regular basis. This continues to risk the health of residents, pets and wildlife. It threatens the delicate biodiversity of our waterways. Perhaps most worryingly, it exposes wild microbes to antibiotic resistant strains of bacteria from human waste and increases the likelihood of humans contracting antibiotic-resistant superbugs. West Oxfordshire District Council and Thames Water need to work together to forge a joined-up sewerage upgrade plan to ensure that the new developments are a success and don't make waterways worse for all of us.

And went on to state the following:

To:

West Oxfordshire District Council and Thames Water

From: Residents

This petition from local residents requests that West Oxfordshire District Council joins us in calling on Thames Water to bring forward essential upgrades to the sewage storage tanks and the sewerage network in West Oxfordshire to put a stop to the frequent discharges of sewage into the River Windrush and other waterways.

Our combined sewerage system is unable to cope with the current volume of foul and surface water. Untreated sewage has been released into our rivers and waterways on a regular basis. This continues to risk the health of residents, pets and wildlife. It threatens the delicate biodiversity of our waterways. Perhaps most worryingly, it exposes wild microbes to antibiotic resistant strains of bacteria from human waste and increases the likelihood of humans contracting antibiotic-resistant superbugs [i].

We expect our services to be fit for the 21st century, not heading back to the pre-Victorian era of inadequate sanitation.

The Local Plan promises 15 000 more houses by 2031 [ii]. That's at least 15 000 more toilets to be added to a system that already cannot cope with rainfall. The plan was written, with Thames Water as consultees, before the full extent of the existing problem was apparent [iii]. Residents report a marked change in the appearance of the Windrush, as well as frequent sewage pollution events.

The areas earmarked for over 1000 new homes each are North Witney (Hailey), Chipping Norton and Eynsham. The Local Plan states that new drainage systems must provide biodiversity enhancement and, at North Witney and Chipping Norton, must achieve a "reduction in surface water run-off below greenfield rates". If biodiversity is already being harmed by frequent sewage discharges in relation to excess surface water, we need Thames Water to fix existing problems before these future targets become plausible.

We want to give WODC a mandate to insist on the improvements that Witney and West Oxfordshire need. Thames Water have a plan that should deliver small changes in step with the expansion rate of the Local Plan but does not acknowledge the unacceptability of the immediate situation. We ask them to bring their works forward. We ask that the Council:

- Works pro-actively with Thames Water to address current sewage pollution.
- Works preemptively with Thames Water to plan infrastructure upgrades ahead of each part of the Local Plan happening, not just in response to the first planning applications for each area.

- Outlines a joined-up approach to sewerage in the Infrastructure Development Plan currently being updated.
- Reminds Thames Water that Section 94 of the WIA91 requires sewerage companies to provide, improve and extend a system of public sewers to ensure an area is effectually drained [iv].
- Reminds Thames Water that Ofwat say: “Strong and on-going conversations... should deliver a range of benefits to all parties, including both new connections customers and monopoly companies’ existing customers. These benefits include ... being able to deliver strategic, joined-up solutions where there are multiple development sites coming forward, rather than a succession of smaller schemes” [iv]
- Works with the Environment Agency and catchment management organisations to pinpoint and control agricultural sources of sewage entering waterways.
- Uses strong relationships with departments at Thames Water and the Environment Agency to keep both organisations candid and realistic in their communications and advice to WODC.
- Seeks and records evidence for the causes and circumstances of the raw sewage leaks, and presents it to the Environment Agency.
- Invites residents to submit evidence of Thames Water tankers pumping at locations in villages or towns, and presents it to Ofwat and the Consumer Council for Water.
- Keeps the public aware of sewage leaks as they happen. • Liaises with our MP so that the case for a change in the law can be built, to make such frequent sewage leaks illegal.

[i] <https://wellcome.ac.uk/sites/default/files/antimicrobial-resistance-environment-report.pdf>

[ii] <https://www.westoxon.gov.uk/localplan2031>

[iii] <https://www.windrushwasp.org/>

[iv] <https://www.ofwat.gov.uk/regulated-companies/markets/connections-market/new-connections/#growth>



WEST OXFORDSHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Name and date of Committee	Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee Thursday 1 October 2020
Report Number	Agenda Item No. 6
Subject	Committee Work Programme 2020/2021
Wards affected	All
Accountable member	Cllr Alaa Al-Yousuf, Chairman Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee Email: alaa.alyousuf@westoxon.gov.uk
Accountable officer	Keith Butler Head of Democratic Services Tel: 01993 861521 Email: keith.butler@westoxon.gov.uk
Summary/Purpose	To provide the Committee with an update on its Work Programme for 2019/2020 and suggest a programme for 2020/21.
Annexes	Annex 1 - Approved Work Programme for 2019/2020 Annex 2 – Proposed Work Programme for 2020/2021
Recommendation	That the Committee notes the work programme, provides comment where needed and adopts the new style format.
Corporate priorities	To enable the Committee to review its Work Programme and support the Council's priorities to protect the environment whilst supporting the local economy, to meet the current and future needs of residents and to provide efficient and value for money services, whilst delivering quality front line services.
Key Decision	No
Exempt	No
Consultees/ Consultation	None

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. At the May meeting the Committee gave consideration to the development of its Work Programme for the year having regard to the changes to the approach to scrutiny work adopted by Council on 22 October 2008.

