

PLANNING & REGULATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting held on Monday, 24 November 2025 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 3.52 pm

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Diana Lugova – in the Chair

Councillor Tony Worgan (Deputy Chair)
Councillor Ron Batstone
Councillor Mark Cherry
Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak
Councillor Jenny Hannaby
Councillor Saj Malik
Councillor Gavin McLauchlan
Councillor Paul Austin Sargent
Councillor Geoff Saul
Councillor Gareth Epps

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Chris Brant (Cropreddy & Hook Norton)

By Invitation: Parish Councillor Harvey Marcovitch (Wroxton PC)
Gemma Crossley (Agent)

Officers: Jack Ahier (Senior Democratic Services Officer), Jennifer Crouch (Principal Solicitor – Regulatory), David Periam (Planning Development Manager), Rachel Jones (Minerals and Waste Planning Consultant)

The Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, together with [a schedule of addenda tabled at the meeting][the following additional documents:] and decided as set out below. Except as insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda and reports [agenda, reports and schedule/additional documents], copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

15/24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

(Agenda No. 1)

Apologies were received from Cllr Roz Smith, substituted by Cllr Gareth Epps.

16/24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - SEE GUIDANCE NOTE BELOW

(Agenda No. 2)

There were none.

17/24 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

(Agenda No. 3)

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2025 were approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

18/24 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 4)

Three requests to address the Committee had been received from:

- Cllr Chris Brant (Cropredy and Hook Norton)
- Parish Cllr Harvey Marcovitch (Wroxton PC)
- Gemma Crossley (Applicant's Agent)

They would be heard, and Members could ask questions if they had any after the officer presentation.

19/24 LAND AT WROXTON FIELDS, QUARRY, STRATFORD ROAD A422, WROXTON, OXFORDSHIRE, OZ15 6EZ

(Agenda No. 5)

The Chair introduced the item to the meeting.

The Minerals and Waste Planning Consultant introduced the application, which was about the extraction of mineral, importation of inert restoration material, revised restoration scheme, aggregate recycling facility and other ancillary development at the existing Wroxton Fields Quarry.

Officers provided a few brief updates to the report, outlined below:

- Elements of retrospective development, including extraction of minerals in the existing phases 5 and 6, and the implementation of a temporary staff car park.
- In paragraph 156, the landscape officer commented about concerns that bunding would likely not be effective in mitigating views from the road but could be mitigated by not excavating the southern part of phase 2b or to reduce the timeframe of excavation. The Applicant provided further clarification that the historic extraction was split into 3 sections separated by hedgerow. Further extraction from phase 2b would not take place in the southern-most section, minimising the impact views from outside of the site.

Officers stated that Horton Quarry had been worked out and that Alkerton Quarry had reached the end of its productive life.

The main elements of the application was to extract 410,000 tonnes of iron stone from phase 6c and 340,000 tonnes of mineral from phase 2b. The processing of minerals was proposed to continue to take place in phase 4 of the development.

Photos and maps were shown of the site, including the current and proposed areas of extraction; the site entrance and the processing plant area. The application seeks 150,000 tonnes to be processed through the site per annum and permission would exist until 2042.

There were no outstanding objections from technical consultees, but there were from the local County Councillor and Wroxton Parish Council. Liaison meetings are held with the Quarry, local stakeholders and local councillors.

Councillor Chris Brant (Cropredy and Hook Norton) addressed the Committee as the local Member and thanked the applicant for a recent site visit. He highlighted the impact of the application on the village of Wroxton, which if agreed, would be 100m from the nearest dwelling. He also noted the public health concerns caused by dust from the site on the primary school children and urged the Committee to refuse planning permission, noting that the applicant should come back with a revised proposal without the area closest to the school.

Members asked the speaker several questions, relating to potential conditions if the application was approved and regarding the accessibility of the rights of way within the site and interactions with the local liaison group. Councillor Brant noted his main concerns were the distance of the quarry from the village and any conditions should reflect a further distance from the site. Regarding the rights of way, it was noted that the site does a good job of managing that situation through diversions, but that the local liaison group did not regularly meet for a couple of years and issues raised at that group included traffic, lorry access and speeding.

Parish Councillor Harvey Marcovitch (Wroxton Parish Council) addressed the Committee about the Parish Council's concerns about the extension of the quarry relating to air quality as a public health issue. It was commented on the wind measurements were inaccurate and measured at a different quarry. He noted the good engagement with the liaison group on breaches of conditions, which were usually resolved quickly. Nonetheless, he expressed concerns relating to public health and asked the Committee to refuse planning permission on the extension of phase 6c.

