

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning - Oxford City Planning Committee on Tuesday 18 November 2025



Committee members present:

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Councillor Clarkson | Councillor Fouweather |
| Councillor Henwood | Councillor Regisford |
| Councillor Railton | Councillor Upton |
| Councillor Rehman | Councillor Kerr |
| Councillor Ottino (For Councillor Hunt) | |

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
Felicity Bryne, Development Management Team Leader (East)
Nia George, Planning Officer
Hannah Calow, Planning Officer
Mary Rowe, Planning Officer

28. Apologies for absence

Councillor Hunt sent apologies.
Substitutions are shown above.

29. Declarations of interest

General

For 25/02197/FUL, Councillor Rehman stated that he would leave the meeting for this item as he had a personal interest to the application.

For 25/00823/FUL, Councillor Rehman stated that he was part of the call-in for the application and declared he would watch from the public gallery for this item and address the committee as an objector.

For 25/00823/FUL, Councillor Henwood stated that he was part of the call-in for the application but declared that he would keep a fair and open mind during the meeting.

For 24/02890/FUL, Councillor Railton stated that that she had previously met the applicants but did not have any discussions with them regarding the application and declared that she would keep a fair and open mind during the meeting.

For 24/02890/FUL, Councillor Clarkson stated that she had spoken with the Bursars of both Colleges and been involved on and off with the application for a number of years and declared that she would leave the meeting for this item as she would not come to the matter with a completely open mind.

For 25/01749/FUL, Councillor Clarkson stated that she would leave the meeting before item 7 as she had a personal interest to the application and Councillor Fouweather will chair the meeting until the end.

30. Minutes

The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 7 October 2025 as a true and accurate record.

31. 24/02890/FUL Hertford and Exeter College Playing Fields

Councillor Fouweather stood as Chair during this item.

Councillor Regisford did not partake in the vote for this item having missed some of the presentations.

The Committee considered an application for the upgrade of existing pitches and an addition of a new sports facilities including a light weight canopy and enclosure housing padel tennis courts, outdoor padel courts, cricket nets and the creation of a new basketball and netball hard surface court together with associated fencing. The refurbishment of Exeter Cricket Pavilion and Hertford Cricket Pavilion. Alterations to Exeter squash courts for use as a golf simulator and the change of use of Hertford squash courts to café, changing facilities, sports hub reception area and community facilities with associated access, parking, cycle parking, refuse and recycling, new footpaths and landscape.

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 site comprised two recreation grounds owned by Hertford and Exeter Colleges, located in the green belt, within the setting of the Central Conservation Area, the New Marston Meadows and the Elsfield View Cone and lay within Flood Zones 1, 2, 3a and 3b. The existing pavilions and squash court buildings were regarded as Local Heritage Assets.
- Subject to conditions and a legal agreement, the development was considered acceptable regarding highways safety and parking, biodiversity; trees and landscaping; health, wellbeing and safety; air quality; land quality and utilities.
- However, the proposed padel enclosure failed to preserve Green Belt openness and constituted inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposed car park, golf simulator and pavilion hall were not water compatible uses in Flood Zone 3b. The padel enclosure failed to comply with the sequential test, the Flood Risk Assessment did not show how people would be kept safe or account for

climate change impacts and the drainage strategy was inadequate. The enclosure, lighting and fencing were judged to harm the setting and significance of the Local Heritage Assets and the character of the sports fields and surrounding green spine. Insufficient information had been provided to establish the significance of the site's heritage assets.

- Overall, the development was deemed unacceptable.

Jennifer Edis spoke against the application.

Nicholas Badman, Jamie Clark, Stephanie Wicks and Charles Parrack 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 included, but were not limited to:

- Concerns were raised around the Environmental Agency's objections. The applicant stated they were aware the site flooded but argued that, as an existing use, it could be appropriately enhanced. They accepted there would be flood impacts but said these would be managed through a safety focused management plan. They explained why they could not meet the EA's requirements and felt that the EA applied guidance rigidly without creative consideration.
- Questions were raised regarding land ownership. The applicant confirmed that the riparian zone land was within their ownership and said this had not been clarified earlier because they were unaware it would form part of the objection until the last minute.
- The Planning Lawyer asked officers whether the riparian ownership detail should be removed from the relevant reason for refusal in the report and officers confirmed that it should be removed.

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, subject to the modification in respect of the riparian ownership.

