

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Review Committee on Thursday 5 February 2026

Committee members present:

Councillor Lygo	Councillor Jupp (Chair)
Councillor Goddard	Councillor Yeatman
Councillor Upton	Councillor Clarkson
Councillor Mundy	Councillor Regisford
Councillor Waite (For Councillor Smith)	

Officers present for all or part of the meeting:

Uswah Khan, Committee and Member Services Officer
Ross Chambers, Planning Lawyer
Andrew Murdoch, Development Management Service Manager
Robert Fowler, Development Management Team Leader (West)

17. Election of Chair

Councillor Jupp was elected Chair for the meeting.

18. Election of Vice-Chair

The Committee decided not to vote a Vice-Chair for the meeting.

19. Apologies for absence and substitutions

Councillor Smith sent apologies.

Substitutions are shown above.

20. Declarations of Interest

None.

21. Minutes

The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 April 2024 as a true and accurate record.

22. 25/02702/FUL Unit 11 Kings Meadow

The Committee considered an application for the change of Use from hair dressing training company with ancillary workshop (Use Class E) to a Day Nursery (Use Class E(f)). Removal of 1no. roller shutter door and insertion of 3no. windows to front elevation and alterations to existing front door. Insertion of 3no. windows to side elevation.

The Planning Officer gave a presentation outlining the details of the location and the proposal. This included site photos and existing and proposed elevations and plans.

The Planning Officer recommended that the application be refused for the reasons set out in the report. He noted that since the publication of the agenda, a statement of support had been circulated to members of the committee from the applicant. The statement outlined the reasons why the development was considered acceptable in planning terms. Officers considered the response and concluded that the issues raised had already been addressed in the Officers report. The Planning Officer further noted that although the statement suggested a revised flood risk assessment had been produced which might resolve the technical aspects of the Environment Agency objection, officers did not consider it resolved the overall issue. The site was located in flood zone 3B and the proposals were incompatible with flood risk requirements for this location. Additionally, plans for cycle parking were included within the statement. While this may have been an appropriate solution, it was not part of the original application description and would require separate planning permission. Therefore, it could not be accepted as an amendment.

Coppe Van Urk, Councillor Muddiman and Dr Jens Dopke spoke in favour of the application.

The Committee asked questions about the details of the application, which were responded to by officers and the applicant. The Committee's discussions centred on, but were not limited to, the following issues:

- Questions were raised about whether any alternative sites had been considered. The Development Management Service Manager explained that no information had been provided indicating that alternative sites were sought as part of the process. He noted that the sequential test was not needed in this instance because national policy deemed such a use as inappropriate in Flood Zone 3b . The applicant responded that they had been searching for an extended period, involving parents and reaching out to university colleges, ward councillors, schools and more. He emphasised the difficulty in finding an affordable site.
- Concerns were raised regarding traffic and safety provisions around the site. The Planning Officer clarified that the location was within a working industrial estate with deliveries occurring throughout the day, but the highway authorities had

raised no objections. From a highway safety perspective, they indicated that it was no different from a supermarket car park.

- Questions were raised about flooding and its potential impact on the site. The Development Management Service Manager stated that rainfall events in recent years had become more common. Drainage Officers highlighted that river levels in the catchment area had been high and the onset of flooding could be more sudden if there was rainfall in the various catchment areas, which could lead to flood alerts being changed quickly. He further noted that the area had been under a flood alert for a prolonged period recently. In the event of a flood alert while children were present at the nursery, evacuation would be necessary, posing challenges for safely removing children and accommodating parents picking them up. He added that flood levels in the area could exceed 600mm, significantly affecting the feasibility of flood resilience measures and potentially delaying the nursery's reopening due to the need for drying and reassessment.
- Questions were raised regarding the implications of the planning application if it were approved and what conditions would be imposed. The Development Management Service Manager responded that if members recommended approval, the Environment Agency (EA) would be informed to allow further representations. The Planning Officers would consult with the EA to determine appropriate conditions to mitigate risks. The EA had not yet indicated what conditions would be imposed but the primary concern would be the objection. The EA had raised a technical issue with the flood risk assessment, stating that it did not meet criteria as it inadequately addressed flood levels and failed to provide appropriate mitigation measures, relying solely on the flood alert scheme and an evacuation plan.

Councillor Goddard left the meeting.

On being proposed and seconded that the application be granted because the applicant had clearly demonstrated measures to avoid placing future occupants at risk and had responded clearly to questions regarding safety and addressed concerns by the EA, the proposal was subsequently put to a vote, but the vote did not pass.

On being proposed, seconded, and put to the vote, the Committee agreed with the officer's recommendation to refuse the application for the reasons listed on the report.

The Planning Review Committee resolved to:

1. **Refuse planning permission** for the application for the reasons given in paragraph 1.2 of this report and to delegate authority to the Director of Planning and Regulation to:
 - finalise the reason for refusal including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Director of Planning and Regulation considers reasonably necessary.

2. The recommended reasons for refusal are as follows:

- The proposals would involve the use of the application site for a more vulnerable use in the context of flooding in a location that falls within the defined area of highest risk of flooding (Flood Zone 3b). In addition to this the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) fails to sufficiently consider flood risk as set out in paragraphs 20 to 21 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance and its site-specific flood risk assessment checklist. The application is therefore unacceptable in the context of Policy RE3 of the Oxford Local Plan (2036), Paragraph 170 of the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
- The proposed development fails to provide adequate cycle parking for staff, parents or visitors travelling to the nursery. As a result the proposed development would be contrary to Policy M5 of the Oxford Local Plan (2036).

23. Dates of future meetings

The dates of future meetings were noted.

The meeting started at 6pm and ended at 7.25pm.

Chair

Date: Thursday 5 March 2026

When decisions take effect:

Cabinet: after the call-in and review period has expired

Planning Committees: after the call-in and review period has expired and the formal decision notice is issued

All other committees: immediately.

Details are in the Council's Constitution.