

Survey Types



Response ID #798457

Visibility Unknown.

Question 1.

Your Name:

You must provide an answer to this question.

Judith Harley

Question 2.

Your organisation (if applicable):

Old Temple Cowley Residents' Association (OTCRA)

Question 3.

Your Address:

You must provide an answer to this question.

Your personal details will be properly safeguarded and processed in accordance with the requirements of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) 2018. Your information will be used for The Oxford Local Plan 2036 Main Modifications Consultation only, and we will only store your data until the Oxford Local Plan 2036 is adopted. Information you give in this form will be shared with the Independent Examiners.

Please note: Anonymous representations may not be accepted.

Select at least 1 option.

Select this box if you are happy for us to state your name and the first line of your address and postcode when publishing your response(s).

Select this box if you would rather all personal details except your name and a non-specific address (e.g. Oxford) to be obscured.

Question 7.

To which Modification(s) or part(s) of the Sustainability Appraisal does this response relate?

You must provide an answer to this question.

MM91, MM49 / PMC103, former Policy SP36 (now renumbered SP35) - Cowley Marsh Depot

and

MM121 / MM49 / MM64 former Policy SP66 (now renumbered SP64) - William Morris Sports Ground

Question 8.

Do you Support or Object the proposed modification(s)?

You must provide an answer to this question.

Support

Object

Question 9.

If you object, please state why:

The Examination Inspectors are required to consider whether the Local Plans have been properly prepared against tests set out in the Government's National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 182). Please tick any which apply:

Not positively prepared - i.e. the strategy will not meet development needs

Not justified - i.e. there is no evidence to justify the modification

Not effective - i.e. it won't work

Not consistent with national policy - i.e. does not comply with the law

Question 10.

Reason for SUPPORT or OBJECTION:

Please give details to explain why you support or object to the wording of the Modification(s) or part(s) of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Main Modifications.

You must provide an answer to this question.

MM49 -
SP36
(1960,
99.2)
and
SP66
(1962,
99.4)

My objections are the same for both policies, which are: These policies state "Planning permission will be granted for residential" and both sites have had text added that "other complementary uses will be considered on their merits". It is not clear whether "complementary uses" are in addition to, or instead of, residential. Both sites would benefit from being leisure only, which will better meet local development needs in Temple Cowley than more residential development. The Cowley Marsh Park policy states "redevelopment of the site should help improve the setting of Cowley Marsh Recreation Ground". The setting would be improved if there was no residential development, but the addition of a community centre and new swimming pool.

MM91
SP36 -
1959,
99.1

Question 11.

Summary of Representation:

If your reason for support or objection is longer than 100 words, please summarise the main issues raised.

Lack of clarity in the definition of "complementary uses" for each of these sites;
Lack of clarity as to whether "complementary" refers to the proposed residential or the existing sports use for each of these sites;
Loss of sports provision on the William Morris Sports Field, with inadequate, unsuitable, and unsatisfactory alternative provision;
A missed opportunity to provide sports and community facilities on the Cowley Marsh Depot site to complement the sports facilities present in the adjoining Cowley Marsh Park Recreation Ground.

For the William Morris Sports Field it is difficult to see how the sports provision can be retained, as required by MM64, when planning permission was granted by

MM64
SP66 -
99.3,
1961

Oxford City Council in December 2019 for residential development on the site. The loss of sports provision from this site is not compensated for by the payment of developer funds to improve sports facilities at a school in a different ward, some distance away, with limited community access.