

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, 20 October 2025**

PRESENT

Councillors: Julian Cooper (Chair), , Lidia Arciszewska, Andrew Beaney, Genny Early, Roger Faulkner, David Jackson, Geoff Saul and Tim Sumner

Officers: Abby Fettes (Development Manager), Mathew Taylor (Democratic Services Officer), Emile Baldauf-Clark (Career Grade Planner), Anne Learmonth (Democratic Services Officer), Chris Hargraves (Head of Planning), Kelly Murray (Principal Planner for Enforcement and Appeals) and Rebekah Orriss (Career Grade Planner)

Other Councillors in attendance: Andy Graham

43 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Adam Clements, Mark Walker, Mike Baggaley, Elizabeth Poskitt, Andy Goodwin.

Councillor Tim Sumner substituted for Councillor Elizabeth Poskitt.

44 Declarations of Interest

Declarations of Interest were received as follows:

Pg 61-73 25/01525/FUL Stable to the rear of Valhalla.

Councillor Genny Early declared that she owned the field next to the property and would leave the Council Chamber when the application was heard.

45 Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Chair proposed that the minutes of the previous meeting held on Monday 15 September 2025 be agreed by the Sub-Committee as a true and accurate record. This was seconded by Councillor Genny Early, 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 15 September 2025 as a true and accurate record.

46 Applications for Development

24/02901/OUT Land North of Holliers Crescent, Middle Barton.

The Development Manager Abby Fettes, presented the application for the outline planning with some matters reserved for residential and associated development (up to 80 dwellings) including means of access, access roads, green infrastructure, drainage and other infrastructure (additional info received).

The presentation addressed the following points

- The Development Manager draw members' attention to the additional representations report. Three further objections had been received, comments from environmental health, and additional conditions regarding footpath and the electric bike hub had been included.
- The application was for up to 80 dwellings. It included the means of access, the access roads, green infrastructure, drainage and other infrastructure.
- The site had come before the Sub-Committee in November 2023 but was refused due to biodiversity, archaeology and standard legal agreement reasons. Officers worked with the applicant to move the site closer to the existing housing.
- The revised scheme was closer to Holliers crescent away from the north of the site, at the highest point in a more contained area with additional green space. Those members who had attended the site visit would recall the rise from south to north, the field.

Roger Tyres, a Councillor from Steeple Barton Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application and raised the following points: the site was not sustainable due to no public transport, more housing would result in the increase in traffic to and from the village, harm to the nesting areas for Skylark population and risks to flooding.

Councillor Andy Graham, the ward member and Oxfordshire County Councillor, raised the following points: the comments on page 17 of the officer's report which covered flooding and drainage water management, concerns that the proposed development was situated on a slope and the impact on the village regarding the risks of flooding.

Doug Bamsey, agent for the applicant raised the following points: long term sustainability for the village, with provision of family homes there would be more students attending the local primary school which had seen decline in numbers, new traffic control, economic benefits to the village, ecological mitigation for local wildlife and S106 contributions to services such as NHS, Oxfordshire County Council, Parish Council and provision to support local sports.

The Development Manager continued with the presentation and addressed the following points:

- The Council could not demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, and the site would provide a 12 % increase in the number of houses in Middle Barton. The village fell within Chipping Norton sub-area and was not constrained by the Cotswolds natural landscape. It was expected that both Middle Barton and Enstone would take some of the housing growth in the future.

20/October2025

- The site was considered to be of an appropriate scale, particularly given the housing need in the district. There was a short walk to the village and primary school from the site. It was recognised there was no secondary school provision and limited employment opportunities within the village.
- Oxfordshire County Council Highways acknowledged that there was very limited public transport provision and were satisfied that this would be mitigated through financial contributions towards improvements. There were no objections from Highways.
- The conservation area could not be seen from the proposed site. There were no listed buildings near the proposed site. There was no risk of harm to the conservation area.
- The application had been revised to pull the development closer to the frontage of Hollier's Crescent and there would be a 20 meter boundary on the southern side which was required for drainage.
- The heights of the proposed dwellings were designed to complement the existing housing on Hollier's Crescent due to the slope of the land. The development would sit lower than the development on Worton Road. Planting was also proposed to strengthen boundaries.
- The officer addressed concerns regarding flooding. There had been no objection from the lead local flood authority, and it was considered there were no harms to protected areas.
- The application would deliver 80 new homes which included 40 affordable homes, with 10% biodiversity net gain both on and off the proposed site, a new local playground, improved connectivity for pedestrians and a community orchard. The officer recommendation was for approval.

