

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee**

Held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Woodgreen, Witney, Oxfordshire OX28 1NB
at 2.00 pm on **Monday, 15 September 2025**

PRESENT

Councillors: Julian Cooper (Chair), Mark Walker (Vice-Chair), Lidia Arciszewska, Mike Baggaley, Andrew Beaney, Genny Early, Roger Faulkner, David Jackson, Elizabeth Poskitt and Geoff Saul

Officers: Stephanie Eldridge (Principal Planner), Emile Baldauf-Clark (Planner), Nathan Harris (Planner), Andrew Brown (Head of Electoral and Democratic Services), Ana Prelici (Senior Democratic Services Officer), Mathew Taylor (Democratic Services Officer) and Anne Learmonth (Democratic Services Officer).

Other Councillors in attendance: None.

33 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Goodwin and Clements.

34 Declarations of Interest

Declarations of Interest were received as follows:

Page 17 – 25/01100/FUL Land South of Milwood End, Long Hanborough.

Councillor Mike Baggaley declared that he had lived on Milwood End and was a member of the resident's association but he was not predetermined.

Page 34 – 25/01315/FUL Storage Land, Horseshoe Lane, Chadlington.

The Chair, Councillor Julian Cooper and Councillor Elizabeth Poskitt declared that they knew the agent Huw Mellor as he had been an advisor to a committee with Woodstock Town Council. Councillor Poskitt was not predetermined.

35 Minutes of Previous Meeting

Page 11 -Councillor Poskitt advised there was a typo which needed to be corrected from "hoe" to "homes".

Page 12 – Councillor Mark Walker advised that he had not seconded the proposal for the application 25/00333/OUT Land East of Wroslyn Road. Councillor Mike Baggaley confirmed he had seconded the proposal.

The Chair proposed that the minutes of the previous meeting held on Monday 18 August 2025 be agreed by the Sub-Committee as a true and accurate record. This was seconded by Councillor Elizabeth Poskitt, was put to the vote and agreed by the Sub-Committee.

The Sub-Committee Resolved to:

- I. Agree the minutes of the previous meeting held on Monday 18 August 2025 as a true and accurate record.

36 Applications for Development

37 25/01 100/FUL Land South of Milwood End, Long Hanborough

Emile Baldauf-Clark, Planner, presented the application for the erection of a self-build dwelling and detached garage with associated access and landscaping.

The Planner's presentation addressed the following points:

- The Parish Council objected to the application and their comments had been included in the additional representations report.
- The site was situated next to a plot that had planning permission approved. The access to the plots led to a Market Garden.
- The Council was unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. The application was supported by policies in the Local Plan as the application was for a self-build dwelling.
- The design was appropriate to the plot size and was considered to be of high quality.
- There were no long term harms to the wider setting and no technical objections. There was provision for bat and bird boxes and planting of hedgerows.
- The limited harms of the site did not outweigh the benefits and the application was recommended for approval.

The Chair then invited the Sub-Committee to discuss the application, which raised the following points:

- Members raised concerns about driving and parking in the area due to the narrow road.
- Members commented on the high quality, sustainable design and materials for the application and the provision for family housing. The materials fitted well into the surrounding area and the site was well screened from the Cotswold National Landscape.
- It was confirmed that no trees would be removed from the site and the trees to be planted were beech and hornbeam species.
- The members asked for a construction traffic management plan to be included in the proposal as the road was narrow and the objections raised highlighted the concerns regarding neighbouring properties access and parking as well as pedestrian safety.

Councillor Lidia Arciszewska proposed that the Sub-Committee approve the application in line with officers' recommendation and to include an additional condition for a Construction Management Plan. This was seconded by Councillor Roger Faulkner and put to the vote.

Voting record – the vote for the proposal was unanimous.

The Sub-Committee resolved to:

- I. Approve the application in line with the officer's recommendation and to include an additional condition for a Construction Management Plan.

38 25/01315/FUL Storage Land, Horseshoe Lane, Chadlington

Emile Baldauf-Clark, Planner presented the application for the erection of 2 commercial buildings for mixed use classes B2/B8/E(g). With provision of car parking, cycle parking and landscaping. Also, for an erection of a security entrance gate.

The Planner's presentation addressed the following points:

- The Parish Council objected to the application and their comments had been included in the Additional Representations report.
- The planning history of the site and the current use of storage and a lorry park.
- The new plans included two barns either side of the site. One barn would be slightly larger than the other and would be of a traditional Dutch style design built from a mixture of cladding and stone. The site would also include a security gate and planting.

Ann Gate, local resident spoke in objection to the application and raised the following points: The Parish Council had objected, there were concerns about the habitat of local wildlife and the disturbance of the badger sets around the site including exposed tunnels. This had been reported to Thames Valley Police.

Cllr Prakash Kelshiker, Parish Councillor for Chadlington addressed the Sub-Committee and raised the following points: concerns about the wildlife and disturbance of the badger sets, impacts on the surrounding landscape and Cotswold National Landscape. Impact on landscape with artificial security lighting and the range of commercial uses. Screening should be considered and hedgerows as well as operational hours on the site.

