Newington Parish Council
Oxfordshire
Draft Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on
19th October 2026 at 7:00pm in the Chequers Inn, Berrick Salome

---

Present:
Cllr Black; Cllr Howlett (D); Cllr Howlett (N); Cllr Nettleton; Cllr Thomson
In Attendance: Clerk/RFO Lawrence Wootten
Members of the public: None

46.26 ELECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN
Cllr Nettleton was elected as Chairman for the meeting (proposed by Cllr Howlett, seconded by Cllr Black).

47.26 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE – District Cllr Turner and County Cllr Edwards

48.26 DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS – Cllrs Howlett (D and N) declared an interest in item xxxx and took no part in the discussion of that item.

49.26 ITEMS RAISED BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC – No members of the public present

50.26 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING
(a) The minutes of the last meeting held on 23rd September 2026 were approved, signed by the Chairman and will be added to the website by the Clerk.

ACTION FOR CLERK – post approved minutes on website.

(b) Cllr Nettleton proposed a vote of thanks to Cllr Thomson for his work on recent Planning Applications. This was seconded by Cllr Howlett (D) and carried unanimously.

51.26 PLANNING
The following Planning Application received from SODC was considered:
Ref: P26/S4523/PIP
Proposal: Erection of a minimum of 9 and a maximum of 9 residential dwellings
Location: Land adj former Newington Nurseries, Newbury Hill View, Stadhampton, Oxon
Applicant: Mr J Hunt

Cllrs Howlett (D and N) declared an interest in this item and took no part in the conversation or decision.

Cllr Thomson proposed that the Council object to the application, seconded by Cllr Nettleton and approved unanimously.

The following response will be submitted to South Oxfordshire District Council:
Newington Parish Council objects to application P26/S4523/PIP and asks that Permission in Principle be refused.
This application is a resubmission of P26/S3786/PIP, which the Council refused earlier this month because there was no direct pedestrian connection to the village and the development was premature until the footpath linked to the former Newington Nurseries site was delivered. The applicant's covering letter (2 October 2026) states that the site is outside the settlement, does not comply with the adopted Local Plan, and relies instead on Policy S5(j) of the National Planning Policy Framework.
Policy S5(j) requires development outside a settlement to be "physically well-related to an existing settlement". The Parish Council considers that the amended scheme still fails that test, for two reasons. First, the location itself is not well-related to the village: the site is an open field outside the built-up area, which only partly adjoins existing development and otherwise relies on unbuilt neighbouring developments

being completed. Second, the proposed connections do not overcome this: the A329 route is not yet available, and the northern route is unsuitable whatever its final design.

1. Relationship to the existing settlement

The housing site itself lies wholly outside Stadhampton. The covering letter accepts this, claiming only that the access road and footway corridor fall within the settlement.

That claim depends entirely on unbuilt planning permissions. The letter treats the Nurseries site, and other sites with planning permission, as part of the settlement under the Framework's Glossary, which includes land with permission "which will form part of the built-up area once the development is complete". These developments have not been built. Today, the application site is an open field parcel separated from the village by fields and an undeveloped former nursery.

The proposal would therefore create a new and detached edge to the village rather than a well-integrated extension of it. Adjacency to Newbury Hill View along one boundary does not make a site physically well-related when its only access and its proposed footway both run through land whose development has not happened.

2. Reliance on the Newington Nurseries development (note 28)

Note 28 to Policy S5(j), which the Parish Council considers central to this application, states:

"Where a development proposal is located outside a settlement, and separated from the existing built-up area by virtue of being beyond the outside edge of an allocated site that has yet to be fully developed, consideration should be given to whether the proposal is in a suitable location should the allocated development not proceed."

The covering letter does not expressly address note 28. Its only response to the risk is that the footway process is "well advanced". That goes to the footway, not to whether the Nurseries development will proceed, and in any event "well advanced" is not a guarantee of delivery.

Even if the footway were built, it would not make the site any better related to the village if the Nurseries development does not proceed. The footway and access road would simply run through an undeveloped site, leaving the new houses separated from the built-up area by vacant land.

The Nurseries site is a permitted rather than an allocated site, but the principle applies with equal force. The applicant itself relies on the Glossary to treat that permitted land as part of the settlement. If permitted land can count as settlement, the risk note 28 addresses — that the intervening development never happens — must be considered too.

That risk is real. Reserved matters for the Nurseries scheme were approved around six years ago and the development has not proceeded. Without it, the application site has no built connection to the village, its access road would run through a vacant former nursery, and the A329 footway the applicant now relies on would have to be delivered by this applicant alone, with no mechanism to secure it. Vehicle access would likewise be taken from the A329 south of the village, along a road through undeveloped land. The site would have no road connection through any existing part of the village. The application should be assessed on the settlement pattern that exists, not on the assumption that the Nurseries scheme will eventually be built.

