

## Minutes of a meeting of the Planning - Oxford City Planning Committee on Tuesday 9 December 2025



### Committee members present:

Councillor Fouweather	Councillor Henwood
Councillor Hollingsworth	Councillor Hunt
Councillor Railton	Councillor Rehman
Councillor Kerr	Councillor Muddiman (For Councillor Regisford)
Councillor Ottino (For Councillor Upton)	

### Officers present for all or part of the meeting:

Uswah Khan, Committee and Member Services Officer  
Andrew Murdoch, Development Management Service Manager  
Robert Fowler, Development Management Team Leader (West)  
Tom Sunter, Planning Lawyer  
Victoria Ashton, Planning Officer

### 37. Election of Vice-Chair

Councillor Railton was elected Vice-Chair for the duration of the meeting.

### 38. Apologies for absence

Councillor Clarkson, Upton and Regisford sent apologies.

Substitutions are shown above

### 39. Declarations of interest

#### General

For 25/01788/FUL, Councillor Fouweather declared that he had been involved in the call-in regarding the application and that he would watch from the public gallery for this item.

**For 25/02702/FUL, Councillor Railton** declared that she was pre-determined, as she had been part of the call-in for the application and that she would leave the meeting for this item.

**For 25/02702/FUL, Councillor Ottino** declared that he was pre-determined, as he had been part of the call-in for the application and that he would leave the meeting for this item.

**For 25/02702/FUL, Councillor Muddiman** declared that she was pre-determined as she was speaking in favour of the application and would watch from the public gallery for this item.

**For 25/02092/FUL, Councillor Kerr** stated that the site was in her ward and that she had visited it. She stated that she had not discussed planning matters in detail and was not pre-determined.

**For 25/01788/FUL, Councillor Hollingsworth** declared that although he had received emails from individuals objecting to the application, he had not pre-judged the matter or expressed any opinion and was not pre-determined.

**For 25/01788/FUL, Councillor Kerr** stated that the applicant was the University and that her husband was a senior member of the institution. She stated that she had been unaware that the applicant was the University and approached the meeting with an open mind and had not discussed the matter at all.

## **40. Minutes**

The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 November 2025 as a true and accurate record.

## **41. 25/02092/FUL Magdalen College School**

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of the existing Science Buildings. Partial demolition of the Quinn and 1928 Buildings. Erection of a three storey academic building (Use Class F1(a)). Installation of solar panels, alterations to landscaping and associated works. Provision of cycle parking.

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 proposals include the retention of the existing mature trees on Iffley Road, except for one diseased ash tree and one lime tree that were removed. Landscaping was enhanced along the Iffley Road frontage and within the school site, with biodiversity improvements around the prominent School assembly hall at the corner of Cowley Place and the Plain. Partial demolition of a 1928 single storey building on Cowley Place, identified as a non-designated heritage asset with architectural interest, was justified within the proposals.
- Officers found that the development caused less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area and views, but this was outweighed by the educational benefits and improvements to the partnerships program. The harm to non-

designated heritage assets, including the 1928 building and setting of Big School were also considered outweighed Archaeological concerns were addressed through conditions.

- Transport impacts during construction and operation were carefully assessed. Although more classrooms were added, student numbers were not increased and vehicle movement remained unchanged. The school monitored traffic closely and improved the coach program in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council Highways and local residents. A legal agreement was included to be required as part of the officer recommendation to secure travel plan monitoring, along with conditions to enhance cycle parking.
- The development was recommended as acceptable in design. Heritage impact and neighbour amenity, with remaining issues to be addressed by conditions.

Helen Pike and Lyana Powlesland 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 construction traffic management during demolition and building works, with questions around delivery hours and controls. The Development Management Team Leader responded that these would be regulated by conditions.
- Questions were raised around the demolition of the 1928 building. The Development Management Team Leader explained that the demolition was necessary to create more space and facilitate construction access as part of the application.
- Questions were raised around the engagement with local primary schools and the continuity of the outreach program. The Development Management Team Leader and the applicant confirmed ongoing discussions with local schools were underway and that the program would be required to be expanded by condition ensuring increased participation.
- Concerns were raised about the impact of the development on the Conservation Area, including harm from demolition and site boundaries. The Development Management Team Leader acknowledged that there was less than substantial harm but emphasised that public benefits outweighed the harm. The partial loss of the 1928 building was also considered to be harmful but outweighed by public benefits. In considering this matter officers pointed out that the 1928 building has already been partially demolished previously.
- Concerns were raised about the landscaping and tree retention. The Development Management Team Leader responded that the buildings staggered design would protect existing trees and create more space,

acknowledging the buildings large scale and seasonal considerations for tree maintenance.

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 subject to the satisfactory completion of a unilateral undertaken between the applicant and Oxfordshire County Council 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: finalise the recommended conditions and unilateral undertaking 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.

## **42. 25/01788/FUL Summertown House**

Councillor Fouweather left the meeting for this item.

