

Cherwell District Council

Planning Committee

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held at 39 Castle Quay,
Banbury, OX16 5FD, on 15 January 2026 at 4.00 pm

Present:

Councillor Barry Wood (Chair)
Councillor Amanda Watkins (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Chris Brant
Councillor John Broad
Councillor Phil Chapman
Councillor Becky Clarke MBE
Councillor Dr Isabel Creed
Councillor Ian Harwood
Councillor David Hingley
Councillor Fiona Mawson
Councillor Lesley McLean
Councillor Robert Parkinson
Councillor Chris Pruden
Councillor David Rogers
Councillor Les Sibley
Councillor Dr Kerrie Thornhill
Councillor Douglas Webb

Substitute Members:

Councillor Rob Pattenden (In place of Councillor Jean Conway)

Apologies for absence:

Councillor Jean Conway

Officers:

Paul Seckington, Head of Development Management
Andy Bateson, Team Leader - North Area Major Developments
Carlos Chikwamba, Principal Planning Officer
Rob Duckworth, Principal Planning Officer
Denzil Turbervill, Head of Legal Services
Matt Swinford, Democratic and Elections Officer
Martyn Surfleet, Democratic and Elections Officer
Ian Boll, Executive Director Place & Regeneration
Nick Wyke, Principal Planning Officer

Officers Attending Virtually:

Thomas Webster, Principal Planning Officer

81 **Declarations of Interest**

8. Part OS Parcel 0006 North Of The Moors Kidlington.

Councillor Fiona Mawson, Other Registerable Interest, as a member of Kidlington Parish Council which had been consulted on the application.

Councillor Lesley McLean, Other Registerable Interest, as a member of Kidlington Parish Council which had been consulted on the application.

9. 7 Lock Crescent, Kidlington, OX5 1HD.

Councillor Fiona Mawson, Other Registerable Interest, as a member of Kidlington Parish Council which had been consulted on the application.

Councillor Lesley McLean, Other Registerable Interest, as a member of Kidlington Parish Council which had been consulted on the application.

82 **Requests to Address the Meeting**

The Chair advised that requests to address the meeting would be dealt with at each item.

83 **Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 4 December 2025 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

84 **Chair's Announcements**

1. The Chair reminded members of the public that only registered speakers were entitled to speak at the committee meeting at the time instructed by the Chair and members of the public should remain quiet during the meeting and not cause disturbance.
2. The Chair reminded Members to stay in their seats for the whole agenda item and if a member left the meeting for whatever reason, they should consider abstaining from the vote as they would not have been present for the whole agenda item.

85 **Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

86 **Proposed Pre-Committee Site Visits (if any)**

There were no proposed pre-committee site visits.

In response to a question from the Committee, the Head of Development Management confirmed that site visits would be arranged around the time that an application would be heard at a Planning committee meeting.

87 **Part OS Parcel 0006 North Of The Moors Kidlington**

The Committee considered application 25/01346/OUT, an outline application with All Matters Reserved (except means of access) for up to 340 dwellings (Use Class C3), land for local community use and pavilion, landscaping, public open space, and associated infrastructure, including demolition of 162 The Moors to enable all modes of access at Part OS Parcel 0006 North Of The Moors Kidlington for Harper Crewe Bloombridge Ltd.

Councillor Dorothy Walker addressed the Committee as a Local Ward Member.

Professor Daphne Hampson, on behalf of Campaign to Save the Land Behind the Moors, David Robey, Vice-Chair of Kidlington Parish Council and Dr Lisa Smith, on behalf of Campaign to Save the Land Behind the Moors, addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

Laura Bisbey, on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

It was proposed by Councillor McLean and seconded by Councillor Broad that application 25/01346/OUT be refused, against the officer's recommendation, as the application site strongly contributes to the purposes of the greenbelt and the development would be inappropriate development, and due to substantial harm to the setting of heritage assets close to the application site and to the character of the landscape which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal and therefore would be contrary to policies BSC3, BSC7, BSC8, BSC10-12, SLE4, INF1 ESD13, ESD14, ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan (2015), and saved policies H18, C23 and C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan (1996). (exact wording for reasons for refusal to be delegated to officers).