By the applicant's own account, part of the footway runs over unregistered "gap" land that is still with the Land Registry. The highway (S278) agreement cannot be completed until that is resolved.

As the previous refusal confirmed, until the footway is built this access cannot be relied upon for this site.

3. Northern footpath

The applicant offers the northern route "as an alternative to, or in addition to" the A329 footway. Measured from the applicant's Site Location Plan (P100, 1:2500 at A3), the new route runs from the site north along the field edge to the public right of way off Newells Close. This is a total of approximately 250 m before joining the right of way.

No details are given of this new access in regard to its surface, width, lighting or boundary treatment, or of how a 250 m path along a field edge and through residential land would be safe and usable all year round.

The covering letter relies on other schemes using the same right of way, but those are separate sites with their own connections and do not show that this route is suitable.
The Council's own Joint Design Guide (Principle 3.3) requires links to existing streets and rights of way to be "direct, safe (consider surveillance, sight lines, lighting) and attractive links for all users". A 250 m path along a field edge, with garden fences on one side and open or unbuilt land on the other, would have no natural surveillance and would not meet that standard. It would also depend for its setting on the outline scheme at P25/S0643/O, which has not been built and whose final layout is not fixed.
The Parish Council's view is unchanged from the refused application. In fact, the Council believes the addition of such an inappropriate path not only fails to overcome the reason for the previous refusal, but further demonstrates that the site is not physically well-related to the village.

4. The village is less sustainable than when earlier schemes were approved
The covering letter argues that walking distances are no worse than those accepted for P25/S0643/O and P25/S4074/PIP, and by Inspectors for P14/S4105/O and P16/S3988/O. Those appeals concerned applications made in 2014 and 2016.
Since then the village has lost facilities. Bus services have been reduced and a public house has closed. The site's accessibility should be judged on the services that exist now, not those that existed when earlier permissions were granted.
Without a secured or appropriate footway, residents would still depend on the car to reach the village and its facilities. That conflicts with the emphasis on sustainable transport in both the Local Plan and national policy, including Policy TR3 on which the applicant relies.

5. Scale and density
The proposal would be much less dense than the two neighbouring developments. That gives it a different grain and character and reinforces its separation from the village.

Development	*Density (dwellings per hectare, gross site area)*
Hampton Meadow (built)	*21.4*
Newington Nurseries (permitted, not built)	*18.6*
This proposal (9 dwellings on 0.94 ha)	*9.6*

Gross site area is the fair basis for comparison, because the neighbouring site areas also include access and amenity land. The covering letter quotes about 12 dwellings per hectare by excluding the access way and connections, and itself accepts that this is "at the lower end" of local densities.

Conclusion
Newington Parish Council considers that the amended proposal is still not physically well-related to Stadhampton, as Policy S5(j) requires. In particular, the proposal:

- *lies wholly outside the existing settlement, and counts as adjoining it only if the unbuilt Newington Nurseries scheme is treated as built;*
- *would remain separated from the village if that scheme does not proceed, a risk note 28 to Policy S5(j) requires to be considered and the applicant does not address;*
- *without the nurseries scheme it relies on about 250 m of new northern path, which is not, even without technical details, capable of conforming to the Council's design guide due to surveillance and relative location to back gardens of current development*
- *would therefore leave residents dependent on car travel to reach village facilities, which have reduced since earlier permissions were granted; and*
- *has a substantially lower density and different grain from the neighbouring developments.*

The reason for refusing P26/S3786/PIP has not been overcome: the pedestrian connection is no more real than before, and the only alternative is a poorly designed bolt-on, which simply highlights the inappropriateness of this location. Newington Parish Council respectfully requests that Permission in Principle be refused.

ACTION FOR CLERK – submit the agreed comments and objection to South Oxfordshire District Council.

52.26 ITEMS FOR INFORMATION OR NEXT AGENDA

a) It was noted that the unstable ceiling in St Giles Church meant that Parish Council meetings could no longer be held there until the situation was resolved. The Council was very grateful to the Chequers Inn for allowing the meeting to be held there at no cost, but the Clerk pointed out that a licensed premises should only be used when no other alternative meeting place can be sourced (as was the case for this meeting). The Clerk will seek an alternative venue for subsequent meetings.

ACTION FOR CLERK – seek an alternative venue for Parish Council meetings.

53.26 DATE OF NEXT MEETING – Wednesday 25th November 2026 (to be confirmed)

Meeting closed at 7.30pm

Signed …….. Date 25th November 2026

DRAFT