



SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Planning Committee

23 July 2026

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title
16	Page 2	Public Speakers
16	Pages 3 - 6	Written Updates

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Matt Swinford / Martyn Surfleet, Democratic and Elections democracy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk, 01295 221534

Planning Committee 23 July 2026 – Public Speakers

Agenda Item	Application Number	Application Address	Ward Member	Speaker – Objector	Speaker – Support
12	25/03234/OUT	Land To The East Of Claydon Road, Cropredy	None	Geoff Scammans on behalf of Keep Cropredy Rural Jacqui Smith, Vice Chair of Cropredy Parish Council	Paul Galgey, agent on behalf of applicant
13	25/02895/OUT	Land Adjoining And West Of Bloxham Recreation Ground, South Newington Road, Bloxham	Cllr Rob Pattenden	Neil Homer, on behalf of Bloxham Parish Council Adrian Burton, local resident	Eleanor Gingell, agent on behalf of applicant
14	25/02918/OUT	Land At Islip Fuel Depot, Adjoining Oxford to Bicester Railway, Bletchington Road, Islip	None	Dennis Price, Chair, and Andrew Smith, Vice-Chair, Islip Parish Council	Sarah Butterfield agent on behalf of applicant
15	25/02863/OUT	Part Of Os Parcels 1864 And 3655 South West Of Milestone Farm, Broughton Road, Banbury	Cllr Kieron Mallon	None	Richard West, agent on behalf of applicant

CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE- 23 JULY 2026

WRITTEN UPDATES

Agenda Item 8
Planning Performance Report

No update

Agenda item 9
Appeals Progress Report

No update

Agenda item 10
Planning Enforcement Report

No update

Agenda item 11
Campsfield Immigration Removal Centre (IRC) Evenlode Crescent Kidlington OX5
1GN – 26/01402/CROWN

No update

Agenda Item 12
Application No: 25/03234/OUT
Site Name: Land To The East Of Claydon Road, Cropredy

Additional comments have been received:

CDC CONSERVATION OFFICER: **no objection**, overall, the proposal is not considered to result in harm to the significance to either of the conservation areas as a result of development within their setting

CANAL AND RIVERS TRUST: **no objection**, subject to conditions and consideration of S.106 contribution towards towpath improvements.

CDC ECOLOGY: **no objection**, the outstanding breeding birds survey has been submitted and there is no objection on all ecological matters subject to a S.106 and conditions.

No change to the Officer recommendation

Agenda Item 13

Application No: 25/02895/OUT

Site Name: Land Adjoining And West Of Bloxham Recreation Ground

Further to para. 9.17. a date has now been agreed for the referendum for the Bloxham Neighbourhood Development Plan (BNDP) which will take place on 27 August 2026.

A correction, paragraph 9.93 the education contribution should read **£1,001,929** instead of £960,298.

The applicant initially raised concerns about the contribution saying the figure was not fully justified. However, David Wilson Homes have stated

'that as a responsible housebuilder, we recognise local concerns in relation to the capacity at the Local Primary school to serve the cumulative impacts of developments in Bloxham. We have carefully considered our position and formally withdraw our objection to this amount'

which now for the avoidance of doubt is £1,001, 929.

Paragraph 9.96 the sentence should read the applicants would like the contribution to be spent in Bloxham, the is agreed in principle subject to agreeing wording with the ICB.

Bloxham Parish Council have submitted details of two appeals were dismissed largely on the strength of the emerging Neighbourhood Plans. The Plans had not yet been the subject of a Referendum at the time of the appeals however the Plans were given substantial weight by both Inspectors.

In the Burghclere (Harts Lane) Appeal APP/H1705/W/20/3248187, the Inspector found:

- The neighbourhood plan had been examined and was proceeding to referendum.
- It therefore attracted "**significant weight**" as an emerging plan
- The proposal conflicted with the neighbourhood plan's intended scale and location of growth.
- The Inspector concluded that the proposal would **undermine and prejudice the neighbourhood plan process** because the scheme was substantial relative to the level of growth being planned for the village.
- He gave the resulting harm "**very significant weight**" in the planning balance. importantly:
- The Council only had a 3.67–4.86 year housing supply.
- The tilted balance was engaged.
- The proposal was dismissed not simply because of neighbourhood plan conflict, but because the combined harms (landscape, neighbourhood plan conflict and prejudice to the plan-making process) significantly outweighed the benefits

In the Thorpe Appeal APP/Q3630/W/20/3253944 the Inspector also found:

- The neighbourhood plan was at an advanced stage (post Regulation 16 and heading to examination).

- The proposal conflicted with the neighbourhood plan allocation.
- Granting permission would predetermine decisions about scale and location of development and undermine the plan-making process
- The proposal was therefore considered premature.

The Inspector did not say that every conflict with an advanced neighbourhood plan attracts decisive weight. The conclusion relied on the proposal frustrating the neighbourhood plan's core strategy for growth.

With regard to Bloxham and its emerging Neighbourhood Plan, this has:

- passed examination.
- has a Decision Statement.
- is proceeding to referendum.

Therefore it sits at a very advanced stage and **significant weight** is clearly justified under the NPPF and PPG. The crucial distinction is whether the proposal would genuinely:

"predetermine decisions about the scale, location or phasing of development that are central to the emerging plan"

which is the NPPF prematurity test (para 50).

In Burghclere:

- The neighbourhood plan was planning for around 15 dwellings.
- The appeal proposal was 35 dwellings.
- The Inspector considered that to be a fundamental challenge to the neighbourhood plan's strategy.

In Bloxham:

- The emerging plan allocates several sites and establishes a settlement boundary.
- The proposal is outside that boundary and contrary to the emerging strategy.
- However Bloxham is a much larger Category A village.
- The proposal does not frustrate delivery of the allocated sites.
- Cherwell has only a 3.1-year housing land supply.
- The tilted balance remains engaged because the neighbourhood plan has not yet been made.

These are considered materially different circumstances from Thorpe and Burghclere.

It is concluded in the Bloxham case, the BNDP is at an advanced stage and has significant weight. However, the development of the site would not prejudice the overall housing strategy for Bloxham and prejudice the delivery of further sites. As such the current application is not premature and is in line with paragraph 50 of the NPPF. This was the approach taken during the determination of application 24/02541/OUT at the site on the opposite side of South Newington Road at the Committee meeting on 2 July 2026.

Agenda Item 14

Application No: 25/02918/OUT

**Land at Islip Fuel Depot, Adjoining Oxford to Bicester Railway, Bletchingdon Road,
Islip**

Officer Update: To confirm the ICB Contribution should be £197,353 and the Thames Valley Police Contribution should be £20,571 (as detailed in Paragraphs 9.174 and 9.182)

Agenda Item 15

Application No: 25/02863/OUT

**Part Of Os Parcels 1864 And 3655 South West Of Milestone Farm, Broughton Road,
Banbury**

No update