2. MAIN POINTS

- 2.1. Following a number of cancelled meetings earlier in the year due to Covid-19, officers have taken the opportunity to look at the work programmes for each scrutiny committee with a view to making them more focused and relevant.
- 2.2. It had become apparent that there were a number of 'historic' items that may no longer be relevant or there was little that could be done to influence them.
- 2.3. In addition, officers hoped to enable Members to recognise the influence that scrutiny could have on decision making, particularly with a large number of projects and recovery programmes moving forwards.
- 2.4. Attached at [Annex 1](#) is the old style Work Programme for 2019/2020 for discussion and explanation as to which items can be removed and/or progressed further.
- 2.5. Attached at [Annex 2](#) is a new style Work Programme for 2020/2021 for discussion and approval.
- 2.6. In addition to the items contained in the Work Programme there will still be the opportunity to bring forward one-off reports and papers on particular issues of interest to the Committee but it will also be necessary to maintain a general overview of the ways in which external agencies are responding to community concerns. The inclusion of a standing agenda item for Members' questions also provides the opportunity to raise relevant issues.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1. There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1. None

5. RISK ASSESSMENT

- 5.1. Not applicable

6. CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1. Whilst there may be climate change implications arising from specific items within the Work Programme, there are none arising directly from this report.

7. ALTERNATIVES/OPTIONS

- 7.1. In accordance with the Constitution of the Council, Committee has the power to investigate any matters it considers relevant to its work area, and to make recommendations to the Council, the Executive or any other Committee or Sub-Committee of the Council as it sees fit.

8. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 8.1. None

	Work Area	Comments	Meeting / Anticipated Completion Date	Originator
1	Flood Prevention, Drainage and Sewerage Infrastructure Issues	<p>The Committee has already undertaken significant work in respect of flooding issues.</p> <p>At the last meeting it was agreed that a further 'Water Day' would be held in 2020. The Business Manager, Environmental Services will attend this meeting to discuss the format of the event.</p> <p>It was suggested that an update from Laurence King could be given at the next meeting of Committee on 16 April 2020 and it would be useful to formulate some specific questions prior to the update. TW to be invited?</p> <p>The Committee could put a formal request forward to Cabinet to agree to host an annual 'Water Day' / invite Cabinet Member to provide update / retain on Work Programme as a quarterly update / put a task and finish group together to look at issues with a view to changing policy/increasing communication etc.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>16 April 2020</p>	Environment O&S
2	Open Space Grass Cutting	<p>Following the County Council's reduction of funding, West Oxfordshire agreed to supplement the resultant shortfall in grass cutting.</p> <p>The Council has also been looking at options for a more coherent approach including collaborative working with town/parish councils but has found it difficult to make progress.</p> <p>Open Space Grass Cutting – to be taken off the work programme. If items are identified which need discussion, it could be brought back to Committee.</p>	To be removed	Environment O&S
3	Implementation of Car Parking Strategy	<p>At the June 2018 meeting it was noted that the Cabinet was to give consideration to the implementation of the Car Parking Strategy and agreed that this item be added to the Work Programme.</p> <p>A report outlining the results of the consultation regarding parking in</p>	Further updates will be provided as appropriate.	Environment O&S

	Work Area	Comments	Meeting / Anticipated Completion Date	Originator
		<p>Woodstock town centre will be submitted to the Committee and Cabinet in due course.</p> <p>Remove – can be revisited as and when it is raised at Cabinet.</p>		
4	Low Carbon and Environmental Plan - Biodiversity	<p>At the last meeting it was noted that this work would be incorporated within the report of the Climate Action Working Group submitted to the Council in January 2020.</p> <p>Local Carbon and Environmental Plan – Biodiversity – this had been completed.</p>	Completed	Environment O&S
5	Environmental Regulations	<p>At its meeting held on 21 July 2016 the Committee agreed to monitor the aftermath of Brexit and the dismantling of the Department for Energy and Climate Change in relation to environmental laws and regulations and, in particular, two issues with a direct bearing on West Oxfordshire; air quality and flood alleviation measures.</p> <p>Officers would continue to maintain a watching brief and any specific risks arising from revised Regulations or Government Guidance would be drawn to Members' attention.</p> <p>Remove – can be revisited as and when it is raised at Cabinet.</p>	On-going	Environment O&S
7	Single Use Plastics	<p>At the last meeting it was noted that the Working Party had concluded its task. A separate report on the agenda for this meeting includes the action plan arising, which is to be presented to Cabinet and Council, and recommends the formal dissolution of the Working Party.</p> <p>Further work would now be taken forward by the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Climate Change and the Climate Action Working Group. The Climate Change Manager advised that this work would be monitored and the Committee advised of progress.</p>	<p>Completed</p> <p>Ongoing as appropriate</p>	Environment O&S

