SOUTH NEWINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of an Extra Ordinary Parish Council Meeting
Held on Tuesday 6th October 2026 at 7.30pm
In the Village Hall, Barford Road

Present:
Councillors: Mohamed Cassimjee (Chair), Stephan Lucks, Michael Rapp, Graham Smith and Sarah Wilson-Medhurst.

Mrs Christine Coles (Parish Clerk), County Cllr G Epps, District Cllr D Rogers, 15 villagers and an ex villager

26/68. To receive apologies
No apologies were received.

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. He thanked everyone for coming and thanked the Parish Clerk for arranging the meeting. The agenda item to discuss a new highway sign will be deferred until the next meeting.

This meeting tonight is to discuss the planning application for ten new dwellings including 3 affordable houses at Barford Road Farm. Written comments were received from villagers who could not attend tonight which have been summarised. The Chair read them out.

- Not opposed but there should be no more than 6 dwellings.
- They would need to be well designed with appropriate landscaping and in keeping with the village.
- If people are concerned about the look of a new development, the current NOTS site is an eyesore and car graveyard.
- If there was a choice I would prefer new housing to the regular HGV traffic from the NOTS site over and above the agreed limits.
- I would like to know the background, intentions and ultimate outcome which measures this development to be a success.
- How did it all start and by whom?
- Is it a money making exercise. Is it private or a public initiative? Are building developers involved?
- The planning statement implies that because a previous application to expand the NOTS business was refused, it is reasonable to build 10 houses on the site. I do not think this is a justifiable reason. Some of the objections to the expansion of the NOTS apply to this application.
- The comments from CPRE note:
    - The application seeks permission for 10 new dwellings in a location that is not allocated for housing in the currently adopted CDC Local Plan 2015-2031 nor the emerging Local Plan Review 2042.
    - We note this is a previously developed site. CPRE supports a brownfield first, greenfield last strategy as a general principle. However just because a site is brownfield does not mean it should necessarily be developed and the applicant cannot simply state that site is brownfield to justify development.
    - The location is considerably outside the current built up settlement and is not in a sustainable location.

DRAFT

- The planning statement infers that building houses on the site would free up the business to relocate. It is difficult to see how re-locating the business depends on outline planning permission. They are separate matters. Nothing prevents the owners from relocating the business anytime if they wish to expand operations.
- MW.0009/25 (Section 73 application to continue the development) generated 80 comments almost all of which were strongly against the application. The main reasons given were road safety, noise/disturbance and loss of amenity. Robust evidence shows that NOTS has regularly breached planning conditions since 2016.
- Section 4 of the Transport Statement is highly misleading. Table 4.1 fails to mention
  - Buses through SN are rare.
  - Pedestrian access to the bus stop and convenience store at Milcombe is problematic.
  - Pedestrian and cycle access to Wigginton and Bloxham are similarly challenging.
  - Fast moving cars/HGVs make non vehicular access via the A361 problematic.
- SN has no streetlights and residents value the dark sky environment. There is a risk of light pollution from the proposed development.

There are material considerations that are matters which can be taken into account when looking at a planning application. They can include (but are not limited to):-
Overlooking/loss of privacy, loss or light or overshadowing, parking, highway safety, traffic, noise, layout and density of building and nature conservation. Issues such as loss of view, or negative effect on the value of properties are not material considerations.

The public session notes 3 minutes per person but the Chair will allow 5 minutes per person. He asked those present to be to the point as much as they could and not repeat what others have said.

26/69. Public participation session ***(Members of the public are invited to address the council. The session will last for a maximum of one hour with any individual contribution lasting a maximum of 5 minutes)***

A villager noted that South Newington is classified as a Category B Satellite village. In CDC's Local Plan, housing development outside the built up limits of Category B villages in the open countryside is strictly controlled and is generally not permitted. Under Policy Villages 1, Category B villagers are designated as satellite villages. This policy restricts residential development within these villages to minor developments, infilling and conversions within the built up limits of the settlement. The proposed development is outside the built up limits of the village and in open countryside. Relevant policies are saved Policy H18 and Policy C8 alongside Rural Areas Strategy Policies such as Policy RUR3. Under these policies new houses in the open countryside are rejected unless they meet strict criteria as shown below
Essential needs – Dwellings intended for rural agricultural or forestry workers who absolutely must live on site. Whilst the site is called Barford Road Farm, it is not a farm in the normally understanding of the text farm. The principal operations on the site are that of North Oxfordshire Topsoil and have nothing to do with agriculture.
Replacement dwelling – Not applicable to this application.
Rural Exception Site – This is not a Rural Exception site.
Therefore the application should be refused on the basis of the above policies.
She asked how does this application will fit in with CDC not having a five year housing land supply?