Councillor Railton stood as Vice-Chair during this item.

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of existing boundary railings and access gate, installation of 2 no. air source heat pumps to the North and South elevations. Alterations to fenestration, formation of new boundary railings and access gate. (additional information).

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:

- Officers stated that the proposed development was acceptable in principle, design and its impact on designated heritage assets including archaeology, subject to recommended conditions. It was determined that the proposal would not cause any detrimental impacts to the amenity of any neighbouring dwellings, subject to the recommended conditions. The proposal was deemed acceptable in regard to flood risk, surface water, drainage, tree impacts, ecology, biodiversity, land contamination and highways. Overall, the proposal complied with relevant local and neighbourhood planning policies.

- The planning officer provided a verbal update noting that written materials circulated to members before the meeting included a comment about unclear recommended conditions, specifically condition 4 regarding noise levels from installed air source heat pumps. To clarify, officers recommended a clear and enforceable timeframe requiring a post installation noise assessment within three months of installation and implementation of any necessary mitigation within three months of approval.
- Another comment in the written material referred to officers not applying paragraph 198 of the local policy framework. However, officers confirmed that relevant local plan policies addressed this. The proposal included suitable noise mitigation measures, which officers deemed acceptable.

Dr Victoria Whitford and Chris Botsman spoke against the application.

Tom Heel and Neil Eaton 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:

- Questions were asked about the specifics of condition 4, particularly how and when background noise levels were measured and the steps for mitigating noise if necessary. The Senior Planning Officer explained that a post-installation noise assessment would be required within three months, with mitigation measures implemented if noise levels exceeded expectations. Background noise data would be gathered according to established standards, addressed by environmental health specialists to address any difference of opinion regarding noise levels.
- Members asked if condition 4 could include a strict noise ceiling of 37 decibels for the pumps, but it was clarified that the current approach, recommended by environmental health officers, provided an established and enforceable method for managing noise rather than a fixed limit.
- Concerns regarding the differing opinions on noise impact between objectors and the applicants noise impact assessment were noted. However, the Senior Planning Officer was of the view that these had been considered by Environmental Health Officers who were of the view that the mitigation measures and assessments secured by condition would prevent harm. The condition required establishing the background noise level prior to installation, with no allowance for noise to exceed the background noise level once installation was in place, when measured from the nearest noise sensitive premises.

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 and subject to the amended wording of condition 4.

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 (subject to the amended wording of condition 4 as agreed at Committee) of this report and grant planning permission
2. **Delegate authority** to the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services to:
  - finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services considers reasonably necessary.

### **43. 25/02702/FUL Unit 11 Kings Meadow**

Councillor Fouweather rejoined the meeting for this item.

Councillor Ottino, Railton and Muddiman left the meeting for this item.

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 proposed development was deemed unacceptable in principle due to its location within the floodplain, the highest flood risk area. The access road and much of the surrounding area also lay within Flood Zone 3b, increasing flood risk and potentially preventing safe site access during flooding.
- The submitted Flood Risk Assessment was found inadequate in methodology and detail, leading to an objection from the Environmental Agency. The site was located within an industrial estate lacking pavements, with surrounding units in industrial use. While the Local Highway Authority suggested some improvements, such as marked walkways, they did not object to the proposals.
- The development failed to provide cycle storage; a policy requirement linked to the change of use. This, combined with site constraints, meant the issue could not be resolved through a planning condition. Additionally, the minor design alterations to the industrial unit were considered acceptable in terms of design and amenity impact.
- The Planning Officer made a verbal update on the written material circulated by members of the public, responding that were no matters in the material that were not already addressed in the officers report.

Coppe Van Urk 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 absence of an outdoor playground. It was noted that the site had no external play space and a question was raised about whether planning permission could be conditioned on the provision of such a space. The Development Management Team Leader responded that the applicant had shown intent to lease an outdoor area nearby and to take children off site, potentially using handcarts, therefore a condition tied specifically to the application site would not be necessary.
- Questions were raised about whether a cycle-parking condition could be imposed. The Development Management Team Leader explained that as cycle parking had not been included within the application description, it had not been subject to consultation and therefore could not be required.
- Members were reminded that they could, if granting permission, consider conditions relating to management or hours of operation.
- Concerns were raised regarding the use of the existing site and whether the floodplain designation pre-dated the use of the land. The Development Management Service Manager explained that the previous industrial use had been acceptable at the time and that the shift from an industrial use to a more vulnerable nursery use now required planning permission. It was noted that flood risk was considered fundamental and that the Environmental Agency had assessed the proposal as unacceptable in flood risk terms.

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 Oxford City Planning Committee resolved to:

1. **Refuse 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:**

1. 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).
2. 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).

#### **44. Forthcoming applications**

The Committee noted the list of forthcoming applications.

#### **45. Dates of future meetings**

The Committee noted the dates of future meetings.

**The meeting started at 6pm and ended at 8.25pm.**

**Chair .....**

**Date: Tuesday 20 January 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.*