	Work Area	Comments	Meeting / Anticipated Completion Date	Originator
		Remove - completed		
8	Waste Collection Data	<p>Waste Team to provide tonnage data for plastics and other waste streams e.g glass for comparison. The latest data is at Annex 2.</p> <p>Quarterly report / Regular item on work programme combined with an update from relevant Cabinet Member if needed</p>	Ongoing / Rolling item to each meeting	Environment O&S
9	Air Quality	<p>Added – February 2020 Phil Measures will be invited to attend the next meeting. Members to submit any specific issues of concern, which officers would be able to update at the next meeting.</p> <p>Live issue – need an update since the impact of Covid</p>	Q&A – April 2020	

New Style Work Programme – Environment O&S**OCTOBER 2020**

	Title	Format	Lead Officer / Cabinet Member	Next report / Anticipated Completion Date	Comments
1	Waste Service	Presentation & verbal update	Scott Williams / Councillor MacRae Ubico representative to be invited (Area Manager)	Six monthly	Scott Williams to provide service update and provide data for information. To discuss and review options for new waste contract due for renewal in 2022.
2	Update on Carbon Action Plan	Cabinet report	Ness Scott / Councillor Harvey	Due at Cabinet 21 October 2020	Invite Ness Scott to present a verbal update plus Q&A
3	Community Recycling (bring sites) in West Oxfordshire	Cabinet report	Scott Williams / Bill Oddy / Councillor MacRae	Due at Cabinet 21 October 2020	Bill Oddy to outline proposals

DECEMBER 2020

	Title	Format	Lead Officer / Cabinet Member	Next report / Anticipated Completion Date	Comments
1	Air Quality	Verbal update & Q&A	Councillor MacRae / Phil Measures		Update needed to provide update on situation since Covid.
2	Flood Prevention, Drainage & Sewerage Infrastructure Issues	Update	Councillor Harvey / Laurence King / Matt Kirby		Update needed to provide update on situation since Covid.

New Style Work Programme – Environment O&S**FEBRUARY 2021**

	Title	Format	Lead Officer / Cabinet Member	Next report / Anticipated Completion Date	Comments
I					

Regular Reports	Frequency	Next Meeting Date

Suggestions for future workstreams

Update from representative on relevant Cabinet Advisory Group for Environment



WEST OXFORDSHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Name and date of Committee	Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Thursday 1 October 2020
Report Number	Agenda Item No. 7
Subject	Community Recycling (Bring Sites) In West Oxfordshire
Wards affected	ALL
Accountable member	Cllr Norman MacRae, Cabinet Member for Environment Email: norman.macrae@westoxon.gov.uk
Accountable officer	Scott Williams, Business Manager – Waste Email: scott.williams@publicagroup.uk
Summary/Purpose	To update Members on the issues being experienced at the community recycling (bring sites) in West Oxfordshire and to seek approval for their permanent removal.
Annex	Annex A – List of all bring sites and facilities
Recommendations	<p>a) That the risks and financial, and performance related implications of removing the community recycling (bring site) facilities be noted, as set out in this report; and</p> <p>b) That the Committee submits any comments to Cabinet on the request for approval to be given for the permanent removal of the community recycling (bring site) facilities, in a structured and managed way, with effective communication in order to mitigate the issues being experienced with high levels of contamination, fly tipping and misuse.</p>
Corporate priorities	The proposal contained within this report supports the Council priority: Modern Council Services and Sustainable Finance - Delivering excellent modern services whilst ensuring the financial sustainability of the Council?
Key Decision	Yes
Exempt	No
Consultees/ Consultation	Councillor Norman MacRae and Senior Officers from the Council and Publica have been consulted on this report and the detail contained within.

I. BACKGROUND

- I.1. Bring site provision has been part of the waste service offered by West Oxfordshire District Council for over 15 years.
- I.2. The bring sites have not increased in size over time to cope with increasing in housing (in particularly in Witney, Carterton and Chipping Norton), and higher levels of recyclable waste being deposited by residents, and this has accelerated during the Covid-19 pandemic with an increase in online shopping and packaging that residents want to dispose of.
- I.3. Sites are frequently subject to recycling material being left outside the bins (littering) and non-recyclable items being left including mattresses, large waste electricals, and increasingly hazardous waste. There is evidence that material is left by traders who are not entitled to dispose of items at the centres and also people deliberately disposing of general waste and/or using them as a Household Recycling Centre (HRC). County Council operated HRC's are much larger and have the ability for the public to dispose of recyclables and general waste. However, they are continually monitored by an on-site team and so they can then police what is being disposed of. Examples of the excess waste/recyclables left and fly-tipping are in the two photos below.



Chipping Norton



Witney

- I.4. The council has 15 recycling bring sites in the district (3 of which are on private caravan/camping parks) Shown in [Annex A](#).
- I.5. All 15 sites vary in size but they all offer residents the opportunity to recycle mixed recycling and glass, 5 offer small electrical recycling (WEEE) and 11 offer textile recycling.
- I.6. All bring sites banks (dry mixed recycling including paper, cardboard, cans, tins and plastics – DMR and glass) are serviced by the councils waste contractor UBICO with the exception of textiles banks which are privately emptied by SOEX LTD, through a separate contract.
- I.7. South Oxfordshire and Vale of the White Horse District Councils' removed the majority of their recycling bring sites in approximately 2015, but just kept clothing banks. Cherwell still has bring banks, but they are mainly for glass as they don't accept that material as part of their kerbside recycling collections.
- I.8. During 2019/2020 West Oxfordshire District Council collected 12,688 tonnes of kerbside recycling in comparison to approximately 851 tonnes from the recycling bring sites - this accounted for approximately 6.7% of the authority's total recycling performance.

- 1.9. The Cabinet will be considering this matter at its meeting on 21 October 2020, and this Committee is invited to submit comments for Cabinet to take into account.

2. MAIN POINTS

- 2.1. Bring sites have been a tried and trusted approach enabling residents to recycle their waste for many years, but in current times where the Council now provides an effective kerbside collection service for a substantial number of items, the negatives in not being able to police the sites usage far outweigh the positives in the amount and quality of material received.
- 2.2. The Council is spending significant costs on clearing material being left outside the bins (littering) and this resource could be redeployed on other street cleansing activities.
- 2.3. There is some evidence that bring sites are used by traders and so there are likely to be companies out there which are not paying for their recycling waste to be collected and processed, which means that the tax payer is picking up a proportion of the costs. In addition, these users are breaking the law by not honouring their duty-of-care responsibilities in arranging for a reputable waste collection contractor to collect and properly dispose of their waste. As a secondary dis-benefit it's likely that they are not using the Councils trade recycling collection service, which is impacting on the income received.
- 2.4. Whilst the bring sites have been a useful alternative to the kerbside service during the Covid-19 pandemic and associated lockdown, and allowed residents to dispose of larger amounts of recycling, particularly in light of the increase in home deliveries, the Council has had to bear a significant financial cost to maintain these sites and respond to the misuse and fly-tipping.
- 2.5. There is a risk that recycling performance will decrease by 6.7% if the bring sites were removed from service and that material didn't transfer into the kerbside service, but on balance the anticipated benefits both financial, reputational and in building in greater capacity for the UBICO operation, look to outweigh this.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Costs (Operational)

- 3.1. Pre January 2018 the service ran independently with a separate truck and crew with the below break down of costs:

Truck cost (capital)	£210,000
Depreciate 7yrs	£30,000
Crew pa x 2	£65,000
Fuel pa	£30,000
Maintenance	£15,000
Narrow support	£20,000
Streets fly tipping	£40,000
Total revenue p.a.	£200,000

- 3.2. In Jan 2018, UBICO made efficiencies and included bring sites as part of the domestic recycling rounds, so costs were absorbed into this service and a breakdown of that budget is not available. That does however mean that there isn't a dedicated resource emptying the bring site bins and instead it is divided amongst all of the Ubico recycling collection crews on the basis that the closest domestic round to a particular site is responsible for collecting.

Fly tipping clearance

- 3.3. During April, May and June this year cleansing crews were visiting bring sites constantly to clear material being left outside the bins (fly-tips). Higher profile sites such as Chipping Norton are cleared daily and smaller sites 2-3 times per week.
- 3.4. The work is carried out by agency staff using a street cleansing truck (taken off other duties) at a cost of approximately £5,000 in staffing alone (over the 12 weeks).
- 3.5. In addition, the Council, through Publica, has to deal with complaints about the bring sites from residents and parish councils as well as undertake investigations into littering / fly-tipping. For the purposes of this review we have made a resource assumption that 0.5fte which is £15,000.
- 3.6. The Council receives two income streams for the recycling material collected from the bring sites:
- Sale of the textile material to the re-processor SOEX at income of £255 per tonne (pre-Covid 19). During the pandemic the textile commodity market have been significantly affected which has resulted in the Council not receiving any income for this material.
 - Recycling credits paid by Oxfordshire County Council (OCC). During 2019/2020 the Council received £54.55 from OCC for every tonne of material collected for recycling from the bring sites.
- 3.7. A summary of the income and costs of the service are below for the financial year 2019-2020

Recycling credits (dry recycling DMR and glass)	£40,171
Recycling credit and payment for textiles	£35,598
Total income	£75,768
Processing Fees (SUEZ)	£51,510
Net Income	£24,258

- 3.8. This would indicate that there would be a net reduction in income of £24,258 to the authority if the bring sites were removed.
- 3.9. Whilst it would not be possible to reduce the number of collection crews as the function is spread across the entire fleet, there would be a cost reduction in labour and lower fuel usage as a result of the Ubico recycling crews not emptying the bring sites which is estimated to be £23,000, meaning that the financial implications for the Council are likely to be negligible. In addition, there would be a non-cashable saving from not dealing with complaints of misuse and material being left outside the banks (fly-tipping) (£15,000). There may be an option to partially reduce resources further in the future, but this would have to be completed as part of a modelling exercise and would likely involve collection round optimisation which would result in collection day changes for some residents. In addition, by doing this it would limit the recycling service ability to absorb future housing growth, meaning that additional resources would then be required by UBICO sooner than anticipated.
- 3.10. In recent months Asda in Carterton and four parish councils (Burford, Clanfield, Long Hanborough and Eynsham) have asked the council to remove the bring sites on their property / in their parish. This could have a negative impact on the other sites, with increased use and misuse.
- 3.11. If the bring sites were removed then it is recommended that a budget of up to £20,000 be allocated for site cleansing and the erection of new signs informing residents that they would no longer be able to deposit recycling items at the sites. The signs would also inform users

that they could recycle those items either by way of the kerbside service, or by using their local Household Recycling Centre and that fly-tipping is a criminal offence.

- 3.12. To support the proposed removal, a communications strategy is being formulated which will include setting out the options available to residents, to ensure that they can continue recycling this material predominantly by way of the kerbside collection service. For larger items which have been deposited at the bring sites previously, the Bulky Waste Service and Household Recycling Centres will be promoted.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1. The Council is legally required to collect waste under the Environmental Protection Act however, there is no requirement to offer bring sites as a means of collection.

5. RISK ASSESSMENT

- 5.1. The Pros and Cons of removing the bring sites are set out below:

Pros

- Financial implications appear to be negligible. It would offer a financial benefit in the current scenario where greater emptying and cleansing is being required. Would also provide non-cashable savings in officer time.
- Pushes businesses towards using the council commercial waste service
- Reduces cost of clearing fly-tips
- Frees up cleansing staff for other duties
- Reduces complaints / calls / press enquiries and potentially reputational damage
- Reduces contamination in DMR
- Builds in capacity to the recycling collection rounds to be able to absorb property growth in the future
- Reduces demand on ERS team in having to investigate fly-tipping / littering with frequently no evidence present

Cons

- Up to £20,000 one off costs required to support removal process.
- A potential small reduction in recycling performance & recycling credit income but this could be offset by campaigns and increase in housing in the district
- It's difficult to establish monetary savings from the UBICO contract, other than a reduction in agency staffing and fuel from fly-tipping collection (£23,000). Further work is required on this as part of the renewal of the contract in 2022.
- Fly tipping may increase in other potentially harder to reach areas although the risk of this is low as material being left outside the bins is left by residents who don't see this as an offence.
- Removal may result in an increase in recycling collected at kerbside and increased costs on that service for DMR processing by Suez although the data indicates bring sites only account for 6.7% of the total. UBICO has already confirmed that they have sufficient capacity to cope with an increase in demand from a collection perspective
- Removal of service provided by WODC may lead to criticism but the communications needs to be clear that residents have an effective kerbside service and can requests more boxes.

- May result in higher usage of County Council run household recycling centres (Dix Pit).
- May result in an increase in requests for 360 recycling bins and the associated higher container costs so the council will need to adopt a policy to manage this.

6. EQUALITIES IMPACT

- 6.1. The recommendations within this report will have a neutral effect on the different service users, customers and staff, because the Council will retain its kerbside recycling collection service and the County Council operated Household Recycling Centre's will also remain available. The only negative effect will likely be felt by traders who currently use the facilities illegally.

7. CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1. Not all of the recycling material captured by the bring sites is likely to transfer over to the kerbside service. However, the reduction in fuel used by UBICO in order to service these sites and the ongoing reduction in fly-tipping will lessen the impact this proposal has in the amount of Co2 produced and the effect on the climate.

8. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 8.1. The alternatives to removing the bring sites would be to:
- 8.2. Retain the sites, accepting that they are prone to significant fly tipping, misuse and contamination;
- 8.3. Retain only the larger sites and partially mitigate the problems currently being experienced in having fewer to service however acknowledging that in doing so, this may increase the fly-tipping, misuse and contamination at the remaining sites and result in an increase in net cost for the Council by having to service more frequently.

9. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 9.1. None

Annex A**List of all bring sites and facilities**

Recycling bank site	Glass	Paper	Cans	Card	Plastics	Textiles	Shoes	Electricals
Bablock Hythe Caravan Park	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Burford Garden Centre	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Carterton, Black Bourton Rd car park	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Charlbury Spendlove Centre car park	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chipping Norton Albion Street car park	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Chipping Norton Caravan & Camping park	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Chipping Norton New Street car park	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ducklington Aston Rd car park	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hardwick Park Caravan Site	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Stonesfield Field Close	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Tackley Village Hall	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Witney Hailey Rd	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Witney Moorland Rd	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Witney Woodford Way car park	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Woodstock Hensington Rd car park	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes



WEST OXFORDSHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Name and date of Committee	Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Thursday 1 October 2020
Report Number	Agenda Item No. 8
Subject	Motion: Firework Displays
Wards affected	All
Accountable member	Cllr Alaa Al-Yousuf, Chairman Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee Email: alaa.alyousuf@westoxon.gov.uk
Accountable officer	Keith Butler Head of Democratic Services Tel: 01993 861521 Email: keith.butler@westoxon.gov.uk
Summary/Purpose	To consider the motion referred by Council on 26 February 2020, and agree comments/recommendations back to the Council.
Annex	Annex 1 : Minute from the Council meeting held 26 February
Recommendation	That the Committee considers the motion and agrees comments/recommendations to be submitted to the Council.
Corporate priorities	Not applicable.
Key Decision	N/A
Exempt	No
Consultees/ Consultation	None

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. At the meeting of the Council on 26 February 2020, the following motion was proposed and seconded by Councillors Toby Morris and Suzi Coul respectively:

“This Council resolves:

- (a) To ask for all public firework displays within the local authority boundaries to be advertised in advance of the event, allowing residents to take precautions for their animals and vulnerable people*
- (b) To actively promote a public awareness campaign about the impact of fireworks on animal welfare and vulnerable people – including the precautions that can be taken to mitigate risks*
- (c) To write to the UK Government urging them to introduce legislation to limit the maximum noise level of fireworks to 90dB for those sold to the public for private displays*
- (d) To encourage local suppliers of fireworks to stock ‘quieter’ fireworks for public display”.*

- 1.2. The draft minute of the Council meeting is attached at [Annex 1](#).

2. MAIN POINTS

- 2.1. As can be seen from the draft minute included in [Annex 1](#) the proposer and seconder agreed to incorporate two proposed amendments into the motion at paragraphs (c) and (d); and the Council agreed to refer the motion to this Committee for consideration.
- 2.2. The Committee is accordingly invited to consider the matter, and to agree comments/recommendations for submission to the Council.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1. There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1. None

5. RISK ASSESSMENT

- 5.1. Not applicable

6. ALTERNATIVES/OPTIONS

- 6.1. Not applicable.

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 7.1. None

**Extract from the minutes of the Council meeting
held 26 February 2020**

NOTICE OF MOTION – FIREWORK DISPLAYS

The following motion had been received in the names of Councillors Toby Morris and Suzi Coul, namely:-

“This Council resolves:

- (a) To ask for all public firework displays within the local authority boundaries to be advertised in advance of the event, allowing residents to take precautions for their animals and vulnerable people*
- (b) To actively promote a public awareness campaign about the impact of fireworks on animal welfare and vulnerable people – including the precautions that can be taken to mitigate risks*
- (c) To write to the UK Government urging them to introduce legislation to limit the maximum noise level of fireworks to 90dB for those sold to the public for private displays*
- (d) To encourage local suppliers of fireworks to stock ‘quieter’ fireworks for public display”.*

Councillor Morris proposed the motion and explained that the matter had been brought to his attention by local residents who had been made aware of a similar proposal by the RSPCA. He added that as a dog owner himself, he was sympathetic to the intentions of the motion and whilst he did not wish to advocate being a ‘kill-joy’ considered it was one the Council should support. Councillor Morris explained that most public displays would already be advertised in advance, but the requirement to implement a maximum noise limit was due to the majority of private displays not being advertised to local residents and he hoped for these reasons, Council would support the motion.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Coul.

Councillor Postan expressed the view that whilst fireworks were a part of British history, they were, in his view, an uncontrolled and unlicensed nuisance which caused risks to livestock and pets. He added that he considered the activity was one that should be licensed and he therefore supported a review of the Council’s licensing system, should the motion be supported, to ensure firework displays were included as part of that system.

