

# Public Document Pack

## PLANNING & REGULATION COMMITTEE

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Monday, 25 April 2022 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 11.50 am.

**Present:**

**Voting Members:** Councillor Geoff Saul – in the Chair  
Councillor Robin Bennett  
Councillor Yvonne Constance OBE  
Councillor Imade Edosomwan  
Councillor Mohamed Fadlalla  
Councillor Judy Roberts  
Councillor David Rouane

**Officers:**

Whole of meeting David Periam, Mary Hudson & Matthew Case (Strategic Infrastructure & Planning); David Mytton & Cameron MacLean (Law & Governance).

*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.*

### **22/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS**

(Agenda No. 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Richard Webber (Deputy Chair), Councillor Felix Bloomfield, and Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak.

### **23/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - SEE GUIDANCE NOTE OPPOSITE**

(Agenda No. 2)

There were no Declarations of Interest.

### **24/22 MINUTES**

(Agenda No. 3)

There was one amendment to the minutes, as follows –

Item 7/22: Faringdon Quarry

Councillor Bennett noted that he had left the meeting before the Committee considered Agenda Item No. 7: Faringdon Quarry. Therefore, the number of votes in favour of approving the application, as set out on Page 8 of the minutes, should be 11 and not 12.

Subject to that amendment, the Committee approved the minutes of the meeting of 28 February 2022 and authorised the Chair to sign them as a correct record.

**25/22 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS**

(Agenda No. 4)

Representations had been received from the applicant and the applicant's agent in respect of Item 6: Land at Quarry Farm North of Green Lane, Green Lane, Chipping Norton, Great Tew.

**26/22 ALKERTON QUARRY, RATTLECOMBE ROAD, ALKERTON WITH SHENNINGTON, OXFORDSHIRE**

(Agenda No. 5)

The Committee considered a report by the Assistant Director for Strategic Infrastructure and Planning regarding the modification of the approved restoration scheme through importation of inert soil material for nature conservation afteruses and the erection of 18 single storey holiday lodges with associated landscaping and car parking at Alkerton Quarry, Rattlecombe Road, Alkerton with Shennington, Oxfordshire

Subject to:

- (i) The final comments from the Environment Agency confirming they have no objection to the application; and
- (ii) The applicant first entering into a Section 106 agreement and Routeing Agreement for the obligations set out in Annex 4; and
- (iii) Subject to conditions to be determined by the Assistant Director for Strategic Infrastructure and Planning, to include those set out in Annex 1 [of the report];

it was RECOMMENDED that planning permission for MW.0124/21 be approved.

Mary Hudson, Principal Planning Officer, Strategic Infrastructure and Planning, presented the report that was before the Committee.

In response to a Member's question, Mary Hudson stated that, at the time of writing the report, the Environment Agency, which had objected to the application, had yet to submit a reply in response to additional information provided by the applicant.

David Periam stated that, if the Committee was minded to approve the recommendation set out in the report, the committee would be delegating authority to officers to issue the permission subject to the Environment Agency confirming that they no longer objected to the application. If the Environment Agency maintained its objection, officers would bring the application back to the Committee.

In response to a further question, Mr Periam stated that the application had been brought before the Committee because it had been called in by the local Member, and because the next scheduled meeting of the Committee was not until 6 June. Accordingly, the recommendation had been framed in such a way as to allow the matter to progress should the Environment Agency withdraw its objection to the application.

As there were no more questions for officers, the Chair asked if Members wished to debate the application. As there was no response from Members, the Chair asked if any member wished to move that the Committee approve the recommendation as set out in the report before the Committee.

Motion

That the Committee approve the recommendation as set out in the report.

Moved by Councillor Constance. Seconded by Councillor Edosomwan.

The votes cast were, as follows:

For:	7
Against:	0
Abstentions:	0

**RESOLVED:** subject to -

- (i) The final comments from the Environment Agency confirming they have no objection to the application;
  - (ii) The applicant first entering into a Section 106 agreement and Routeing Agreement for the obligations set out in Annex 4 [of the report]; and
  - (iii) Subject to conditions to be determined by the Assistant Director for Strategic Infrastructure and Planning, to include those set out in Annex 1 [of the report],
- to approve Planning Permission for Application MW.0124/21.

**27/22 LAND AT QUARRY FARM NORTH OF GREEN LANE, GREEN LANE, CHIPPING NORTON, GREAT TEW, OXFORDSHIRE**

(Agenda No. 6)

The Committee considered a report by the Assistant Director for Strategic Infrastructure and Planning RECOMMENDING that planning permission for Application No's: MW.0100/21 and MW.102/21:

- (i) Extraction of limestone and deposit of imported clay to achieve an agricultural restoration (part retrospective) Land at Quarry Farm North of Green Lane, Green Lane, Chipping Norton, Great Tew, Oxfordshire; and
- (ii) Temporary Change of Use to Mineral Processing and Storage Area to continue the development of limestone quarry extension permitted by 18/02008/CM (MW.0027/18) without complying with condition 1, condition 2, condition 8 and condition 26 in order to amend the approved restoration scheme, extend the date for restoration and allow the importation of inert material at Enstone Airfield North, Land at Enstone Airfield North, Banbury Road, Enstone, Oxfordshire;

be approved.

The report was presented by Matthew Case, Senior Planning Officer. Mr Case noted changes to the proposed conditions set out in the report.

In response to questions by Members of the Committee, officers provided the following information.

