

218

Policy SP57.

Summarized.

View Response

Response Details

From Jane Farrow

Date Started: 04 Dec 2018 08:25. Last modified: 04 Dec 2018 08:25

Status Complete

Response ID #668259

Visibility Response visibility: **Unknown.**

Email Address [REDACTED]

Postal Address

Postcode OX [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, Planning and Regeneration, Transport and Parking, Community Issues, Equalities

Survey Types

1

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

- Paragraph Policies Map
- Policy Number Sustainability Appraisal

Please give the relevant paragraph or policy number

Policy M3 NOTM3 but SP 2019 57

2/8/1-925

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 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.

This policy and Appendix 7 makes no reference to the continued development of hospitals in Marston/Headington. No anticipation of the further congestion and air quality issues that will arise from the further development of the hospitals.

Ruskin Field (development site 463) has been allocated for housing. It seems that a considerable opportunity to rectify the current and future congestion within the Marston and Headington area could be missed.

The progressive development of the Marston/Headington area, particularly the JR Hospital, other hospitals and Brooks University, without any radical transport solution, has led to the acknowledgment that the existing road network have reached their maximum capacity, resulting in congestion and air quality issues impacting on residential areas, hospitals, schools and businesses. The current highway works is unlikely to alleviate this.

The Local Plan now proposes still further development on the JR and other sites without appearing to reference to any appropriately radical transport, parking or travel solution.

SP209
2/8.1-928

SP42
2/8.2-929

218.2 cont.

On its own, putting infrastructure in place to enable connections by walking, cycling and public transport is unlikely to alleviate the current and further anticipated car congestion associated with the JR Hospital, given the distance that visitors, patients and healthcare staff have to travel.

Ruskin field is the obvious location for a 1500 space hospital PARK and WALK, for staff and/or visitors and patients. Its proximity to the hospital is unsurpassable (approximately 350m between the edge of Ruskin field and the hospital boundary) and negates the unsolvable problem of creating a direct vehicular access from the ring road to the hospital. With the City Council's housing development adjacent to Barton there is now a direct access from the ring road to the hospital for buses so there could even be a bus connection.

218.1 cont.

Currently the Marston/Headington roads are congested and it is difficult to envisage how the current works being undertaken in Headington will in anyway alleviate the current situation in a tangibly way, let alone for future development in the area. Therefore, to lose one potential solution by allocating housing on this site instead of parking, could effectively remove any real solution to the additional traffic generated by future development.

A Ruskin Field parking solution could have the potential to alleviate congestion and pollution within Marston and Headington, provide direct access to the main JR hospital from the ring road without cutting vehicular routes through Northway or Old Headington and so go some way to alleviating the current over capacity on the inner road network.

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.

218.2 Cont.
929
SP42

Either state that there will be no further development on the JR Hospital site or ensure that a radical solution to remove some of the congestion within Marston /Headington is facilitated as referenced above