The Oxford City Planning Committee resolved to:

1. **Refuse the application** for the reasons given in paragraph 2 of the report, subject to an amendment to reason for refusal 3, and to delegate authority to the Director of Planning and Regulation to:

- finalise the reasons 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 proposed padel enclosure would fail to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and would conflict with the purpose of including land within it. The proposals amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt where no exceptions apply. There are no very special circumstances to allow such inappropriate development in the Green Belt. As such the proposals are contrary to Policies G1 and G3 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 and Chapter 13 of the NPPF.
 - The application site includes extensive areas of Flood Zone 3b (the functional floodplain) in which only water-compatible development is permitted. The proposed car park, golf simulator and 'hall' in the Exeter Pavillion are not deemed water compatible under Annex 3 of the NPPF and therefore these uses are inappropriate. The proposed padel enclosure fails to comply with the sequential test, the Flood Risk Assessment fails to consider how people will be kept safe from the identified flood hazards, and it also fails to take the impacts of climate change into account. The proposals are contrary to Policy RE3 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036, Chapter 14 of the NPPF, and the Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance.
 - The proposed drainage strategy fails to clarify whether the design incorporates lining to all detention/attenuation features which is required to avoid a reduction in storage volume due to high groundwater levels. There are vague suggestions of bunding proposed to protect attenuation features in flood risk areas, however they have not been fully detailed. In addition, insufficient detail has been provided to demonstrate how this would operate in times of flooding with reference to levels. Overall the submission fails to demonstrate that the drainage strategy proposed complies with Policy RE4 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.
 - Due to the size, mass and height of the padel enclosure, and the height of the proposed lighting and fencing structures associated with the intensification of use, the proposed development would detract from the setting of the existing building group on the site and their significance as Local Heritage Assets, the remote and peaceful character of the sports fields, the surrounding green spine and neighbouring Local Heritage Asset known as New Marston Meadows. The proposals would cause a high level of less than substantial harm to the setting of the identified heritage assets. The cumulative moderate level of public benefits derived from the proposed development would not outweigh the harm caused, and as such the proposals conflict with Policies RE2, DH1 and DH5 of the Local Plan and Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

- The application site is located on the edge of the River Cherwell floodplain, adjacent to the relict channel of the Peasmoor Brook, where there is potential for prehistoric and Roman activity. Given the site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, the Local Planning Authority require the developer to submit an appropriate field evaluation. In the absence of an archaeological evaluation, insufficient information has been submitted with the application to establish the significance of the heritage assets at this site, and as such the submission fails to demonstrate compliance with Paragraph 207 of the NPPF and Policy DH4 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.
- The energy statement submitted claims that the proposed padel enclosure would be exempt from Part L Building Regulations and therefore claim the proposed padel enclosure would not need to achieve at least a 40% reduction in the carbon emissions compared with a 2013 building regulations compliance base case in accordance with the requirements of Policy RE1. No evidence has been submitted with the application however to confirm this from a building control inspector and therefore in the absence of such the submission fails to demonstrate that the proposals comply with Policy RE1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.
- The acoustic assessment fails to consider the noise which would be emitted from the proposed air source heat pumps on sensitive receptors and local amenity. In the absence of any assessment, the submission fails to demonstrate how the air source heat pumps would not result in any detrimental impacts in relation to noise and disturbance and therefore fails to demonstrate compliance with Policies RE7 and RE8 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

32. 25/02197/FUL 15 Halliday Hill

Councillor Clarkson stood as chair for this part of the meeting.

Councillor Rehman left the meeting for item 5 and 6.

The Committee considered an application for the sub-division of existing dwelling to create 2 x 1 bed flats (Use Class C3). Alterations to fenestration. Provision of private amenity space, bin and bike stores. (amended description and plans).

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.

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 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.

33. 25/00823/FUL 11 Glebelands

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of existing detached garage and existing rear extension. Erection of a part single, part two storey rear extension. Erection of a two-storey side extension. (Amended description and amended plans).

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 proposed development was considered acceptable in regards of its design and would not cause any detrimental harm to the character or appearance of the dwelling or the wider street scene. It was also assessed as having no detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity, as well as drainage or ecology, subject to conditions. Therefore, the proposal was considered to comply with the policies of the Oxford Local Plan, and the NPPF.
- Officers concluded that the proposal was acceptable overall and aligned with the development plan when viewed in its entirety, supporting the granting of planning permission.
- The Planning Officer noted that amended plans were submitted during the application process, removing the rear dormer and front roof light; the assessment was based on these revised plans. As the changes were minor and reduced the scale of the proposal, re-advertising the application was deemed unnecessary.

Councillor Rehman, Councillor Harley and James Henton spoke against the application.

Neil Simpson 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 included, but were not limited to:

- Clarifications were provided by the Planning Officer regarding the number of HMOs in the area, along with floor plan structure and extensions.

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 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.
 - and issue the planning permission.

34. 25/01749/FUL 8 Dunstan Road

Councillor Rehman rejoined the meeting.

Councillor Clarkson left the meeting during this application, as stated in the declarations of interest, and did not return.

Councillor Fouweather stood as Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

The Committee considered an application for the provision of cycle storage (part-retrospective).

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.

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 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 Head Director of Planning and Regulation considers reasonably necessary.

35. Forthcoming applications

The Committee noted the list of forthcoming applications.

36. Dates of future meetings

The Committee noted the dates of future meetings.

The meeting started at 6pm and ended at 7.58pm.

Chair

Date: Tuesday 9 December 2025

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.