

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Review Committee on Tuesday 16 June 2026

www.oxford.gov.uk



Committee members present:

Councillor Munkonge	Councillor Smith
Councillor Chapman (For Councillor Turner)	Councillor Yeatman
Councillor Fouweather (For Councillor Smowton)	Councillor Jupp (For Councillor Goddard)
Councillor Ottino (For Councillor Fry)	Councillor Powell (For Councillor Mundy)
Councillor Bala (For Councillor Dhall)	

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 (East)
Chloe Jacobs, Senior Planning Officer

24. Election of Chair

Councillor Munkonge was elected as Chair for this meeting.

25. Apologies for absence and substitutions

Councillors Turner, Fry, Mundy, Dhall, Smowton and Goddard sent apologies.

Substitutions are shown above.

26. Declarations of Interest

General

Councillor Powell declared that he had received numerous correspondence for the application but had no discussions and attended the meeting with an open mind.

27. Minutes

The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2026 as a true and accurate record

28. 25/01859/OUTFUL Warneford Hospital, Warneford Lane, Oxford

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a graduate college for the University of Oxford comprising Student accommodation (Sui Generis), ancillary college buildings (Sui Generis), provision of landscaping, bin and cycle parking, car parking, public realm and open space. Full application for demolition of existing buildings and partial demolition of existing walls, erection of a hospital building (Use Class C2), a research building (Use Class E(g)(ii)), a hospital research link building (C2/E(g)(ii)), and erection of relocated POWIC/SANE building (Use Class E(g)(i) and (ii)) and pavilion building. Provision of associated car parking, cycle parking, bin storage, access, landscaping, public realm works and associated infrastructure works. Refurbishment and repair of the Gate Lodge and use for residential accommodation associated with the College (Use Class Sui generis)

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 noted that the application had been considered by the Oxford City Planning Committee on 21 April 2026 where Members resolved to grant planning permission for the redevelopment of Warneford Hospital including a new mental health hospital, research centre, POWIC building and associated landscaping and works. The application had been called in on the grounds that it was considered not to comply with the requirements of policies M1 and M3 in the Local Plan.
- The full planning application sought permission for a new mental health hospital for Oxford, research and development facilities for medical research taking place at the University of Oxford, with additional space for biotech, pharmaceutical start-up companies, a new POWIC/SANE building and associated works. The outline application sought planning permission for a new student accommodation which would form part of a new graduate college for the University of Oxford focused on medical sciences, bioengineering and related disciplines.
- Officers concluded that the proposed development was acceptable in terms of both national and local development plan policies. It was not considered that the increase in parking provision would give rise to any adverse impacts that would justify refusal of the application. Officers also noted that the scheme would deliver significant public benefits across economic, social, and environmental matters which they considered should be given considerable weight when assessing the scheme as a whole, but also in relation to the grounds for the call-in.
- Officers therefore recommended that the Committee resolve to grant planning permission for the development proposed subject to the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Councillor Dhall, Siobhann Mansel-Pleydell and Hannah Kirby spoke against the application.

Heidi Johansen-Berg, Heather Smith, Karl Marlowe, Neil Marshall, Nigel Porter, Eric Parry, Helen Ensor and John Rhodes spoke in favour of the application.

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

- Concerns were raised regarding the increase in parking spaces and whether they were essential to the development. The Planning Officer explained that the research building was fundamental to the scheme, with the location of the hospital and research facilities playing a pivotal role in securing funding, supporting viability and accelerating mental health research.
- Questions were raised around the interpretation of Policy M3, particularly whether the proposal constituted a redevelopment of an existing site. The Planning Officer responded that the proposal represented an expansion of an existing use, with the hospital and parking already established on the site and that the submitted transport assessment and officer report supported this interpretation.
- There were questions raised on how the policies were interlinked and the role of the Planning Inspector for the Oxford Local Plan 2036 in the process. The Development Management Service Manager explained that the Planning Inspector had found aspects of the draft policies unclear in relation to non-residential parking and that the assessment balanced the objective of minimising parking with the operational needs of the proposed facilities.
- Concerns were raised regarding the extent of redevelopment at the hospital site and whether new uses had been kept to the minimum necessary. The Development Management Service Manager clarified that the proposal represented an expansion of existing uses and that the range of uses proposed complies with the relevant Local Plan policies.
- Concerns were raised on parking access, impacts on surrounding roads and potential congestion. The Planning Officer noted that the transport assessment had been reviewed throughout the application process and that the Highway Authority, as the statutory consultee, had concluded that the impacts would not be severe.
- There were concerns regarding hydrology and potential impacts of development on the SSSI. The Planning Officer stated that detailed drainage and ecological assessments prepared by specialists concluded there would be no adverse impacts and these findings complied with policies in the Local Plan.
- Questions were raised around the principle of introducing additional parking spaces while also proposing their reduction over time. The applicant stated that parking levels were based on detailed studies of existing travel patterns and realistic sustainable travel targets, with future reductions linked to longer-term improvements in public transport and sustainable travel options.
- Concerns were expressed about the lack of electric vehicle charging provisions within the basement area. The Planning Officer noted that the provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure within the basement could not be

supported for the reasons set out in the report. However, a condition had been added to the consent to mitigate the impact where possible.

- Concerns were raised around how the capacity issues identified in the report aligned with Policy M2, which relates to assessing and managing development in areas served by high-quality public transport. The Development Management Team Leader explained that financial contributions in section 106 had been secured to address the identified capacity constraints and to increase capacity to the level assumed within the transport assessment. The Development Management Service Manager further added that the improvements would deliver wide benefits to the transport network by increasing capacity and enhancing the service for both future occupants of the developments and other users in the area.
- Concerns were addressed regarding objections relating to highway impacts and congestion. Objectors argued that the assessment had not fully considered the harm arising from additional parking. The Planning Officer stated that the Highway Authority had assessed the proposal and concluded that impacts on the network would not be severe, subject to mitigation measures set out in the recommendations.

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

The Planning Review 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 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. **Agree to delegate authority** to the Director of Planning and Regulation to:
 - seek amended plans to show:
 - The revised pedestrian route from the new north gate being diverted around the historic embankment and the 2no trees within this embankment retained. Including any updates to any related architectural, parameter or landscape plans which show these elements.
 - To show the retained trees T245 within Zone 02 and T65 within Zone 01. Including any updates to any related architectural, parameter or landscape plans which show these elements.
 - The revised pedestrian route from the new north gate, moving east – this will show a large gap for pedestrians between the car parking spaces. Including any updates to any related architectural, parameter or landscape plans which show these elements.

- seek amended technical documents to reflect the above changes including:
 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment
 - Landscaping and Planting Character Report
 - Landscaping Management Plan
 - Delivery and Servicing Plan
 - Design and Access Statement
 - Design Code
 - Transport Assessment
 - Travel Plan

- 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
- finalise the recommended legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other enabling powers as set out in this report, 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

The meeting started at 6pm and ended at 7.55pm.

Chair

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.