

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning - Oxford City Planning Committee on Tuesday 14 July 2026

www.oxford.gov.uk



Committee members present:

Councillor Clarkson	Councillor Fouweather
Councillor Altaf-Khan	Councillor Henwood
Councillor Railton	Councillor Upton
Councillor Bala	Councillor Davis
Councillor Fry	Councillor Ottino
Councillor Powell	

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
Hayley Jeffery, Development Management Team Leader (Majors)
Robert Fowler, Development Management Team Leader (West)
Felicity Byrne, Development Management Team Leader (East)
Jennifer Coppock, Planning Officer
Emma McLeod, Planning Officer
Nia Baldwin, Planning Officer
Mary Rowe, Planning Officer

18. Apologies for absence

Councillors Corais, Rawle and Taylor sent apologies.

19. Declarations of interest

General

For 24/01104/FUL, Councillor Fouweather declared that he had been involved in the call-in relating to the application and that he would withdraw from the meeting for this item, observe from the public gallery and rejoin the meeting after.

For 25/01588/FUL and 26/01199/LBC, Councillor Henwood declared that he would recuse himself for the consideration of these items based on his view of Littlemore Parish and rejoin the meeting after.

For 25/01588/FUL and 26/01199/LBC, Councillor Railton declared that she had attended a drop-in session on the sites but had not taken part in any discussion or expressed a view of the applications.

For 24/01104/FUL, Councillor Railton declared that she would withdraw from the meeting for this item and rejoin the meeting after.

For 25/01588/FUL, Councillor Upton declared that she attended presentations at which the community was being consulted to provide feedback before any plans had been finalised and that she did not consider this to have predetermined her view. She also declared that she was a member of the Oxford Preservation Trust and Civic Society, both of which had made comments on the application, but she had taken no part in any related discussions.

For 25/01588/FUL, Councillor Ottino declared that he had attended a presentation relating to the site but had not taken part in any discussions

20. Minutes

The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2026 as a true and accurate record.

21. 25/01588/FUL Ozone Leisure Park, Grenoble Road

Councillor Henwood left the meeting.

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of existing commercial and leisure buildings (Class E/Sui Generis) and erection of a phased redevelopment of the site comprising of mixed use R&D laboratories (Class E(g)) with active ground floor uses (Class E), restoration of Grade II* Listed Minchery Priory public house (sui generis), construction of community leisure building (sui generis), construction of Cowley Branch Line mobility hub, construction of electrical substation, hard and soft amenity and biodiversity landscape and public realm and other supporting or ancillary works and infrastructure including access and servicing (amended certificate of ownership). (Amended plans and documents).

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

- The Planning Officer provided a verbal update to Committee, noting that since the publication of the report, an objection had been received from the Oxford Civic Society. The objection related to the balance between employment and housing across the Kassam Stadium and Overflow Car Park sites, the emerging Local Plan requirement for a master plan led approach, the proposed building

heights, parking provision and the impact on neighbouring residents. The Planning Officer explained that the redevelopment was considered acceptable and in accordance with the NPPF and adopted and emerging local policies. While the emerging Local Plan promoted a comprehensive masterplan, limited weight could be given to it at this stage and a piecemeal approach could not be resisted in advance of its adoption.

- In response to the concerns about parking, the Planning Officer confirmed that the 520 parking spaces outside the applications line boundary, secured through the section 106 legal agreement, would be reduced to 347. The Car Park Management Plan would limit car mode share to 33% on day one, reducing to 20% once the Cowley Branch line became operational. An additional clause within the section 106 would also allow parking provision to be reduced further.
- The Planning Officer also addressed concerns regarding the proposed building heights, advising that the reduced heights, massing and improved articulation enabled the development to better relate to its surroundings. Verified view assessments concluded that the proposal would not result in unacceptable visual or residential amenity impacts. Heritage officers found no harm to the setting of the Central Conservation Area or the Littlemore Conservation Area, with only a low to moderate level of less than substantial harm identified to the setting of Minchery Farmhouse.
- Concerns regarding the impact of Building A on residents of the Minchery Farm Cottages were addressed by referring to the separation distance of approximately 73 metres, existing vegetation between the sites and the findings of the daylight and sunlight assessment, which concluded that neighbouring privacy and sunlight would not be unacceptably affected. Officers considered these matters had been adequately addressed through the report, planning conditions and section 106.
- The Planning Officer updated Committee on the Environment Agency's objection, confirming that discussions had taken place and it had been agreed the objection could be resolved through amendments to the landscaping scheme. Discussions remained ongoing but officers were confident the objection would be withdrawn.
- Finally, the Planning Officer confirmed that the proposal would not harm protected species, would achieve 10% Biodiversity Net Gain through on and off-site enhancements, deliver a 40% reduction in carbon emissions and would be subject to conditions to address flooding, drainage, contamination, noise pollution and air quality. The development was therefore considered to respond appropriately to the site context and Local Plan policies and approval was recommended, subject to the 106 legal agreement, resolution of the EA's objection, finalisation of financial contributions and planning conditions.