Huw Mellor, Agent, addressed the Sub-Committee and raised the following points:

The design of the barns were modest in size and of a high quality for commercial use, the site did not extend into the surrounding countryside, the employment supported the rural economy. There were no objections from the statutory consultees.

The Planner continued with the presentation and addressed the following points:

- The benefits of the application included the well-established site for commercial use.
- The proposed design was modest in scale and traditional in appearance which complimented the rural location. The proposed materials included stone and cladding which would soften the appearance next to the surrounding character of the area.

15/September2025

- The proposal would not result in any harms to the character of the area.
- A condition had been recommended to limit the use of the external lighting regarding the hours of operation to protect the night skies in the rural area. This would also reduce the number of HGV vehicles accessing the site.
- There were no objections from Oxfordshire County Council Highways.
- The biodiversity officer had not identified any badger sets on the site however a condition was recommended requiring a pre-commencement badger survey and implication of mitigation to safeguard other species and maintain wildlife corridors.
- The proposal would provide flexible business space use and support local employment opportunities.

The Chair then invited the Sub-Committee to discuss the application, which raised the following points:

- Members asked for clarification on the use of lighting on the site and position of rooflights. The Planner confirmed the skylights faced the road.
- The protection of the badger sets and the work done on the site before the application had been approved. The Principal Planner confirmed that the damage to badger sets was dealt with by separate legislation and the approval of the application would include conditions to protect wildlife.
- Members asked if the provision of bird boxes be included to help mitigate the disturbance of the badger sets.
- Members asked why solar panels were not included in the application.
- Members raised concerns about the lighting when the building is in use, the Planner advised that the report covered the working times.

Councillor Geoff Saul proposed that the Sub-Committee approve the application in line with the officers' recommendations. This was seconded by Councillor David Jackson and put to the vote.

Voting Record – the vote for the proposal was unanimous.

The Sub-Committee Resolved to:

- I. Approve the application in line with the officers' recommendations.

The Planner's presentation addressed the following points:

- The Planner brought the Sub-Committee's attention to the additional representation report which included the objections from the Town Council.
- The planner highlighted the red line on the site plan and explained the Tree with the protection order would not be affected by the proposed extensions.
- The property shared a boundary with Blenheim Palace, a World Heritage Site, but the application would not impact the boundary.
- The proposal would be a modest increase to the footprint of the site and the first floor extension would align with the side elevation of the existing building.
- The design was in keeping with the current property and neighbouring properties.

Hardip Boparai spoke in objection to the application which raised the following points: There were objections from the Town Council, the extensions would not fit in with the character of the street and the proposal would be over development, the design was of an industrial theme and not in keeping with the original house and there was a Tree Protection Order within the property.

Mr Whitfield, the application addressed the sub-committee which raised the following points: The house was purchased less than 2 years ago, the protected tree would not be near the construction works and there were conditions included to protect the tree, there would be little impact to the street view and surrounding houses.

The Planner continued with the presentation and addressed the following points:

- The proposed materials would match the rendering with a tiled roof and aluminium frame glazing would be used for the rear glazing.
- The site was well screened by mature trees from the A44 Oxford Road and there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.
- The separation distances and the residential context of the site, the proposal was not considered to result in any harm to the setting of the adjacent conservation area, the grey two listed boundary wall or the wider World Heritage site.
- There were no windows proposed on the side elevation and the flat roof on the ground floor extension will not be used as a balcony.
- Conditions were recommended to prevent the use of flat roof as an amenity space thereby safeguarding the privacy of the neighbouring occupiers.
- The tree officer confirmed the proposal would not adversely affect the protected tree at number 31 subject to a condition ensuring that no works occurred within the root protection area.
- The recommendation was for approval with conditions as set out in the officer's report.

The Chair then invited the Sub-Committee to discuss the application, which raised the following points:

- Members raised concerns over the protection of the cedar tree and acknowledged that over the past few years many of the houses along the street had been extended.
- Members asked how condition 4 would be enforced. The planner confirmed that enforcement action could be taken if there were reports of a breach of use.
- Members raised concerns regarding traffic levels, the Planner confirmed that due to the scale of development a traffic management plan was not needed.

Councillor Elizabeth Poskitt proposed that the Sub-Committee approve the application in line with the officer's recommendations. This was seconded by the Chair and put to the vote.

Voting Record – the vote for the proposal was unanimous.

The Sub-Committee Resolved to:

1. Approve the application in line with the officers' recommendations.

40 Applications Determined under Delegated Powers

The report giving details of the applications determined under delegated powers was received, explained by officers and noted by the Sub-Committee.

41 Appeal Decisions

The report giving details of the appeals was received, explained by the officers and noted by the Sub-Committee.

42 Site Visits

The Principal Planner confirmed there were no site visit reports to consider.

The Meeting closed at 3.10 pm

CHAIR