In reaching its decision the Committee considered the officer's report and presentation, the addresses by public speakers and the written updates.

Resolved

That, contrary to the officer's recommendation, application 25/01346/OUT be refused for the reasons below.

1. Green Belt

The proposed development is unacceptable in principle because the site strongly contributes to the Green Belt and to purposes a and d of paragraph 143 of the NPPF, and the application of heritage policies would provide a strong reason to refuse the development. Therefore, the proposed development is not considered to meet the definition of Green Belt and the proposal cannot therefore be considered appropriate development under paragraph 155 of the NPPF. There are no other exceptions to Development in the Green Belt set out in local and national policies that would enable the development to be considered appropriate, and the proposal also conflicts with purpose c of paragraph 143 of the NPPF. In the absence of a very special circumstances case, the development is considered to be inappropriate development which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and harm to openness and the proposal is therefore, contrary to Section 13 of the NPPF, Policy ESD 14 of the Cherwell Local Plan (2015) and Policy COM 12 of the Cherwell Local Review (2042).

2. Heritage and Landscape

The proposal introduces an urban form of development that would significantly erode the established rural and historic setting and character of the site's existing countryside landscape. The site lies within open countryside characterised by undeveloped rural arable and publicly accessible land providing views towards the Grade I Listed St Mary's Church and the adjacent church street conservation area, therefore, contributing significantly to the significance of adjacent heritage assets. The introduction of a large scale urban development would significantly alter the site's rural character and historic landscape setting, resulting in significant harm to the landscape and heritage assets. The development would therefore fail to enhance and preserve the setting of heritage assets, and it would also fail to protect or reinforce the intrinsic character of the countryside landscape. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies ESD 13 and ESD 15 of the Cherwell Local Plan (2015), Policies C23 and C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan Saved Policies (1996) and Policies LEC 7, COM 10, COM 26, 27 and 28 of the Cherwell Local Plan Review (2042) and Government guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework. The Local Planning Authority consider that such harmful landscape and heritage impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits associated with the proposal.

3. Infrastructure

In the absence of a signed unilateral undertaking or any other form of Section 106 legal agreement the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the proposed development provides for appropriate infrastructure provisions and contributions related to affordable housing, open space, highways, education, health and other social infrastructure, necessary to make the impacts of the development acceptable in planning terms. The proposal therefore runs contrary to Policies, BSC 3, BSC 7, BSC8, BSC 10-12, SLE 4 INF1 of the Cherwell Local Plan (2015) and Policies CSD 22-23,

COM 2, COM 15 -17 COM 20-21, COM 23-24 of the Cherwell Local Plan Review (2042), Cherwell District Council's Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (2018) and Government guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.

88

7 Lock Crescent, Kidlington, OX5 1HD

The Committee considered application 25/02114/F, for change of use from a residential dwelling (Use Class C3) to a 10 bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (Use Class Sui Generis) and associated works including installation of bike and bin stores; single storey rear extension at 7 Lock Crescent, Kidlington, OX5 1HD for Co-Living Capital 2 Ltd.

Councillor Ian Middleton addressed the Committee as Local Ward Member.

Alan Blunsdon, a local resident, addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

David Granat, the applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

It was proposed by Councillor Dr Thornhill and seconded by Councillor Watkins that the application be approved with amended wording to the parking condition to secure at least five car parking spaces and additional parking conditions relating to drainage and restriction of occupancy to 1 occupant per room.

In reaching its decision the Committee considered the officer's report and presentation, the addresses by public speakers and the written updates.

Resolved

That, in line with the officer's recommendation, authority be delegated to the Assistant Director for Planning to grant permission for application 25/02114/F subject to the conditions set out below (and any amendments to those conditions as deemed necessary).

Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the application form and the following plans and documents:

- Existing Plans and Elevations 101

- Proposed Plans OXL-2512-103 F
- Lock Crescent OXL-2512-201 B Rev B Site Plan
- Lock Crescent OXL-2512-202 Rev A SLP and Block
- Lock Crescent OXL-2512-203 Rev A
- LOCK CRESCENT- REVISED FULL SCHEME- OXL-2512-201 REV A
Proposed Floor Plans

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, to ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the local planning authority and comply with government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. Notwithstanding the details submitted, prior to the first use/occupation of the development hereby approved details of proposed parking and access for more than five vehicles to be accommodated within the site (including details of the proposed surfacing and drainage of the provision), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved parking area shall be laid out and completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first use/occupation of the development hereby approved. The car parking spaces shall be retained for the parking of vehicles at all times for the life of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, to ensure the provision of adequate off-street car parking and to comply with Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 and government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Prior to the first use or occupation of the development hereby permitted, covered cycle parking facilities shall be provided on the site in accordance with details which shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning authority. The covered cycle parking facilities so provided shall thereafter be permanently retained and maintained for the parking of cycles in connection with the development.

Reason: In the interests of promoting sustainable transport modes in accordance with Policy ESD1 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 and government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The development shall be occupied until a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul and surface water drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning authority. The drainage scheme shall demonstrate how the development will not worsen the current outflows and discharge rates of the site, with betterment being encouraged. The drainage works shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans before the first occupation of any of the buildings/dwellings hereby approved and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory drainage of the site in the interests of achieving sustainable development, public health, to avoid flooding of adjacent land and property to comply with Policy ESD6 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, saved Policy ENV1 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. Prior to the first use/occupation of the premises as a House in Multiple Occupation, details of refuse and recycling storage (including siting, enclosure/screening and capacity) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved refuse and recycling storage shall be provided prior to first occupation as a House in Multiple Occupation and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory refuse storage and collection arrangements, to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the appearance of the area in accordance with Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, saved Policy ENV1 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until details of how Secured by Design measures have been incorporated into the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt the details of how the scheme accords with the secure by design principles shall include: details of all bedroom doors being certified to PAS24, with a door viewer installed; details of a secure postal strategy; and details of a visitor notification system (doorbell) for each bedroom. The Secure by Design measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved detail and be retained and maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to ensure the safety and security of any future occupants of the site and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

8. The House in Multiple Occupation, hereby approved, shall only be let as a single room occupancy to limit the tenant numbers to not more than 10 persons.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities and character of the area, in the interests of highway safety and to comply with Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, saved Policy C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Committee considered application 21/03268/OUT, an outline planning application (all matters reserved except for access) for the erection of buildings comprising logistics (Use Class B8) and ancillary Office (Use Class E(g)(i)) floorspace; construction of new site access from the B4100; creation of internal roads and access routes; hard and soft landscaping including noise attenuation measures; and other associated infrastructure at OS Parcel 2636 NW Of Baynards House Ardley Green Farm Street To Horwell Farm Baynards Green for Albion Land.

Nick Barnes, Chair of Stoke Lyne Parish Council, addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

Emma Lancaster, agent on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Committee meeting in support of the application.

It was proposed by Councillor Parkinson and seconded by Councillor Broad that application 21/03268/OUT be refused, against officer recommendation, as the proposed development would result in unjustified urbanisation of a currently open and rural site and fail to respect or reinforce the established rural character, appearance, and intrinsic qualities of the locality and the proposal was contrary to policies ESD13 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011–2031, saved Policies C8 and C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and the National Planning Policy Framework with the exact wording for the reasons for refusal to be delegated to officers.

In reaching its decision the Committee considered the officer's report and presentation, the addresses by public speakers and the written updates.