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

- Members raised concerns that the application had been refused in the past, the site would extend the curtilage of the village and was too big in site in relation to the village. Also concerns over the impact on wildlife and flooding. The officer addressed these concerns and confirmed that a smaller development would not be as beneficial financially and there had been no objections on ecological grounds and biodiversity net gain had been addressed.
- Members commented that the Thames Water comments were not clear. The officer confirmed that Thames Water had suggested conditions to cover foul water and drainage.

Member raised concerns regarding the ecology and the presence of Skylarks which were a red listed species, were heard on the site visit. The officer confirmed that Skylarks were in the vicinity of the site and proposals included offsite compensation area for breeding, amended bird mitigation strategy and enhancement of habitat. The Development Manager Abby Fettes, presented the application for the outline planning with some matters reserved for residential

and associated development (up to 80 dwellings) including means of access, access roads, green infrastructure, drainage and other infrastructure (additional info received).

The presentation addressed the following points

- The Development Manager draw members' attention to the additional representations report. Three further objections had been received, comments from environmental health, and additional conditions regarding footpath and the electric bike hub had been included.
- The application was for up to 80 dwellings. It included the means of access, the access roads, green infrastructure, drainage and other infrastructure.
- The site had come before the Sub-Committee in November 2023 but was refused due to biodiversity, archaeology and standard legal agreement reasons. Officers worked with the applicant to move the site closer to the existing housing.
- The revised scheme was closer to Holliers crescent away from the north of the site, at the highest point in a more contained area with additional green space. Those members who had attended the site visit would recall the rise from south to north, the field.

Roger Tyres, a Councillor from Steeple Barton Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application and raised the following points: the site was not sustainable due to no public transport, more housing would result in the increase in traffic to and from the village, harm to the nesting areas for Skylark population and risks to flooding.

Councillor Andy Graham, the ward member and Oxfordshire County Councillor, raised the following points: the comments on page 17 of the officer's report which covered flooding and drainage water management, concerns that the proposed development was situated on a slope and the impact on the village regarding the risks of flooding.

Doug Bamsey, agent for the applicant raised the following points: long term sustainability for the village, with provision of family homes there would be more students attending the local primary school which had seen decline in numbers, new traffic control, economic benefits to the village, ecological mitigation for local wildlife and S106 contributions to services such as NHS, Oxfordshire County Council, Parish Council and provision to support local sports.

The Development Manager continued with the presentation and addressed the following points:

- The Council could not demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, and the site would provide a 12 % increase in the number of houses in Middle Barton. The village fell within Chipping Norton sub-area and was not constrained by the Cotswolds natural landscape. It was expected that both Middle Barton and Enstone would take some of the housing growth in the future.
- The site was considered to be of an appropriate scale, particularly given the housing need in the district. There was a short walk to the village and primary school from the

site. It was recognised there was no secondary school provision and limited employment opportunities within the village.

- Oxfordshire County Council Highways acknowledged that there was very limited public transport provision and were satisfied that this would be mitigated through financial contributions towards improvements. There were no objections from Highways.
- The conservation area could not be seen from the proposed site. There were no listed buildings near the proposed site. There was no risk of harm to the conservation area.
- The application had been revised to pull the development closer to the frontage of Hollier's Crescent and there would be a 20 meter boundary on the southern side which was required for drainage.
- The heights of the proposed dwellings were designed to complement the existing housing on Hollier's Crescent due to the slope of the land. The development would sit lower than the development on Worton Road. Planting was also proposed to strengthen boundaries.
- The officer addressed concerns regarding flooding. There had been no objection from the lead local flood authority, and it was considered there were no harms to protected areas.
- The application would deliver 80 new homes which included 40 affordable homes, with 10% biodiversity net gain both on and off the proposed site, a new local playground, improved connectivity for pedestrians and a community orchard. The officer recommendation was for approval.

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

- Members raised concerns that the application had been refused in the past, the site would extend the curtilage of the village and was too big in site in relation to the village. Also concerns over the impact on wildlife and flooding. The officer addressed these concerns and confirmed that a smaller development would not be as beneficial financially and there had been no objections on ecological grounds and biodiversity net gain had been addressed.
- Members commented that the Thames Water comments were not clear. The officer confirmed that Thames Water had suggested conditions to cover foul water and drainage.
- Member raised concerns regarding the ecology and the presence of Skylarks which were a red listed species, were heard on the site visit. The officer confirmed that Skylarks were in the vicinity of the site and proposals included offsite compensation area for breeding, amended bird mitigation strategy and enhancement of habitat.
- Concerns were raised regarding the poor transport connections to the local towns and rail services. Members recognised the need for affordable housing in the area.

20/October2025

Councillor David Jackson proposed that Sub-Committee refuse the application as it did not meet policies T1, EH3, OS2 and OS3. This was seconded by Councillor Genny Early and put to the vote.