Councillor Bolger commented that whilst she supported the intentions of the motion, she wished to propose an amendment to recommendations (c) and (d) of the motion so as to read; “(c) To write to the UK Government urging them to introduce legislation to limit the environmental impact and maximum noise level of fireworks to 90dB for those sold to the public for private displays”; and “(d) To encourage local suppliers of fireworks to stock climate-friendly and ‘quieter’ fireworks for public display”.

Councillors Morris and Coul confirmed that they were happy to accept the amendment as proposed by Councillor Bolger.

Councillor Leffman informed the Council that whilst she agreed with the views of Councillor Postan, she considered that the main issue was with private displays and was unsure how lowering the decibel level would address this issue. Councillor Leffman therefore proposed that the motion be referred to the Council’s Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Morris and Coul confirmed that they were content for the motion, as amended, to be referred to that Committee, and it was -.

RESOLVED: That the revised motion, having been duly proposed and seconded, be referred to the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee for comment and advice.



WEST OXFORDSHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Name and date of Committee	Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Thursday 1 October 2020
Report Number	Agenda Item No. 9
Subject	Motion: Environmental Awards for Businesses
Wards affected	All
Accountable member	Cllr Alaa Al-Yousuf, Chairman Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee Email: alaa.alyousuf@westoxon.gov.uk
Accountable officer	Keith Butler Head of Democratic Services Tel: 01993 861521 Email: keith.butler@westoxon.gov.uk
Summary/Purpose	To consider the motion referred by Council on 26 February 2020, and agree comments/recommendations back to the Council.
Annex	None
Recommendation	That the Committee considers the motion and agrees comments/recommendations to be submitted to the Council.
Corporate priorities	Not applicable.
Key Decision	N/A
Exempt	No
Consultees/ Consultation	None

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. At the meeting of the Council on 26 February 2020, the following motion was proposed and seconded by Councillors Duncan Enright and Rosa Bolger respectively:

“In light of the climate emergency, the council will encourage businesses and organisations in the district to adopt more sustainable modes of operation. The council therefore resolves to investigate methods to encourage this by audit and award schemes to recognise good practice. These will include exploring best practice by local authorities, the inclusion of environmental measures in procurement decisions, considering awards similar to environmental health audits for food outlets, and discussion with West Oxfordshire Business Awards (WOBA) about sustainability awards.”

- 1.2. The motion having been duly proposed and seconded stood referred without discussion to the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee for comment and advice.

2. MAIN POINTS

- 2.1. The Committee is accordingly invited to consider the matter, and to agree comments/recommendations for submission to the Council.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1. There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1. None

5. RISK ASSESSMENT

- 5.1. Not applicable

6. ALTERNATIVES/OPTIONS

- 6.1. Not applicable.

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 7.1. None



WEST OXFORDSHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Name and date of Committee	Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Thursday 1 October 2020
Report Number	Agenda Item No. 10
Subject	Cabinet Work Programme
Wards affected	All
Accountable members	James Mills, Leader of the Council james.mills@westoxon.gov.uk
Accountable officer	Keith Butler Head of Democratic Services Tel: 01993 861521 Email: keith.butler@westoxon.gov.uk
Summary/Purpose	To give the Committee the opportunity to comment on the Cabinet Work Programme published on 22 September 2020.
Annexes	Annex 1 – Cabinet Work Programme published 22 September 2020.
Recommendation	That the Committee decides whether to express a view to Cabinet on relevant issues in the Work Programme for the period.
Corporate priorities	To maintain and enhance West Oxfordshire as one of the best places to live, work and visit in Great Britain and to meet the current and future needs of residents.
Key Decision	No
Exempt	No
Consultees/ Consultation	None

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. The Cabinet Work Programme is produced on a monthly basis in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 2000, the Council's Constitution and the Regulations relating to publicity for Cabinet decisions that came into force on 10 September 2012. The programme sets out the Cabinet's work programme for the following three months, as applicable.
- 1.2. The programme [published on 22 September](#), covering the period to December 2020 is included in the [Annex to this report](#), for comment.

2. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 2.1. There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

3. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1. None

4. RISK ASSESSMENT

- 4.1. Not applicable

5. ALTERNATIVES/OPTIONS

- 5.1. The Committee may take such action as it considers appropriate within its terms of reference

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 6.1. None

Cabinet Work Programme published 22 September 2020

No.	Proposed Decision and (if applicable) reason(s) the matter is proposed to be considered in private	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be considered in private (Yes/No)	Decision-maker	Date of Decision	Documents	Notes
1.	Approval of Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Issues Paper	No	No	Cabinet	21 October 2020	None	
2.	Consideration and approval of draft Covid-19 Local Recovery Plan for West Oxfordshire	No	No	Cabinet then Council	21 October 2020	None	
3.	Approval of the Council's Carbon Action Plan	No	No	Cabinet then Council	21 October 2020	None	
4.	Approval of Investment Strategy for the recovery of West Oxfordshire	No	No	Cabinet then Council	21 October 2020	None	
5.	Approval of the approach to community recycling (bring-sites) in West Oxfordshire	Yes	No	Cabinet	21 October 2020	None	To be considered by Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 1 October
6.	Approval of a high level commissioning framework to clarify the roles of the Council and Publica	No	No	Cabinet	21 October 2020	None	
7.	Approval of variations to the Off-Street Parking Order	No	No	Cabinet	21 October 2020	None	

No.	Proposed Decision and (if applicable) reason(s) the matter is proposed to be considered in private	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be considered in private (Yes/No)	Decision-maker	Date of Decision	Documents	Notes
8.	Local Recovery and Devolution White Paper - approval of funding to develop the Council's response to the White Paper and its proposals for Local Government Reorganisation	Yes	No	Cabinet	21 October 2020	White Paper may be published in early October	
9.	Consideration of principles for a review of the Tourism service	No	No	Cabinet	21 October 2020	None	
10.	Approval of draft West Eynsham Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for consultation	Yes	No	Cabinet	18 November 2020	Consultation draft	
11.	Approval of East Witney draft Supplementary Planning Document for consultation	No	No	Cabinet	18 November 2020	None	
12.	Approvable of funding and associated matters for affordable housing, scheme at The Elms, Langford	Yes	No	Cabinet	18 November 2020	None	
13.	Approval of Policy for Safeguarding Children, Young People and Vulnerable Adults	No	No	Cabinet	18 November 2020	None	
14.	Consideration and approval of applications for Community Facilities Grants	Yes	No	Cabinet	18 November 2020	None	
15.	Consideration of annual Local Plan Monitoring Report	No	No	Cabinet	18 November 2020	None	

No.	Proposed Decision and (if applicable) reason(s) the matter is proposed to be considered in private	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be considered in private (Yes/No)	Decision-maker	Date of Decision	Documents	Notes
16.	Approval of East Chipping Norton draft Supplementary Planning Document for consultation	No	No	Cabinet	16 December 2020	None	
17.	Approval of North Witney Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Issues Paper for Consultation	No	No	Cabinet	16 December 2020	None	
18.	Approval of upgrade to West Oxfordshire's public space CCTV provision and monitoring arrangements	Yes	No	Cabinet	16 December 2020		Likely to first be considered by Economic & Social Overview and Scrutiny Committee
19.	Approval of Litter Bin replacement programme	Yes	No	Cabinet	16 December 2020		Likely to first be considered by Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee
20.	Approval of Local Council Tax Support Scheme 2021/22	No	No	Cabinet then Council	16 December 2020		
21.	Approval of revised draft Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document for consultation	No	No	Cabinet	16 December 2020	Previous draft, approved June 2020	



WEST OXFORDSHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Name and date of Committee	Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Thursday 1 October 2020
Report Number	Agenda Item No. 11
Subject	Start Time of Meetings 2020/2021
Wards affected	All
Accountable member	Cllr Alaa Al-Yousuf, Chairman Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee; Email: alaa.alyousuf@westoxon.gov.uk
Accountable officer	Not applicable
Summary/Purpose	To consider the start time for meetings of the Committee for the remainder of the 2020/2021 municipal year.
Annexes	None
Recommendation	That the Committee agrees the start time of its meetings for the remainder of the 2020/2021 municipal year.
Corporate priorities	Not applicable
Key Decision	No
Exempt	No
Consultees/ Consultation	None

1. BACKGROUND AND MAIN POINTS

- 1.1. At the meeting of the Council held on 22 January 2020 a programme of meetings for the Committees and Sub-Committees of the Council was agreed for 2020/2021.
- 1.2. The following dates were approved for this Committee:
 - Thursday 18 June 2020 (subsequently cancelled)
 - Thursday 16 July 2020 (subsequently cancelled)
 - Thursday 1 October 2020
 - Thursday 10 December 2020
 - Thursday 11 February 2021
 - Thursday 15 April 2021
- 1.3. It was further resolved that the times for the first meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees in the new civic year be as set out in the appendix, 2.00pm in the case of this committee, but that each be invited to consider the timing of its subsequent meetings during the year.
- 1.4. In the 2019/2020 municipal year the Committee resolved to convene its meetings at 2.00pm.

2. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 2.1. There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

3. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1. None

4. RISK ASSESSMENT

- 4.1. Not applicable

5. ALTERNATIVES/OPTIONS

- 5.1. No recommendation is made. The Committee may agree starting times as it sees fit.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 6.1. None