Cllr Rogers is a District Councillor and Parish Councillor for Deddington. The CDC Local Plan will move to the examination stage. This site does not appear in the Local Plan and has not been put forward. This site is outside of the built up area. The benefit of this application are three affordable houses. Cllr Rogers does not think it is reasonable to build 10 houses in this location. There is no pavement and there will be highway and landscaping issues. He is keen to listen and make notes and understand the village concerns. He will ensure that any perceived benefits and concerns will be correctly relayed to CDC Officers.

He agreed to answer questions at the end with permission of the Chair. The Chair thanked Cllr Rogers for attending.

Affordable housing has been mentioned but there are currently two social houses owned by Sanctuary on St Peters Close which are empty.

The new proposed houses will not be affordable and available for ordinary working class people.

There is a discrepancy in the planning application paperwork in proposed housing sizes. The application form states 7 x 3 bed and 3 x affordable homes. The plans show 2 x 4 bed, 5 x 3 bed and 3 x affordable 3 beds. Which number is correct and how does planning consider this inconsistency?

District Cllr Rogers, as a father of three children, spoke about affordable housing and how to help people get onto the housing ladder. The definition of affordable is 80% of the market value. This is an insurmountable challenge. He was at the Graven Hill development recently in Bicester which CDC has control over. A 1 bedroom apartment costs £238K and the price has increased from last year. It is a major challenge. The question to whoever is in power is why do we house working class people and their children? There are other models to get people into housing but how will they be provided and offered?

County Cllr Epps spoke about the highways and transport side of the proposed application. The site is in open countryside with poor access to services. People will have to use a car to get about and it's a single track road. There is one bus a day which serves the village and there is a busy road to cross. There is no bus service in the neighbouring village of Barford St Michael. The nearest shop is in Milcombe which is not sustainable. This will rely heavily on the use of a car due to the very limited public transport options. A previous planning application by this site was withdrawn as there were a number of objections. The activities on site over the years have involved Planning Enforcement and Cllr Epps will recommend to Highways to object to this application. The Chair thanked him for attending.

An ex villager spoke about the environmental statement. It concentrates more on plants than reptiles or owls and there is no evidence that wildlife has been considered. There is a possibility of newts in the pond and there could be bats in the barn. The hedge along the Barford Road has been ignored and is excluded from the site plan. Will the landowner keep control of this and have it as a ransom strip? This will affect the biodiversity. The comment from Highways has asked for the hedge to be reduced to 600mm (2 feet) to improve visibility which again will affect biodiversity.

Cllr Rogers asked to be copied into any correspondence sent to Cherwell District Council. He agreed with all the points raised by the ex villager and agreed the discrepancy about the number of houses and bedrooms in the paperwork should be included in the PC response.

Cllr Wilson Medhurst encouraged all those present to reply to the consultation as individuals. The Parish Council would also formulate their own response.

A villager confirmed there are great crested newts in the pond which is located less than 25m from the proposed development site.

A villager said if planning is approved, walking between villages will be difficult. He asked if on the north boundary, could a footpath be run to connect with Barford? This would be a safer option for walkers. Cllr Epps replied that this is a good idea but it would be up to the applicant to amend the application and include it.

Signed Dated 10th November 2026

DRAFT

The ex villager spoke about transport and the access to the bus service which is limited. There is a plan of footpaths on site but some are missing. He felt the work produced was not thorough.

Another villager said there are big springs on the land and it was not ideal to build on.

A villager asked about responding to this application. The Parish Council will respond on behalf of the village but villagers should also send their own comments in as individuals.

The deadline to respond is 8th October but the Parish Council have an extension to 16th October. The ex villager asked Cllr Rogers if the parish could have the same extension as the Parish Council to give more time to respond.
Action: Cllr Rogers agreed to speak to the Head of CDC Planning to ask. He could not guarantee they would agree and he asked parishioners to try and get their comments in before the timeframe.

Cllr Smith asked what does this mean for other fields around the site and will it set a precedent? Cllr Rogers replied this is a brownfield site, is not in the Local Plan and is outside the built up area. It is concerning. In Hempton recently 9 houses were proposed. The Parish Council pushed back and it was successfully refused. This concern will apply to the whole of the Cherwell Area and other applications. The ex villager noted there are two other brownfield sites in the village, South Lea Barn and Hawthorn Stud.

26/70. To discuss planning application 26/01222/OUT, 10 new dwellings, including 3 affordable dwellings and associated garages, on previously developed land at Barford Road Farm, Barford Road and agree a response
The Parish Council will record all comments made prior to this meeting tonight and submit their comments to Cherwell District Council.

26/71. To discuss the purchase of a highway sign
Deferred until to the next meeting.

The Chair thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

There being no other business the meeting finished at 8pm.

Signed Dated 10th November 2026

DRAFT