The Sub-Committee voted on the proposal to refuse the application as follows;

Voting Record – 4 for, 4 against and 0 abstentions. As the vote was tied, the Chair used their casting vote to vote against the proposal to refuse. The proposal to refuse fell.

Councillor Geoff Saul proposed the Sub-Committee approve the application in line with the officer recommendations. This was seconded by Councillor Roger Faulkner and put to the vote.

The Sub-Committee voted on the proposal to approve the application as follows;

Voting Record – 4 for, 4 against and 0 abstentions. As the vote was tied, the Chair used their casting vote to vote for the proposal to approve the application. The proposal to approve was carried.

The Sub-Committee Resolved to:

1. Approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

48 25/00805/FUL Enstone Quarry, Oxford Road, Enstone

The Development Manager, Abby Fettes, presented the application for a proposed vehicle depot (additional information received).

The presentation addressed the following points:

- The Development Manager drew members' attention to the additional representations report, and the additional objection had been received.
- The application was for consent for the change of use of the former Enstone Quarry to a proposed vehicle depot to aid Smiths of Gloucester limited with the logistics of their Oxfordshire based operations.
- The site was surrounded by agricultural land; there was a substantial hedge row that screened the main roads. The site was made up of existing hard standing area and an old barn on the western part of the site. The entrance to the site was located on to Enstone Road.
- The site did not fall into any special designated areas of control. The proposal included a two storey portacabin.

Councillor Craig Miller, Enstone Parish Council spoke in objection and raised the following points: road safety on to and off the site due to the location and road junctions, the length of the vehicles that would be accessing the site and the contamination of nearby stream by hydrocarbons from the site.

20/October2025

Lucy Binnie, agent for the applicant raised the following points: the proposal was for a low key development on a unused brownfield site, there were no objections from Highways, traffic levels would be higher at the beginning and end of the day, and the development of buildings would be at the far western part of the site away from the stream. There would also be CCTV and securing fencing around the site and gates at the entrance.

The Development Manager continued with the presentation and addressed the following points:

- The application is supported by policy OS2 as the development would be on previously used land on a brownfield site.
- The application supported rural businesses and enabled them to grow in a sustainable manner whilst supporting and maintaining employment in the local area.
- The site is surrounded by agricultural land and well-established planting around the site which reduced the visibility of public view.
- The structure of the two-storey cabin is not attractive but would be functional as an office and welfare space. A condition had been included to ensure that external lighting spill would be controlled.
- A revised layout for parking had been included to accommodate provision for 8 cars rather than 16. When considering the concerns over flooding, comments were still expected from the drainage engineer, the officer asked that delegated authority was given subject to there being no objections from the drainage engineer and any further conditions were to be agreed with the Chair.

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

- Members asked if a condition could be included for the cabin could be painted to better fit in with the surrounding area and the site not to be used for storage purposes.
- How would the parking on site be enforced? The officer confirmed that a new plan was submitted to allow only HGVs and 6 vehicles for overnight parking.
- Concerns were raised concerning the condition for drainage, the officer confirmed that this condition would be agreed with the Chair for delegation.
- Members asked if the entrance could be moved back onto the site to help with the road safety concerns and asked for clarification of who would be maintaining the gates to the site. The officer confirmed that there would be a member of staff on site and gates would be open during operating hours. It would not be possible to move the entrance back due to limited space to manoeuvre vehicles on the site.

Councillor Geoff Saul proposed the Sub-Committee approve the application to include an additional condition that the cabin be painted and no storage be allowed on the site. This was seconded by the Chair and put to the vote.

Voting record – 6 for 2 against 0 Abstentions.

The Sub-Committee Resolved to:

- I. Approve the application to include an additional condition that the cabin be painted and no storage be allowed on the site.

49 25/01525/FUL Stable to the rear of Vahalla, Church Street, Stonesfield.

Councillor Genny Early left the Council Chamber.

The Planner, Emile Baldauf-Clark presented the application for the conversion of an existing home office and art studio/ gym (former stable building) into an independent residential dwelling, including extension to create first floor accommodation, modification of external appearance, landscaping and amenity space.

The presentation addressed the following points

- The application was to convert a home office into a separate residential dwelling. The building was previously a single storey stable.
- The footprint would remain the same with the small infill to square the site off and include the two parking spaces, the existing field access was to be maintained.
- The proposed elevation included a slight increase to the height of the roof by 1.7 meters to allow space for first floor accommodation with additional dormers.

Mr Drew spoke in objection as an agent for Mr and Mrs Miles and raised the following points: highlighted inaccuracies in the design and access at the edge of Church Street, the narrow footpath for pedestrians, the number of cars accessing the driveway.

