

PLANNING & REGULATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting held on Monday, 13 October 2025 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 2.43 pm

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Diana Lugova – in the Chair

Councillor Tony Worgan (Deputy Chair)
Councillor Ron Batstone
Councillor Mark Cherry
Councillor Lesley McLean
Councillor Gavin McLauchlan
Councillor Paul Austin Sargent
Councillor Geoff Saul
Councillor Roz Smith
Councillor Ted Fenton

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak
Councillor Peter Stevens

Officers: Jack Ahier (Senior Democratic Services Officer), David Periam (Planning Development Manager), David Mytton (Solicitor), Jason Sherwood (Head of Regulatory Planning Enforcement).

The Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting. Except as insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda and reports, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

10/24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS (Agenda No. 1)

Apologies were received from Councillor Saj Malik, substituted by Councillor Ted Fenton, and Councillor Jenny Hannaby.

11/24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - SEE GUIDANCE NOTE BELOW (Agenda No. 2)

There were none.

12/24 MINUTES (Agenda No. 3)

During the consideration of the minutes of the meeting on 31 March 2025, the following amendments were made:

- To note Councillor Ted Fenton's virtual attendance at the meeting on 31 March 2025.

Councillor Gavin McLauchlan noted that the minutes related to actions from Hazell and Jeffries in Ewelme and stated that their actions continued to contravene the Certificate of Lawful Existing Use of Development (CLEUD). He wanted this on the record.

Lastly, the Committee agreed, where possible, to hold site visits on Monday mornings before the Committee in the afternoon to make better use of time.

Subject to the amendments as above, the Committee resolved to agree the minutes of the meetings held on 31 March 2025 and 20 May 2025 as a correct record.

RESOLVED: that the Committee approved the minutes of the meetings held on 31 March 2025, as amended, and 20 May 2025 as an accurate record.

13/24 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 4)

The following speakers requested to address the Committee on the following items on the agenda:

Item 5: Land at Sutton Courtenay Waste Management Site, Appleford Sidings, Sutton Courtenay

- Andrew Barton (Associate Director – Axis), on behalf of the applicant.
- Rita Atkinson (Chair – Sutton Courtenay Parish Council)

The Chair advised that a late written statement from Appleford Parish Council had been circulated to the Committee.

14/24 LAND AT SUTTON COURTENAY WASTE MANAGEMENT SITE, APPLEFORD SIDINGS, SUTTON COURTENAY

(Agenda No. 5)

The Chair introduced the item to the meeting.

The Planning Development Manager introduced the application which was a section 73 application to continue the development permitted by MW.0088.13 (Waste transfer facility to handle 60 000 tonnes per annum of non-hazardous waste and 200 tpa of clinical waste; and associated operational development including a northern egress to Corridor Road, concrete pad, soil storage bunds, perimeter fencing, transformer pad and transformer, traffic (Armco) barriers and traffic lights at the consented Materials Recycling Facility (MRF)) without complying with conditions 3 and 4, to extend the end date of the existing Waste Transfer Facility from 31st December 2030 to 31st December 2050.

Officers provided a brief update to the report on paragraph 44, which referred to a Joint Local Plan 2041 from South Oxfordshire District Council and Vale of White

Horse District Council. Officers confirmed the two councils had received a report from the Planning Inspectors, which had been critical of the work done, but that it did not materially affect the consideration of the application.

Officers presented photos of the site, maps of the area and internal layout plans of the current building plans for the information of the Committee.

The Chair invited public speakers to address the Committee.

Andrew Barton (Axis), on behalf of the applicant, summarised the position of the Waste Disposal Authority in the importance of a transfer station in the south of the county, given direct delivery to the Ardley Energy Recovery Facility was not practical or efficient. It supported the continued use of the site in Sutton Courtenay due to its important role in management of waste in Oxfordshire, emphasising that there were no changes to operational matters, only an extension of the contract to 2050. It was confirmed that no objections were received from Oxfordshire County Council's transport, rights of way, landscape, environmental protection or ecology officers, or the Environment Agency.

Rita Atkinson (Chair, Sutton Courtenay Parish Council), spoke in favour of the officer's recommendations for the Committee to refuse the application. It was noted that the extension would have a cumulative impact on the communities in Sutton Courtenay, noting traffic through the village as an example.

Members raised the following points:

- The site being a greenfield site and therefore, subject to restoration conditions and whether alternative sites could be used through relocation. It was confirmed by officers that if another site had to be found, the cost would fall on the Council under the terms of the contract between the Council as Waste Disposal Authority and the applicant.
- How this application would relate to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) and whether this strategy would be published shortly. Officers confirmed that the LRNS was scheduled on the Forward Plan for Cabinet on 21st October.
- That the current facility could fully become a waste transfer facility station as the developer could use the internal layout how they wished for waste transfer purposes. The applicant had not sought to amend a condition which limited the throughput at the waste transfer station to no more than 60,200 tonnes per annum.
- The likelihood, if the Committee were to agree with the officer recommendation, on the application being appealed. Officers confirmed that the previous decision of the Committee in 2014 voted against the officer recommendation to approve, but that there was a strong case here that could be defended due to strong policy grounds for agreeing with the officer recommendation to refuse the application. It was further pointed out that the time left for the landfill site to cease operations prior to the completion of the restoration works (5 years now, compared with 16 years in 2014) was the main difference between the applications (i.e the existing permission did not conflict

with the restoration requirements but the proposed extension of time in the application does so).

- Whether weight should be given to the lack of alternative sites. Officers advice was that possible alternative sites had been identified by the applicant but were discounted on the grounds of the cost of relocation and the Committee should give limited weight to the costs of relocation that would fall on the Council.

Councillor Sargent proposed the recommendation as set out on page 36 in the report that the application should be refused for the reasons set. This was seconded by Councillor Cherry. The reasons for refusal were as follows:

1. The proposed development would retain a large waste management building and associated curtilage which is significantly larger than is needed for the proposed waste transfer use. This would result in the continued industrialisation of the area for a prolonged period after which the surrounding landfill site would otherwise be restored. Due to the change in the character of the surrounding area through the wider restoration of the landfill site, the development would have unacceptable impacts on amenity including through visual and traffic impacts on the amenity of other users of the Rights of Way network and the permissive paths which are required to be provided in association with the restoration of the landfill site contrary to OMWCS policies C5, C10 and C11, VLP1 policy CP37 and VLP policy DP23. It has not been demonstrated that this greenfield site is the most suitable and sustainable option for a waste management facility after the completion of landfilling in 2030, and therefore the proposal is contrary to OMWCS policy W5.

2. The proposed retention of a large waste management building and associated curtilage for 20 years beyond the end date on the existing planning permission, would mean that both the application site and the landfill site in which it is located would not be restored in a timely and phased manner contrary to OMWCS policy M10 and OMWCS policy W6.

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

..... in the Chair

Date of signing