Resolved

That, contrary to the officer's recommendation, application 21/03268/OUT be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would result in the unjustified urbanisation of a currently open and rural site, introducing built form of significant scale, bulk and massing that would appear visually intrusive within the wider landscape. The proposal would fail to respect or reinforce the established rural character, appearance, and intrinsic qualities of the locality. Its scale, siting and form would give rise to a harmful visual impact, resulting in a prominent and enduring intrusion that would cause severe and irrevocable harm to the landscape. For these reasons, the proposal is contrary to Policies ESD13 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011–2031, saved Policies C8 and C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996, and the principles of good design and landscape protection set out within the National Planning Policy Framework. The Local Planning Authority considers that the extent of landscape harm arising from the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits associated with the proposal.
2. In the absence of a satisfactory unilateral undertaking or any other form of Section 106 planning obligation legal agreement, the Local Planning

Authority is not satisfied that the proposed development would provide appropriate transport infrastructure and landscape and ecological mitigation required as a direct result of the development, and which would be necessary to make the impacts of the development acceptable in planning terms. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy INF1 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031, Cherwell District Council's Developer Contributions SPD 2018 and Government guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.

90

O.S. Parcel 0006 South East Of Baynards House Adjoining A43 Baynards Green

The Committee considered application 21/03266/F for Site clearance, construction of new site access from the B4100, permanent and temporary internal roads, an internal roundabout and a foul drainage station, diversion of an existing overhead power cable and public right of way, and soft landscaping at O.S. Parcel 0006 South East of Baynards House Adjoining A43 Baynards Green for Albion Land.

It was proposed by Councillor Wood and seconded by Councillor Parkinson that application 21/03266/F be refused, against officer recommendation, as the proposed development would cause unacceptable visual harm and an erosion of the rural landscape character as well as unnecessary ecological harm and the proposal was contrary to policies ESD10 and ESD13 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011–2031 and national guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework with the exact wording for the reasons for refusal to be delegated to officers.

In reaching its decision the Committee considered the officer's report and presentation, the addresses by public speakers and the written updates.

Resolved

That, contrary to the officer's recommendation, application 21/03266/F be refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed access and internal road would require the removal of part of the established roadside hedgerow, resulting in unacceptable visual harm and an erosion of the rural landscape character, as well as unnecessary ecological harm through the loss of habitat and green-corridor connectivity. As there is no approved development that the access would serve, this harm would occur without any corresponding planning benefit, and is therefore unjustified. The proposal is contrary to Policies ESD10 and ESD13 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011–2031 and national guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.

91 **OS Parcel 0006 South East Of Baynards House Adjoining A43 Baynards Green**

The Committee considered application 21/03267/OUT, an application for outline planning permission (all matters reserved except for access) for the erection of buildings comprising logistics (Use Class B8) and ancillary Office (Use Class E(g)(i)) floorspace and associated infrastructure; construction of new site access from the B4100; creation of internal roads and access routes; and hard and soft landscaping at OS Parcel 0006 South East Of Baynards House Adjoining A43 Baynards Green for Albion Land.

Emma Lancaster, agent on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Committee meeting in support of the application.

It was proposed by Councillor Parkinson and seconded by Councillor Rogers that application 21/03267/OUT be refused, against officer recommendation, as the proposed development would result in unjustified encroachment into open countryside and cause unacceptable landscape harm and development would fail to protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity and the proposal was contrary to policies of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011–2031, saved Policies C8 and C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996, and Government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework with the exact wording for the reasons for refusal to be delegated to officers.

In reaching its decision the Committee considered the officer's report and presentation, the addresses by public speakers and the written updates.

Resolved

That, contrary to the officer's recommendation, application 21/03267/OUT be reused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, due to its scale, massing and bulky form, would appear as a prominent and visually intrusive feature within this open countryside location, eroding the rural character of the landscape and blocking established views across the central Cherwell area and towards Stoke Wood. The scheme represents sporadic and incongruous development remote from any settlement and fails to demonstrate compatibility with, or integration into, its rural surroundings. As such, the proposal would result in unjustified encroachment into open countryside and cause unacceptable landscape harm, contrary to Policies ESD13 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011–2031, saved Policies C8 and C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996, and Government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Local Planning Authority considers that this harm would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal.
2. The site lies adjacent to ecological corridors used by bats, birds and small mammals moving between the surrounding countryside and