Members asked about the evidence of air quality issues and the details of measurements being incorrect in the document. It was stated that the measurements were taken from the centre of the school rather than the boundary of the playground; whilst also noting that wind measurements were taken from the Great Tew Quarry. It was referenced that the further away the quarry was, the less interference there would be, but there was no evidence that the Parish Council had to support this.

Members asked how the issue of dust was reported. Parish Councillor Marcovitch noted that dust issues were reported to the Parish Council and issued are reported to the liaison group to be resolved. One of the conditions is that the lorries cannot enter the site until 7am, but that lorries would queue in Wroxton from 6:30am; but that the applicant deals with these issues. He stated that a potential future condition could be to have the site more than 200m away from the boundary of the school; and proper environmental assessments to base those findings.

Members noted that there was no evidence of dust on the vegetation on Wroxton/South Newington Lane; and during the site visit, whilst the quarry was in operation, the noise was minimal. Parish Councillor Marcovitch clarified that noise complaints were received when lorries were queuing up to enter the site, rather than when the site was in operation. Dust was not a big problem on the road to North Newington as the road was not used by lorries.

On behalf of the applicant, the agent, Gemma Crossley, addressed the Committee and raised some of the key benefits; outlining that planning policies supported extension of quarries. She noted that the Local Aggregate Assessment 2024 demonstrated 3 and ½ years of mineral reserves in Oxfordshire. It aimed to improve the restoration scheme, drainage and provide in excess of the 10% biodiversity gain. The processing plant being in phase 4 provided natural mitigation in terms of noise and dust as that section was lower down. Issues raised at the liaison groups include vehicle speed and routing, which Earthline have tried to rectify by putting trackers on their vehicles. Thorough noise and environment assessments had been undertaken, which complied with policy and the applicant supported the officer recommendation to recommend approval.

Members raised the following points:

- The need to ensure controls were in place to manage dust in dry periods, which was confirmed that water could be sprayed on dry areas in these circumstances as there weren't water shortages at the quarry. Substantial boundary planting was also in place as mitigation.
- Trying to resolve vehicle idling in Wroxton and surrounding areas would be important and should be raised with Earthline. Whilst all lorries were not Earthline vehicles and could not be tracked, all drivers entering the site are given an induction to understand what is required.
- The importance of understanding the levels of particulates of dust at the school. Monitoring equipment was installed in 2021 within the school grounds to monitor dust levels and fine dust was found, as heavy dust doesn't travel very far. It was also confirmed that directional work could be undertaken to see which direction the dust had travelled from, and that a Dust Monitoring Plan would be beneficial.
- The importance of consistent monitoring from planning officers, in consultation with other teams such as public health.
- The possibility of including open rock faces when the site is restored for geological and educational purposes.

Following a question from Members, officers clarified the distances from the extraction areas to different parts of Wroxton Primary School:

- From the edge of extraction area to edge of school playground – 165m.
- From the edge of extraction area to edge of school building – 240m.
- From the edge of consented quarry boundary to edge of school playground – 136m.

It was noted that meteorological data would have been taken from the nearest monitoring station, which could also be the closest point to other quarries in the area.

Condition 13 in the report was noted to be a circular statement, as it should refer to item 12. Officers noted the error and would amend the document.

Officers clarified that the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan had been superseded by the core strategy. The core strategy did not bring over either policy PE1 or PE18, which had been referred to in several responses. Furthermore, recommended buffer zones between areas of mineral extraction and residential areas had also been superseded by National Planning Practice Guidance, which states to rely on environmental assessments in individual circumstances.

It was noted that conditions could not be enforced on things outside of the planning permission boundary, such as on vehicles travelling to the site or on the primary school. Certain areas couldn't be stipulated in conditions but could form part of wider plans put forward by the planning authority.

Councillor Gawrysiak proposed the recommendations as set out on page 52 in the report that the application be approved. This was seconded by Councillor Sargent.

It is RECOMMENDED that subject to a S.106 legal agreement to cover the matters in Annex 2, planning permission for MW.0063/24 be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Planning Development Manager, to include those set out in Annex 1.

RESOLVED: that the Committee unanimously approved the recommendation to approve the application as set out above.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing