

213

Policy 51

View Response

Response Details

From Ian Ashley

Date Started: 27 Dec 2018 18:45. Last modified: 27 Dec 2018 18:45

Status Complete

Response ID #675057

Visibility Response visibility: **Unknown.**

Email Address [REDACTED]

Postal Address

Postcode OX44 [REDACTED]

Gender

What is your age?

If you are under 16,
what is your date of
birth?

What is your ethnic
group?

Your ethnic group (if
you answered other)

Are you disabled?

Organisation Name

Job Title / Position
within the Organisation

Areas of Interest Local economy and Business Issues, Environment, Housing,
Community Issues

Survey Types

1

Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number below)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Paragraph | <input type="radio"/> Policies Map |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Policy Number | <input type="radio"/> Sustainability Appraisal |

Please give the relevant paragraph or policy number

S1

2

Do you consider that the document:

Select the most applicable option in each row.

- | | Yes | No |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| (a) is legally compliant? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| (b) is sound? | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| (c) complies with the duty to co-operate? | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |

3

Do you consider that the document is **unsound** because it is **not**: (tick as appropriate)

(a) positively prepared?

(b) justified?

(c) effective?

(d) consistent with national policy?

4

Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound, not legally compliant or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. If you do believe the document is sound, legally compliant, or complies with the duty to co-operate you may use the box to explain why.

911
913 - 213.1
912
913
213.2
912
913 - 213.3
HI

Whilst this plan has some redeeming features, such as favourable planning to enable the university and hospital to build low cost homes for their employees, it presents an overriding vision of economic growth at the expense of communities and our precious landscape. This is not, in my view, acceptable at a time when we need to figure out how we can conserve our natural environment rather than destroy it. There certainly is a problem in Oxford with a lack of homes that the workforce can afford but there seems to be no alternative strategies considered other than build more homes within the city and remove land from the green belt around the city boundary to build even more. Why this problem has occurred and will continue to occur is not explored in this plan. Oxford has a successful economy with low unemployment - further economic growth (ie. more jobs) will not benefit existing residents. There is clearly an imbalance between the number of jobs available within the city, the amount of accommodation needed to support the workforce and maintenance of the unique cultural environment. Rather than consider how to limit jobs and housing to maintain the population at an appropriate level whilst continuing to deliver economic prosperity, this plan is seeking to develop urban sprawl in conjunction with neighbouring councils.

The recently updated SHMA, para 9-15, using as a base the latest population growth statistics from the Office of National Statistics (Sept 2018) shows that Oxford only needs to build between 543 – 585 dwellings per annum but in this plan is continuing to pursue the development of 1400 dpa. This is to facilitate the delivery of the Oxfordshire Growth Deal which in turn is supporting government policy that is seeking to more than double the population of Oxfordshire over the next 20 – 30 years. This has not been consulted on and is not generally understood by the vast majority of people that live in Oxfordshire. An alternative government approach would be to focus funding on employment and regeneration in poorer communities in other parts of the UK rather than encourage relocation of key talent to Oxfordshire. Despite challenges with housing in Oxford this plan is protecting sites for further employment that could easily be converted to accommodation and is also intending to open up further employment sites around the Cowley branch railway line and Grenoble Road. This will exacerbate the problem for decades to come.

Not a great plan.

Ian Ashley.

213.H/cont.
EI
212.4
9/15

5

What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination.) It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

Develop a plan that does not encroach into the green belt.