Oliver Neagle, agent for the applicant raised the following points: the design of the proposed building does not extend past the original footprint, and would be reuse of a current building, there would be no harm to the surrounding landscape, no overlooking, loss of privacy, and overbearing impact on neighbours.

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

- The proposed site was within the residential area of Stonesfield and was supported by policies OS2, H2 and H6. The proposed dwelling would make effective use of the site and respected the local character of the area.
- The proposed site supported sustainable development and contributed to the housing supply. There were no harms to the Cotswold National Landscape, the site was outside the conservation area and there were no listed buildings nearby.

20/October2025

- The proposed dwelling was of a sustainable design and was an efficient use of the land. Proposed natural materials would ensure the building was in keeping with the surrounding properties.
- Oxfordshire County Council had not objected in terms of highways and parking subject to conditions. There were no anticipated residential privacy or immunity concerns as well as any biodiversity or contamination issues. the recommended was for approval subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

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

- Members asked if the driveway could be adopted by Highways, the officer confirmed that the matter would be a legal one, under civil law and not covered by planning. Members raised concerns that the driveway was a single track.
- Members commented on the planning history of the site and raised concerns of cumulative developments within the village which impacted Brook Lane, Churchfields and Church Street.

Councillor David Jackson proposed that the Sub-Committee approve the application in line with the officer recommendation. Councillor Geoff Saul seconded the proposal and it was put to the vote.

Voting Record – 5 for, 1 against and 1 abstention.

The Sub-Committee Resolved to:

1. Approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

Councillor Genny Early return to the Council Chamber.

50 25/01567/FUL Land East of 4 Meadow End, Fulbrook.

The Development Manager Abby Fettes, presented the application for the erection of four dwellings including associated access, landscape, drainage and other works (revised drawing received).

The presentation addressed the following points;

- The proposal was for 2x 2 bed semi-detached dwellings and 2x 3 bed semi-detached dwellings and is accessed via a lane off Walnut Row.
- The site was not in the Conservation area but was in the Cotswold National Landscape and there was a public right of way to the north of the site.
- The officer gave a planning history of the site and the adjacent housing that had been recently approved. The proposed plans had been amended to address concerns regarding the proximity of the approved adjacent dwellings.

20/October2025

Hannah Wiseman agent for the application raised the following points: the scheme had been amended with a revised layout which included 2 visitors parking bays. The design was of a high quality sustainable design within 10 minutes' walk to the town of Burford. There had been no objections from Highways.

The Development Manager continued with the presentation and addressed the following points:

- The parish council and local residents had raised concerns about the safety of the road network as the site was located on a narrow lane and adjacent to a playground. Highways gave a detailed response to explain the expected volume of traffic to the resident area and the lowering of the speed limit to 20 MPH.
- The proposal would be a more efficient use of the land with the development at Walnut row providing a good example.
- The design was in keeping with the character of the surrounding buildings, the site was well contained. There was no harm to the Cotswold National Landscape. There were no adverse impacts on the residential amenities.
- When taking the tilted balance in favour of development into consideration there were no clear reasons to refuse the application and therefore officers recommended the application for approval.

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

- Members queried the construction traffic management plan and asked if the developer would work in conjunction with the approved development of 4 bedroom housing being built. The officer confirmed that it was the same applicant and would need to work together using the plan.
- Member commented on the size of the housing and were happy to see 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings being included in the development over larger properties for the site.

The Chair proposed the sub-committee approve the application in line with officer recommendations. This was seconded by Councillor David Jackson and put to the vote.

Voting record- the vote was unanimous for approval.

The Sub-Committee Resolved to:

- I. Approve the application in line with officer recommendations.

51 Applications Determined under Delegated Powers

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

52 Appeal Decisions

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

53 Progress on Enforcement Cases

Kelly Murray, Principal Planner (Enforcement and Appeals), introduced the report, which provided an update on progress in respect of priority enforcement investigations.

The Officer explained that the team were fully staffed which had helped with caseloads and progression of cases.

The Officer explained the numbers of caseloads and what stages various cases were at, however where certain cases were sensitive, such as those going to court, these could not be discussed in full.

Members thanked the Officer and team for all their hard work, detailed report and the new system where councillors could see the status of cases.

The officer asked that members try to adopt the new process as it helped the team triage new cases more effectively.

54 Discharge of S52 Agreement

Rebekah Orriss, planner, presented the report for the discharge of S52 Agreement in relation to planning permission W906/85 at Parlours, Widford, OX18 4DU.

The officer explained that the discharge of a historic section 52 agreement on the property in has since become lawful and therefore was beyond the scope of enforcement action and the legal agreement is obsolete.

The Sub-Committee noted the report.

The Meeting closed at 4.25 pm

CHAIR