

Oxford Local Plan**Proposed Submission Draft, November 2018****Comments from:**

Name: Mrs Rosie Lodwick

Postal Address: [REDACTED] Kidlington [REDACTED]

E-mail address: [REDACTED]

Date: 28 December 2018

I would prefer all personal details other than my name and a non specific address (eg Oxford) to be obscured

I do not wish to speak at the examination hearings

I wish to be notified when

The Council submits the plan to the Government

The Inspectors Report is published and

The Plan is adopted by the Council

Representation from Mrs Rosie Lodwick

258
1512

1. This representation relates to Paragraphs 3.1 to 3.12 and Policy H1
 2. I consider the Proposed Submission Plan to be Unsound
 3. I consider the Document Unsound because it is Not Justified and Not Effective
- #### 4 Reasons why the plan is uncompliant and/or unsound

The plan does not take account of the Council's own 2018 updated assessment of need and the Government's own standard methodology for calculating need. Both of these put the need at around 750 dwellings per annum including a large and substantial and realistic addition for affordable housing. The Council's target of 1400 per annum is therefore based on out of date evidence.

The Council also underestimates the city's own capacity for new housing. Firstly, it is protecting sites for employment that could be used for housing. (like the Northern Gateway). Secondly, it assumes much lower housing densities than are possible in an urban area when planning mainly for small dwellings.

Oxford's submitted plan means that surrounding Districts are expected to build large numbers of houses to meet Oxford's supposed needs, irretrievably destroying Green Belt in the process. This is not necessary, because the needs have been vastly exaggerated and because Oxford's capacity has been underestimated as I say above.

5 What changes are needed

The plan should use the latest assessments of housing need, which are little more than half of those shown in the plan.

The plan is too protective of land for employment. It should give more priority to housing and to increasing housing density on housing sites.

As a result, the plan should make clear that many fewer houses, if any, are needed to be built in the Green Belt in the surrounding Districts.

Representation from Mrs Rosie Lodwick

258.2
1513

1. This representation relates to paragraphs 2.1 to 2.10 and Policy E1

2. I consider the Proposed Submission Plan is Unsound

3. I consider the Document Unsound, because it is:
Not Justified and Not Effective

4 **Reasons why the plan is uncompliant and/or unsound**

Oxford's plans to greatly increase employment in the City are not needed and will be damaging because:

- Oxford has low unemployment already and does not need more jobs
- there will be even more traffic congestion on the road network
- it will add to the problems of an already congested city centre
- more people will have to move to the area resulting in more demand for housing and pressure for development on the Green Belt

It does not therefore need to protect sites for employment as proposed in Policy E1 because

- these sites could be better used for other purposes and especially housing
- many sites for business in and around the City are already undeveloped or unoccupied
- many, large science parks and other sites are already being planned near Oxford such as at Kidlington, Eynsham and Bicester
- there is no need for "knowledge-based" businesses to be located in or near Oxford, especially because of the availability of high speed internet

5 **What changes are needed**

Policy E1 should be more flexible, and should permit housing on suitable employment sites, especially where these are currently underused.

The city council should actively encourage the re-location of businesses, including some academic, research and medical activities, to suitable locations elsewhere in the county, where it is not essential for them to be based in Oxford.