

Oxford Local Plan

Part A

Name: Sue Stewart

Address: [REDACTED] Charlton-on-Otmoor [REDACTED]

E-mail address: [REDACTED]

Date: 28/12/2018

Data Protection. All responses have to be made public. Choose one of:

- NO - I am happy for OCC to publish my name, first line of address and postcode
- YES - 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

Part B form 2 of 2, from Sue Stewart

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

265-1
15/5/6

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

The plan shows that the City Council is planning to increase employment in the City whereas what is needed is more affordable housing within the City boundaries for the existing big employers in Oxford: NHS, the University and Schools. My friends in education and the NHS tell me that there is:

- a huge shortage of affordable housing for teachers and NHS workers, they cannot afford to live close to where they work so unless they are able to travel in by train/public transport there is huge pressure on the road networks causing more pollution (in many areas in Oxford pollution is already well above WHO recommendations for healthy living)
- difficulty in filling available vacancies in the NHS and teaching posts in schools due to lack of affordability of housing – high quality employees may come for a few years' experience in Oxford but they move on to more affordable places so there is high turnover

It would help the UK as a whole if more employment could be created in the North where housing is cheaper and people can have a better quality of life.

I am opposed to pursuing the significant increase of employment in Oxford:

- * Oxford already has low unemployment
- * it will increase traffic congestion on the road network which is already under pressure (especially in the centre)
- * it would threaten the Green Belt around Oxford because more people would move to the area resulting in more demand for housing and pressure for development on the Green Belt – increase in need for leisure and recreation facilities – more golf courses needed (not fewer!)
- * developing the Green Belt would put more pressure on Oxford's air quality
- * many business/science parks in and around the City are already undeveloped or unoccupied eg the Oxford Business Park and Oxford Science Park
- * plans to expand employment in the area are already in other plans eg Kidlington, Eynsham and Bicester and so are not needed in Oxford as well

5 What changes are needed

1. Policy E1 should consider and address existing needs of people already employed in Oxford who cannot afford to live here – genuinely affordable or social housing.

2. Reducing the need for traffic in the City, ensuring air quality at least meets the WHO recommended standard:

Below is an extract from an article by **Dr Maria Neira**, Director Department of Public Health, Environmental and Social Determinants of Health, WHO

“Health must be the number one priority for urban planners”

<https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/health-must-be-the-number-one-priority-for-urban-planners>

Extract:

One of the best overall “indicators” of a healthy or unhealthy city is air quality. This is because air pollution levels are typically low in well-planned cities with good transport systems, walkable streets and ample green spaces to filter the air. And air pollution levels soar in urban settings that prioritize road transport over pedestrians and cyclists, and that allow uncontrolled sprawl in large, grey, unbroken blocs of asphalt and concrete.

More than 80% of all cities worldwide exceed the air quality limits set by the World Health Organization (WHO). And more than half of all cities that monitor air pollution report air quality levels 3.5 times or more than the WHO limits.

Air pollution is an insidious killer. Every year 3 million people die prematurely due to outdoor air pollution, which is heaviest in major cities of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Most of these deaths are due to heart attack, stroke, respiratory diseases and lung cancers – that are also among the world’s top disease killers today.