- (a) During a monitoring visit in April of last year, it was noted that materials were being extracted from the area. Officers issued a "Temporary Stop Notice" and entered discussions with the applicant. Pursuant to those discussions, the applicant agreed to submit the present planning applications.
- (b) If the Committee was not minded to approve the applications, consideration would have to be given to taking appropriate enforcement action.

- (c) The applications had been made because officers were of the view that the activities of the applicant constituted unauthorised development.
- (d) The reasons for the delay in determining the applications included objections received in response to formal and informal consultation on various issues including archaeological, landscape, biodiversity, and transport elements of the application. In response to the objections, the applicant had amended the proposed restoration scheme and landscape assessment. In addition, there had been discussion on proposed conditions, including appropriate safety signage.
- (e) The Mullin development to build a large permanent motor museum on Enstone Airfield, south-east of the site of the current application, had been granted outline planning permission by West Oxford District Council. As the current application was for a temporary development which would be restored to an agricultural field, officers were of the view that they could not support a requirement for a bridleway as part of the Mullin development to make the current application acceptable.
- (f) Initial reservations by the Highway Authority about the application had been resolved by the inclusion of appropriate signage in the proposed conditions and officers were satisfied that it was not necessary to require a Routeing Agreement to make the impacts of the development acceptable.
- (g) The Transport Officer had approved the proposed signage as a condition of the planning approval which would be enforceable and subject to monitoring by officers carrying out site inspections.
- (h) Green Lane was a tarmac road with passing places that was part of the highway, and which was sufficiently wide to allow motorised and non-motorised users, including coaches and lorries from the quarry, to pass each other in a safe manner. In addition, Green Lane served traffic to and from the airfield.
- (i) If the committee was minded to approve the application, it could include an informative to the effect that the Committee would support a requirement for a bridleway.
- (j) The processing plant that was part of the present application was land that was part of the Mullin development.
- (k) The proposed conditions included the installation of wheel washes to ensure that mud would be removed from the wheels of vehicles entering and leaving the site before travelling on the highway. Julian

As there were no more questions for officers, the Chair invited the applicant, Mr Julian Veal, and the applicant's agent, Ms Lucy Binnie, to address the Committee.

The Committee then heard a presentation by Mr Veal and Ms Binnie in support of the application.

In response to a question by the Chair, Ms Binnie stated that the number of vehicular movements were set out in the officer's report<sup>1</sup>. Vehicles leaving the site would turn left to head south.

The Chair then invited Members of the Committee to debate the application. The following points were made in the subsequent debate.

---

<sup>1</sup> Page 55 of the report: "The transport statement estimates that the traffic generated between both the quarry and processing site would see between 28 to 32 movements per day, approximately three movements per hour".

- (a) This was a small-scale operation to remove one third of the limestone beyond the Great Tew Estate which would not significantly increase the number of vehicular movements and the objections had been met by the conditions relating to signage and Green Lane.
- (b) The application would contribute towards meeting the gap in the Council's crushed rock minerals policy with minimal transport disturbance.

At this stage in the proceedings, Councillor Constance moved that the recommendations, as set out in the report of the Assistant Director for Strategic Infrastructure and Planning, in relation to both applications be approved.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Fadlalla.

In the subsequent discussion of the motion to approve the recommendations, which included objections by the Parish Council which opposed the application, officers provided the following information.

- (a) The main objection by the Parish Council was the proposal that it was not necessary for there to be a routeing agreement. Having considered the objection, officers remained of the view that the application did not require a routeing agreement as a condition to the application being granted.
- (b) The Highway Authority had required that the sleeping policeman in Green Lane be removed as they had been laid without the necessary permission.
- (c) Regarding soil stored on the Mullin site, it was noted that various works were being carried out on the airfield in preparation for the Mullin development and any soil stored there was not part of the operation that was the subject of the planning application before the Committee.
- (d) Soho Farmhouse had been notified about the application and had made no response.
- (e) Regarding road safety concerns in relation to Green Lane, these had been addressed by the proposed conditions for appropriate signage. In addition, the Highway Authority was of the view that a routeing agreement was not necessary.
- (f) Other matters raised by the Parish Council, including ecology and archaeology had been addressed in the report.
- (g) Should the Committee approve the report's recommendations, an informative supporting the creation of a bridleway as part of the West Oxford District Council Mullin development planning application would be included in the notices granting planning permission.

Having concluded the debate on the motion, the Chair put the motion to approve both planning applications to a vote.

The votes cast were, as follows:

For:	7
Against:	0
Abstentions:	0

**RESOLVED:** That Planning Permission be granted for Application No's: MW.0100/21 and MW.102/21 viz.

- (i) Extraction of limestone and deposit of imported clay to achieve an agricultural restoration (part retrospective) Land at Quarry Farm North of Green Lane, Green Lane, Chipping Norton, Great Tew, Oxfordshire; and
- (ii) Temporary Change of Use to Mineral Processing and Storage Area to continue the development of limestone quarry extension permitted by 18/02008/CM (MW.0027/18) without complying with condition 1, condition 2, condition 8 and condition 26 in order to amend the approved restoration scheme, extend the date for restoration and allow the importation of inert material at Enstone Airfield North, Land at Enstone Airfield North, Banbury Road, Enstone, Oxfordshire; and
- (iii) That the notice(s) granting planning permission include an Informative supporting the inclusion of a condition requiring a bridleway in any grant of planning permission by West Oxford District Council in respect of the Oxford Mullin Automotive Park development.

**28/22 RELEVANT DEVELOPMENT PLANS AND POLICIES**

(Agenda No. 7)

**NOTED**

..... in the Chair

Date of signing .....