Sally Coble spoke against the application.

Jonathan Bainbridge and James Latham spoke in favour of the application.

The Committee asked questions about the details of the application which were responded to by officers and, through the Chair, the applicant. The Committee's discussions included, but were not limited to:

- Concerns were raised regarding the ecological buffer zone from Littlemore Brook and the EA's outstanding objection. The Planning Officer explained that the proposal reduced hardstanding within the 10m buffer zone and increased soft landscaping, representing an improvement over the existing situation. However, the EA sought full reinstatement of the buffer zone and had identified landscape amendment that could resolve its objection. Habitat concerns had previously been addressed.
- Questions were raised around the financial viability of the reduced bowling facility. The applicant explained that leisure consultants had undertaken market testing with operators throughout the feasibility process, with interest expressed by several operators, ensuring the proposal reflected current market demand.
- Questions were asked around the proposed grasscrete surfaces and their suitability for cyclists. The Planning Officer confirmed that the scheme had been amended following Highway Authority comments to provide smoother cycling routes, with further consideration being given to reducing grasscrete where appropriate. The Highway Authority were satisfied with the revised proposal.
- Questions were asked around the loss of car parking spaces due to the substation. The Planning Officer confirmed that the existing main car park lay outside the red line boundary, hotel parking would be retained and access would continue to be managed through an automatic number plate recognition.
- Questions were raised regarding the impact of the development on neighbouring solar panels. The Development Management Team Leader (Majors) explained that solar panel impacts were a material planning consideration but concluded there was no evidence of unacceptable impacts. The environmental benefits of the proposal outweighed any potential effect and there were no planning grounds for refusal on this basis.
- Concerns were raised regarding whether the development would appear overbearing to neighbouring properties. The Planning Officer noted that the assessment considered separation distances, daylight and sunlight impacts, vegetation and overall residential amenity, concluding that no material adverse impact would arise.
- Questions were raised around whether future changes to the community floorspace secured by the S106 agreement would return to Planning Committee. The Development Management Service Manager confirmed that it would depend on the Council's constitution but an informative could be added that any applications for significant alterations to the S106 agreement be notified to the Chair of Planning Committee.
- Questions were raised around how community engagement would influence the future community floorspace. The Planning Officer responded that there had been public consultation which was part of the application process and future uses would be developed through the section 106 agreement in consultation with the council's economic development team to ensure they met local community needs.

On being proposed, seconded, and put to the vote, the Committee agreed with the officer's recommendation to approve the application for the reasons set out in the report and subject to conditions and a legal agreement.

The Oxford City Planning Committee resolved to:

1. **Approve the application** for the reasons given in the report and subject to the required planning conditions set out in section 12 of this report and grant planning permission; and subject to:
 - the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other enabling powers to secure the planning obligations set out in the recommended heads of terms which are set out in this report; and
2. **Delegate authority** to the Director of Planning and Regulation to:
 - finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Director of Planning and Regulation considers reasonably necessary; and
 - resolve the outstanding objection made by the Environment Agency in relation to the 10m ecological buffer zone from the Littlemore Brook; and
 - finalise the recommended legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other enabling powers including refining, adding to, amending and/or deleting the obligations detailed in the heads of terms set out in this report (including to dovetail with and where appropriate, reinforce the final conditions and informatives to be attached to the planning permission) as the Director of Planning and Regulation considers reasonably necessary; and
 - complete the section 106 legal agreement referred to above and issue the planning permission.

22. 26/01199/LBC Minchery Farm Club, Minchery Farm Lane, Oxford, Oxfordshire

The Committee considered an application for the external and internal alterations to include removal of modern fittings, fixtures, and partitions; the stripping back of incompatible modern finishes; urgent repair works to improve the weather-tightness and ventilation of the building; and targeted structural opening-up works.

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

- The application was for Listed Building Consent relating to the Grade II* listed Minchery Farmhouse located in the southwestern corner of the Ozone Leisure site, which had just been considered as part of the main redevelopment proposal. As part of the wider redevelopment, the applicant committed to bringing forward a listed building consent application to return the building, which had been vacant for 13 years and was included on Historic England's Heritage Risk Register, to a long-term sustainable use.
- This application did not fulfil that commitment in full but represented the first step towards the outcome. This included the removal of modern fixtures, finishes and redundant services, targeted opening up works to enable structural assessment and structural support, replacement of temporary boarding with security grilles to improve ventilation and associated making good works.

- The work would improve the understanding of the buildings condition and historic fabric, inform future repair proposals, allowing the building to dry out naturally and address urgent risks. While there were some minor levels of less than substantial harm, this was considered justified and could be appropriately controlled through planning conditions.
- Overall, the works were considered to preserve the significance of the listed building and it was recommended that listed building consent be granted, subject to the conditions set out in section 12 of the report.

The Committee asked questions about the details of the application which were responded to by officers.

On being proposed, seconded, and put to the vote, the Committee agreed with the officer's recommendation to approve the application for the reasons set out in the report.

The Oxford City Planning Committee resolved to:

1. **Approve the application** for the reasons given in the report and subject to the recommended listed building conditions set out in section 12 of this report, grant listed building consent and
2. **Agree to delegate authority** to the Director of Planning and Regulation to:
 - Finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Director of Planning and Regulation considers reasonably necessary.

23. 24/01104/FUL 35 Ash Grove, Oxford, Oxfordshire, OX3 9JN

Councillor Henwood rejoined the meeting.

Councillor Fouweather and Railton left the meeting.

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of existing garage and rear extension. Removal of timber to front elevation and chimneys. Erection of a part single, part two storey side and rear extension. Alterations to roof to form hip to gable and insertion of rooflights in association with a loft conversion. Insertion of window to side elevation. Installation of flue, pipework and air conditioning unit. Alterations to landscaping and installation of nesting boxes and dropped kerb (Retrospective). (Additional noise impact assessment).

The Planning Officer gave a presentation outlining the details of the location and the development. This included existing elevations and plans:

- The Planning Officer provided a verbal update noting that paragraph 2.3 of the published report should be disregarded, as it had been included in error from a previous draft and was no longer relevant. References to the development being contrary to Policies M3 and RE8 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 in relation to

parking and noise were removed. The report's conclusions on neighbouring amenity and transport remained unchanged.

- The application sought retrospective planning permission for extensions and alterations to a single dwelling house at 35 Ash Grove. The proposal included the demolition of the existing garage and rear extension, the erection of a part single, part two storey side and rear extension, as well as roof alterations to form a hip to gable with rooflights for a loft conversion, the installation of a window, flue pipe, nesting boxes, a dropped kerb, an air conditioning unit and associated landscaping works.
- The development was considered acceptable in terms of design and would not harm the character or appearance of the dwelling or on the street scene of Ash Grove. It was also found to have no unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity, parking, highway safety, drainage, trees, sustainability or ecology. The development was therefore considered to comply with the relevant policies of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 and the NPPF.

Matthew Mainstone spoke against the application.

Councillor Snowton and Eric Huy Nguyen spoke in favour of the application.

The Committee asked questions about the details of the application which were responded to by officers and, through the Chair, the applicant. The Committee's discussions included, but were not limited to:

- Concerns were raised regarding the differences between the current and previous application. The Planning Officer clarified that the application had been assessed on its own merits and concluded that the extensions remained proportionate and subservient to the original dwelling, with sufficient visual separation and an acceptable level of subservience despite the reduced set down of the rear extension.
- Questions were raised around the drainage condition and how compliance would be secured given that the development had already been built. The Development Management Service Manager explained that the condition was a standard requirement for householder developments and would be enforced through planning enforcement. It was also confirmed that delegated authority could be used to amend the wording of the condition to require confirmation that sustainable drainage measures had been implemented.
- Concerns were raised regarding the assessment of loss of light to a neighbouring window. The Planning Officer confirmed that, although the proposal contravened the 45-degree guideline, the assessment also considered other material planning considerations and concluded that impact did not justify refusal.
- Concerns were raised regarding the impact on neighbouring amenity, including noise from the air conditioning unit, kitchen extract, overlooking and privacy. The Development Management Service Manager confirmed that these matters had been fully assessed and were considered acceptable as set out in the report.
- Questions were raised around the replacement tree and how compliance could be monitored. The Development Management Service Manager confirmed that a

planning condition required details of the replacement tree to be submitted and implemented within a specified timeframe, enabling the local planning authority to monitor and enforce compliance. It was also confirmed that delegated authority could be used to amend the wording of the condition to require confirmation photographic evidence that the replacement tree had been planted.

- Questions were raised around whether a Tree Preservation order could be applied to the replacement tree. The Development Management Team Leader (East) noted that this would not normally be appropriate for a tree within a private garden.

On being proposed, seconded, and put to the vote, the Committee agreed with the officer's recommendation to approve the application for the reasons set out in the report.

The Oxford City Planning Committee resolved to:

1. **Approve the application** for the reasons given in the report and subject to the required planning conditions set out in section 12 of this report and grant planning permission.
2. **Agree to delegate authority** to the Director of Planning and Regulation to:
 - finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Director of Planning and Regulation considers reasonably necessary.

24. 26/00786/FUL 11 Glebelands, Oxford, Oxfordshire, OX3 7EL

Councillor Fouweather and Councillor Railton rejoined the meeting

The Committee considered an application for the change of use from dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a large House in Multiple Occupation (Sui Generis). Provision of cycle and bin storage and landscaping. (Amended plans. Part retrospective)

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

- The proposed development was a called in delegated application seeking permission for the change of use from a C3 dwellinghouse to a Sui Generis House in Multiple Occupation, including the provision cycle and bin stores.
- The application was assessed against Policy H6 relating to HMO density and complied with the requirement of less than 20% HMO density within 100 metres of the property. It also met internal space standards and external amenity requirements.
- The Highway Authority raised no objections, subject to the property being excluded from the residents' parking scheme.
- Officers concluded that the proposal was acceptable, complied with the development plan when considered as a whole and therefore recommended for approval.

Councillor Harley and Barbara Pomroy spoke against the application.

The Committee asked questions about the details of the application which were responded to by officers. The Committee's discussions included, but were not limited to:

- Concerns were raised regarding the potential impact on parking outside controlled parking hours and whether changes to the parking scheme would affect permit eligibility. The Development Management Team Leader (East) confirmed that the property would be excluded from the residents' parking permit scheme, which the Oxfordshire County Council considered sufficient to mitigate parking impacts.
- Questions were raised around how drainage arrangements would be monitored. The Planning Officer explained that the proposal did not increase built floorspace and that drainage requirements related to the previous application. Surface water from the bin stores would drain into gravelled soakaway area with no impact on the Lye Valley SSI.
- Concerns were raised regarding the number of bedrooms and occupants within the HMO. The Development Management Service Manager responded that the plan provided for eight bedrooms accommodating eight occupants and that the proposal complied with the relevant space standards and HMO density policy. The number of occupants is controlled via the HMO licence.

On being proposed, seconded, and put to the vote, the Committee agreed with the officer's recommendation to approve the application for the reasons set out in the report.

The Oxford City Planning Committee resolved to:

1. **Approve the application** for the reasons given in the report and subject to the required planning conditions set out in section 12 of this report and grant planning permission; and
2. **Agree to delegate authority** to the Director of Planning and Regulation to:
 - finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Director of Planning and Regulation considers reasonably necessary;
 - issue the planning permission.

25. 26/00712/FUL 137 Hurst Street, Oxford, Oxfordshire OX4 1H

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of existing garage. Erection of a single storey side and rear extension with provision of cycle storage. Alterations to fenestration and colour-blocking brickwork to side and rear. Installation of canopy overhang to side and rear. Associated landscaping (Amended description and additional information)

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

- This report considered a proposal for the demolition of an existing garage and rear storage and the erection of a single storey side and rear extension. The proposal also included alterations to fenestration, colour blocking of brickwork to the side and rear, the installation of small canopies and associated landscaping.
- The proposed development was considered acceptable in terms of design and following amendments to the front facing materials, would not cause harm on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene. It would not have resulted in unacceptable impacts on neighbouring amenity, drainage, ecology, parking or highway safety. It was therefore considered compliant with the policies of the Oxford Local Plan and the NPPF.
- Officers concluded that the proposal accorded with the development plan when considered as a whole and having regard to all material considerations, recommend that planning permission be granted.

No further questions.

On being proposed, seconded, and put to the vote, the Committee agreed with the officer's recommendation to approve the application for the reasons set out in the report.

The Oxford City Planning Committee resolved to:

1. **Approve the application** for the reasons given in the report and subject to the required planning conditions set out in section 12 of this report and grant planning permission.
2. **Agree to delegate authority** to the Director of Planning and Regulation to:
 - finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Director of Planning and Regulation considers reasonably necessary.
 - And issue the planning permission

26. Forthcoming applications

The Committee noted the list of forthcoming applications.

27. Dates of future meetings

The Committee noted the dates of future meetings.

The meeting started at 6pm and ended at 9.20pm.

Chair

Date: Tuesday 25 August 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.