Stoke Wood, an ecologically significant and Woodland Trust–managed site. The extensive built form, associated lighting and activity would disrupt these established flight paths and wildlife movements, and the proposal does not adequately demonstrate that such impacts would be avoided or mitigated. The hedgerows surrounding the site also represent important biodiversity features that would be adversely affected. The development therefore fails to protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity. As such the proposal fails to accord with policy ESD10 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. The Local Planning Authority consider that such harmful ecological impact would substantially and demonstrably outweigh the benefits associated with the proposal.

3. In the absence of a satisfactory unilateral undertaking or any other form of Section 106 planning obligation legal agreement, the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the proposed development would provide appropriate transport infrastructure and landscape and ecological mitigation required as a direct result of the development, and which would be necessary to make the impacts of the development acceptable in planning terms. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy INF1 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031, Cherwell District Council's Developer Contributions SPD 2018 and Government guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.

92

Os Parcel 6124 East Of Baynards Green Farm Street To Horwell Farm Baynards Green

The Committee considered application 22/01340/OUT, an outline planning application (all matters reserved except means of access (not internal roads) from B4100) for the erection of buildings comprising logistics (use class B8) and ancillary offices (use class e(g)(i)) floorspace; energy centre, hgv parking, construction of new site access from the B4100; creation of internal roads and access routes; hard and soft landscaping; the construction of parking and servicing areas; substations and other associated infrastructure at Os Parcel 6124 East Of Baynards Green Farm Street To Horwell Farm Baynards Green for Tritax Symmetry Ardley Ltd.

Nick Barnes, Chair of Stoke Lyne Parish Council, addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

Emma Lancaster, agent on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Committee meeting in support of the application.

It was proposed by Councillor Parkinson and seconded by Councillor Rogers that application 22/01340/OUT be refused, against officer recommendation, as the proposed development would result in substantial and harmful alteration to its appearance, character and visual qualities and the proposal was contrary to policies ESD13 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011–2031, saved Policies C8 and C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996, and

Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework with the exact wording for reasons for refusal to be delegated to officers.

In reaching its decision the Committee considered the officer's report and presentation, the addresses by public speakers and the written updates.

Resolved

That, contrary to the officer's recommendation, application 22/01340/OUT be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by reason of the exceptional height, scale, massing and expansive roof profile of the buildings, would introduce large and visually dominant structures that are wholly out of keeping with the established rural character of this part of the North Oxfordshire landscape. The site lies within open countryside characterised by traditional, undeveloped rural views and an attractive landscape setting, and the introduction of buildings of this magnitude would result in substantial and harmful alteration to its appearance, character and visual qualities. The development would therefore cause significant and detrimental landscape and visual harm, would fail to integrate with its rural surroundings, and would not protect or reinforce the intrinsic character of the countryside. As such, the proposal conflicts with Policies ESD13 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011–2031, saved Policies C8 and C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996, and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. The Local Planning Authority consider that such harmful environmental impact would substantially and demonstrably outweigh the benefits associated with the proposal.
2. In the absence of a satisfactory unilateral undertaking or any other form of Section 106 planning obligation legal agreement, the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the proposed development would provide appropriate transport infrastructure and landscape and ecological mitigation required as a direct result of the development, and which would be necessary to make the impacts of the development acceptable in planning terms. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy INF1 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031, Cherwell District Council's Developer Contributions SPD 2018 and Government guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appeals Progress Report

It was proposed by Councillor Wood and seconded by Councillor Hingley that due to the already excessive length of the meeting, consideration of the Appeals Progress Report be deferred for one planning cycle, to the scheduled meeting on 12 February 2026, to allow for full consideration by the Committee. On being put to the vote the motion was carried.

Resolved

That consideration of the Appeals Progress Report be deferred to the next scheduled Planning Committee meeting on 12 February 2026.

The meeting ended at 11.15 pm

Chair:

Date: