

**Oxford City Council
Consultation Statement
Local Plan 2045
July 2026**

Contents

Oxford City Council.....	1
Consultation Statement	1
Local Plan 2045	1
July 2026	1
1. Introduction	4
2. Local Plan Timeline.....	4
2.1. Engagement Throughout the Local Plan Process	4
2.2. Proposed Submission (Regulation 20) Consultation	5
2.3. Proposed Submission Consultation Period	5
2.4. Who was notified?	5
2.5. Methods Use to Notify of the Publication Period	5
2.6. Responses Received	6
3. High Level Summary of Responses Received	6
3.1. Chapter 1.....	6
3.2. Chapter 2.....	8
3.3. Chapter 3.....	9
3.4. Chapter 4.....	11
3.5. Chapter 5.....	13
3.6. Chapter 6.....	15
3.7. Chapter 7.....	16
3.8. Chapter 8.....	17
4. Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Consultation Statement.....	19
4.1. Early draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report	19
4.2. Interim Sustainability Appraisal of the Preferred Options Document	20
4.3. Sustainability Appraisal of the Proposed Submission Document	21
5. Preferred Options Consultation Process	22
5.1. Who was consulted?	22
5.2. Consultation Materials.....	23
4.3. Consultation Methods.....	23
4.3.1. Promotion and Publicity of the Preferred Options Consultation Period.....	23
4.3.2. Preferred Options Consultation Events and Meetings.....	24
5.4. Responses to Preferred Options Questionnaire.....	25
5.4.1. Responses to Consultation Questionnaire and Emailed Responses	25
5.4.2. Graphs of Responses	25

Appendix 1 – Statutory Consultees

Appendix 2 – Additional Local Groups and Organisations Contacted Directly

Appendix 3 – Submission Draft Consultation Responses and Officer Responses

Appendix 4 – Preferred Options Consultation Report

Appendix 5 – Preferred Options First Draft Oxford Local Plan 2042 Consultation Document

Appendix 6 – Early Engagement Report

1. Introduction

The Oxford Local Plan 2045 will set out how we want the city to look and feel. It will guide new development to the right locations while protecting and improving the environment and people's quality of life. It will help deliver new homes, businesses, jobs, shops and infrastructure needed to support the growth of Oxford over the next 20 years and it will be used in determining planning applications and to guide investment decisions across the city.

Oxford City Council is required (Regulation 22¹) to produce a Statement of Consultation to accompany the submission of the Oxford Local Plan 2045 to the Secretary of State. This Statement will assist the Inspector at Examination in determining whether the Plan complies with the statutory requirements for involvement and government guidance. The report demonstrates how planning officers:

1. Have taken account of the public feedback to the preferred options as received during the Regulation 18 consultation.
2. How the proposed submission draft was shaped in response.
3. Summarises the responses received to the consultation on the proposed submission draft Local Plan 2045 in relation to Regulation 20.

The report covers the following:

- (i) An overview of the Proposed Submission Draft Consultation, including which bodies and persons were invited to make representations, how they were consulted, and how many comments were received.
- (ii) A summary of the main issues raised and officer responses in relation to the proposed submission draft.
- (iii) An overview of the Preferred Options (Regulation 18) consultation, including which bodies and persons were invited to make representations and how they were consulted.
- (iv) A summary of the proposed submission draft was shaped in response to the public feedback.

2. Local Plan Timeline

2.1. Engagement Throughout the Local Plan Process

Involvement of local communities and other stakeholders from the beginning of the preparation of the Local Plan has been a key priority for the council. The main stages of consultation on the Oxford Local Plan 2045 were as follows:

1. Proposed Submission (Regulation 20) Consultation (30 January 2026 - 13 March 2026)
2. Preferred Options (Regulation 18) Consultation (27 June 2025 – 8 August 2025)
3. Informal Early Engagement Consultation (17 March 2025 – 28 April 2025)

¹ *Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended)*

2.2. Proposed Submission (Regulation 20) Consultation

This section sets out how the City Council has complied with Regulation 20 (Proposed Submission Consultation) on public participation of a development plan document. It also summarises the representations received in response to the consultation, setting out how many representations were made and what the issues raised were. As this Consultation Statement highlights, by the time of the Proposed Submission Consultation extensive consultation and engagement had taken place on the emerging draft Local Plan as summarised in the list above.

2.3. Proposed Submission Consultation Period

The consultation period on the Proposed Submission Document and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report commenced on 30th January 2026 for a period of 8 weeks until 13th March 2026. This consultation period exceeds the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 and the City Council's usual consultation period identified in the Oxford City Council Statement of Community Involvement. Notice of consultation was communicated by email on 30th January 2026 to those on the City Council's database and advertised on the council's website and social media platforms. More information on the methods used is provided in this report, further below.

2.4. Who was notified?

The previous stages of Local Plan consultation focused on the broad issues, utilising a wide range of adaptable and interactive opportunities for engagement to increase the numbers of people involved and to maximise the benefits of the consultation. The proposed submission stage is a formal consultation stage which is required to focus on soundness and legal compliance with aspects of the Plan. Responding to the consultation inevitably requires a greater commitment of time and effort in order to frame responses in terms of the soundness and legal tests. Therefore, as well as statutory consultees, those registered on the City Council's database as having an interest in planning were key to consult. Direct notifications were sent to all those on the City Council's database, which includes those involved in previous rounds of Local Plan consultation, statutory consultation bodies and duty to cooperate bodies, and residents' associations and interest groups. Please see Appendix 1 for a list of the statutory consultees and Appendix 2 for the additional local groups and organisations

2.5. Methods Use to Notify of the Publication Period

The publication period was publicised using a wide range of methods. Primary of these was direct notification or correspondence as identified above. Notice of the consultation was disseminated by other means, including:

The Preferred Options Consultation was publicised through the following channels:

- Publication of an updated Local Development Scheme (LDS) in January 2025
- Direct notification of residents and stakeholders as described above
- Publishing information on the City Council webpage, and dedicated page on the consultation portal
- The City Council's social media channels. Facebook: [22 Jan](#) - 10,193 views, 26 reactions, 23 comments, 5 shares and 20 link clicks; [31 Jan](#) - 2,610 views, 3 reactions, 6 shares and 4 link clicks; [6 March](#) - 1,219 views, 2 comments, 1 share and 3 link clicks. Instagram [22 Jan](#) - 1,984 views, 7 reactions, 1 share and 1 save; [31 Jan](#) - 2,336 views, 7 reactions and 2 saves. LinkedIn: [22 Jan](#) - 2,171 impressions, 88 clicks and 43 reactions; [30 Jan](#) - 840 impressions, 32

clicks, 23 reactions and 3 reposts. Newsletters: 22 Jan - 169 link clicks through to view Local Plan; 29 Jan - 36 link clicks through to consultation portal; 6 Feb – 12 March, featured in list of open consultations: 27 clicks to consultation.

- A press release: [Press release](#): 53 page views
- Briefings to local councillors

2.6. Responses Received

The City Council received comments from 162 respondents. The responses received are summarised in Appendix 3. This provides an extensive summary of the comments received, as well as an officer response to the comments. Minor modifications to the Plan have been proposed in response to some of the comments. Where comments raised concerns, that the City Council has agreed could be resolved with an acceptable modification to the Plan, these modifications would be classed as a main modification that would therefore require consideration in the Sustainability Appraisal process and further consultation. These will need to be recommended by the Inspector as necessary to make the Plan sound.

3. High Level Summary of Responses Received

3.1. Chapter 1

Vision and Strategy

Respondents said the Council's approach fails to properly acknowledge the relationship and interaction between housing and economic growth. Some respondents said that the Local Plan prioritises housing over economic growth and some said that economic growth is prioritised over housing delivery. Likewise, some respondents said that there wasn't enough emphasis on the importance of housing, while some said economic growth was underplayed. There was also some support for the vision and approach.

Comments made by: South Oxfordshire District Council (60), Vale of White Horse District Council (58), Beckley and Stowood Parish Council (69), Oxford Preservation Trust (139), Oxford Green Councillors (59), Christ Church (159), David Lock Associates Limited on behalf of Hallam Land (101), Dominic Woodfield (56), Dr David Anthony (Tony) Eaude (30), National Highways (161), Alistair Wilson (43), Dawn Brodie on behalf of Royal London Mutual Insurance Society (86), New Marston (South) Residents' Association (98).

City Council response: The Vision sets out in broad terms the strategic objectives of the plan as a whole and strikes a balance between these. It covers a wide range of topic areas which are expanded upon in the strategic policies and explored in greater detail in the individual policies of the plan. The Plan extensively identifies land for housing development and economic growth as shown through the site allocation policies and various designations of employment sites. Notwithstanding the balanced approach, housing is prioritised due to Oxford's great need for housing.

Impacts of Housing

Concerns were raised about the impact of housing delivery on a) green and blue infrastructure, b) the Green Belt, c) other neighbouring districts and d) traffic and transport. There was also some support for the approach.

Comments made by: South Oxfordshire District Council (60), Vale of White Horse District Council (58), Beckley and Stowood Parish Council (59), Garsington Parish Council (52), Oxford Preservation Trust (139), Oxford Green Councillors (59), Christ Church (159), David Lock Associates Limited on behalf of Hallam Land (101), Network Rail (58), CPRE (57), POETS (Planning Oxfordshire's Environment and Transport Sustainably) (50), Savills on behalf of Cowley Property Investment Ltd (107), Pegasus Group on behalf of Dorchester Living (113), Thomas White Oxford Ltd and Oxford

North Ventures Ltd (157), Alistair Wilson (43), John Kelly MBE (1), Dr David Anthony (Tony) Eaude (30).

City Council Response: Oxford City Council is unable to meet the full extent of the identified housing need within the city, as such there is an expectation in the NPPF that local authorities collaborate across their boundaries to address any unmet housing need. The approach to housing delivery with neighbouring districts is being agreed through statements of common ground and the memorandum of understanding. Background Paper 006 (Green Belt Review) sets out the approach to Green Belt in greater detail. Criterion d) of Policy S1 is explicit in supporting sustainable transport modes to reduce transport impacts associated with new developments. Sustainable transport is also required in numerous policies throughout the Plan including Chapter 7 and as part of site-specific allocation policies in Chapter 8. The plan includes numerous policies specifically relating to biodiversity and climate change in Chapters 4 and 5 respectively which ensure any negative impacts arising from new developments are mitigated.

Infrastructure Delivery

Expressions of support were received for the requirement for necessary infrastructure to be provided. Comments were raised about contributions towards the Cowley Branch Line (CBL) and whether these were justified and how they would be calculated/required. There was a view that Policy S3 would be ineffective because the major landowners in Oxford would be exempt from CIL.

Comments made by: Alistair Wilson (43), West Oxfordshire District Council (118), Thomas White Oxford Ltd and Oxford North Ventures Ltd (157), Dr David Anthony (Tony) Eaude (30), Independent Oxford Alliance (47), Garsington Parish Council (52), South Oxfordshire District Council (60), Vale of White Horse District Council (58), Beckley and Stowood Parish Council (69), Network Rail (88), Christ Church (159), Headington Heritage (138).

City Council Response: The CBL re-opening would bring significant additional social, environmental or economic benefits in addition to the mitigation or wider benefits delivered by the traditional infrastructure categories. This is why it has been categorised as transformational infrastructure in the IDP. The specifics around developer contributions will be determined at planning application stage when considering the merits of each case. Developer contributions are not just limited to CIL. Section 106/Section 278 contributions also play an important role in delivering much needed infrastructure in the city. Policy S3 sets out the framework for seeking developer contributions towards known infrastructure projects (as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan).

Plan Viability

There was some support for the plan's approach to viability. There were comments about the relationship between viability and other material considerations including carbon reduction, heritage, Biodiversity Net Gain. The key concern was that the list of requirements set out in the plan as a whole would be burdensome and impact detrimentally on the viability of developments. Also, concerns that affordable housing wasn't being prioritised.

Comments made by: JPPC on behalf of Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies (the Centre) (106), Dr David Anthony (Tony) Eaude (30), Alistair Wilson (43), Independent Oxford Alliance (47), Dominic Woodfield (56),

City Council Response: The policies in the plan do not undermine its viability. The policy requirements in LP2045 have been informed by the Viability Assessment and the cumulative impacts have also been tested for policies which may have cost implications. The Viability Assessment uses proportionate and reasonable assumptions for the appropriate level of assessment to support a local plan. Policy S4 seeks to prioritise delivery of affordable housing over and above other policy requirements, because of the significant unaffordability of homes to many people in Oxford. The intention of the cascade approach is that if a site is not viable to deliver the full contributions, that other elements be adjusted in the first instance, only compromising on affordable housing delivery as a last resort. Delivering affordable housing is key priority of the City Council and the Local Plan.

3.2. Chapter 2

Vision and Strategy

Respondents said the Council's approach fails to properly acknowledge the relationship and interaction between housing and economic growth. Some respondents said that the Local Plan prioritises housing over economic growth and some said that economic growth is prioritised over housing delivery. Likewise, some respondents said that there wasn't enough emphasis on the importance of housing, while some said economic growth was underplayed. There was also some support for the vision and approach.

Comments made by: South Oxfordshire District Council (60), Vale of White Horse District Council (58), Beckley and Stowood Parish Council (69), Oxford Preservation Trust (139), Oxford Green Councillors (59), Christ Church (159), David Lock Associates Limited on behalf of Hallam Land (101), Dominic Woodfield (56), Dr David Anthony (Tony) Eade (30), National Highways (161), Alistair Wilson (43), Dawn Brodie on behalf of Royal London Mutual Insurance Society (86), New Marston (South) Residents' Association (98).

City Council response: The Vision sets out in broad terms the strategic objectives of the plan as a whole and strikes a balance between these. It covers a wide range of topic areas which are expanded upon in the strategic policies and explored in greater detail in the individual policies of the plan. The Plan extensively identifies land for housing development and economic growth as shown through the site allocation policies and various designations of employment sites. Notwithstanding the balanced approach, housing is prioritised due to Oxford's great need for housing.

Impacts of Housing

Concerns were raised about the impact of housing delivery on a) green and blue infrastructure, b) the Green Belt, c) other neighbouring districts and d) traffic and transport. There was also some support for the approach.

Comments made by: South Oxfordshire District Council (60), Vale of White Horse District Council (58), Beckley and Stowood Parish Council (59), Garsington Parish Council (52), Oxford Preservation Trust (139), Oxford Green Councillors (59), Christ Church (159), David Lock Associates Limited on behalf of Hallam Land (101), Network Rail (58), CPRE (57), POETS (Planning Oxfordshire's Environment and Transport Sustainably) (50), Savills on behalf of Cowley Property Investment Ltd (107), Pegasus Group on behalf of Dorchester Living (113), Thomas White Oxford Ltd and Oxford North Ventures Ltd (157), Alistair Wilson (43), John Kelly MBE (1), Dr David Anthony (Tony) Eade (30).

City Council Response: Oxford City Council is unable to meet the full extent of the identified housing need within the city, as such there is an expectation in the NPPF that local authorities collaborate across their boundaries to address any unmet housing need. The approach to housing delivery with neighbouring districts is being agreed through statements of common ground and the memorandum of understanding. Background Paper 006 (Green Belt Review) sets out the approach to Green Belt in greater detail. Criterion d) of Policy S1 is explicit in supporting sustainable transport modes to reduce transport impacts associated with new developments. Sustainable transport is also required in numerous policies throughout the Plan including Chapter 7 and as part of site-specific allocation policies in Chapter 8. The plan includes numerous policies specifically relating to biodiversity and climate change in Chapters 4 and 5 respectively which ensure any negative impacts arising from new developments are mitigated.

Infrastructure Delivery

Expressions of support were received for the requirement for necessary infrastructure to be provided. Comments were raised about contributions towards the Cowley Branch Line (CBL) and whether these were justified and how they would be calculated/required. There was a view that Policy S3 would be ineffective because the major landowners in Oxford would be exempt from CIL.

Comments made by: Alistair Wilson (43), West Oxfordshire District Council (118), Thomas White Oxford Ltd and Oxford North Ventures Ltd (157), Dr David Anthony (Tony) Eaude (30), Independent Oxford Alliance (47), Garsington Parish Council (52), South Oxfordshire District Council (60), Vale of White Horse District Council (58), Beckley and Stowood Parish Council (69), Network Rail (88), Christ Church (159), Headington Heritage (138).

City Council Response: The CBL re-opening would bring significant additional social, environmental or economic benefits in addition to the mitigation or wider benefits delivered by the traditional infrastructure categories. This is why it has been categorised as transformational infrastructure in the IDP. The specifics around developer contributions will be determined at planning application stage when considering the merits of each case. Developer contributions are not just limited to CIL. Section 106/Section 278 contributions also play an important role in delivering much needed infrastructure in the city. Policy S3 sets out the framework for seeking developer contributions towards known infrastructure projects (as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan).

Plan Viability

There was some support for the plan's approach to viability. There were comments about the relationship between viability and other material considerations including carbon reduction, heritage, Biodiversity Net Gain. The key concern was that the list of requirements set out in the plan as a whole would be burdensome and impact detrimentally on the viability of developments. Also, concerns that affordable housing wasn't being prioritised.

Comments made by: JPPC on behalf of Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies (the Centre) (106), Dr David Anthony (Tony) Eaude (30), Alistair Wilson (43), Independent Oxford Alliance (47), Dominic Woodfield (56),

City Council Response: The policies in the plan do not undermine its viability. The policy requirements in LP2045 have been informed by the Viability Assessment and the cumulative impacts have also been tested for policies which may have cost implications. The Viability Assessment uses proportionate and reasonable assumptions for the appropriate level of assessment to support a local plan. Policy S4 seeks to prioritise delivery of affordable housing over and above other policy requirements, because of the significant unaffordability of homes to many people in Oxford. The intention of the cascade approach is that if a site is not viable to deliver the full contributions, that other elements be adjusted in the first instance, only compromising on affordable housing delivery as a last resort. Delivering affordable housing is key priority of the City Council and the Local Plan.

3.3. Chapter 3

Vision and Strategy

Respondents said the Council's approach fails to properly acknowledge the relationship and interaction between housing and economic growth. Some respondents said that the Local Plan prioritises housing over economic growth and some said that economic growth is prioritised over housing delivery. Likewise, some respondents said that there wasn't enough emphasis on the importance of housing, while some said economic growth was underplayed. There was also some support for the vision and approach.

Comments made by: South Oxfordshire District Council (60), Vale of White Horse District Council (58), Beckley and Stowood Parish Council (69), Oxford Preservation Trust (139), Oxford Green Councillors (59), Christ Church (159), David Lock Associates Limited on behalf of Hallam Land (101), Dominic Woodfield (56), Dr David Anthony (Tony) Eaude (30), National Highways (161), Alistair Wilson (43), Dawn Brodie on behalf of Royal London Mutual Insurance Society (86), New Marston (South) Residents' Association (98).

City Council response: The Vision sets out in broad terms the strategic objectives of the plan as a whole and strikes a balance between these. It covers a wide range of topic areas which are expanded

upon in the strategic policies and explored in greater detail in the individual policies of the plan. The Plan extensively identifies land for housing development and economic growth as shown through the site allocation policies and various designations of employment sites. Notwithstanding the balanced approach, housing is prioritised due to Oxford's great need for housing.

Impacts of Housing

Concerns were raised about the impact of housing delivery on a) green and blue infrastructure, b) the Green Belt, c) other neighbouring districts and d) traffic and transport. There was also some support for the approach.

Comments made by: South Oxfordshire District Council (60), Vale of White Horse District Council (58), Beckley and Stowood Parish Council (59), Garsington Parish Council (52), Oxford Preservation Trust (139), Oxford Green Councillors (59), Christ Church (159), David Lock Associates Limited on behalf of Hallam Land (101), Network Rail (58), CPRE (57), POETS (Planning Oxfordshire's Environment and Transport Sustainably) (50), Savills on behalf of Cowley Property Investment Ltd (107), Pegasus Group on behalf of Dorchester Living (113), Thomas White Oxford Ltd and Oxford North Ventures Ltd (157), Alistair Wilson (43), John Kelly MBE (1), Dr David Anthony (Tony) Eaude (30).

City Council Response: Oxford City Council is unable to meet the full extent of the identified housing need within the city, as such there is an expectation in the NPPF that local authorities collaborate across their boundaries to address any unmet housing need. The approach to housing delivery with neighbouring districts is being agreed through statements of common ground and the memorandum of understanding. Background Paper 006 (Green Belt Review) sets out the approach to Green Belt in greater detail. Criterion d) of Policy S1 is explicit in supporting sustainable transport modes to reduce transport impacts associated with new developments. Sustainable transport is also required in numerous policies throughout the Plan including Chapter 7 and as part of site-specific allocation policies in Chapter 8. The plan includes numerous policies specifically relating to biodiversity and climate change in Chapters 4 and 5 respectively which ensure any negative impacts arising from new developments are mitigated.

Infrastructure Delivery

Expressions of support were received for the requirement for necessary infrastructure to be provided. Comments were raised about contributions towards the Cowley Branch Line (CBL) and whether these were justified and how they would be calculated/required. There was a view that Policy S3 would be ineffective because the major landowners in Oxford would be exempt from CIL.

Comments made by: Alistair Wilson (43), West Oxfordshire District Council (118), Thomas White Oxford Ltd and Oxford North Ventures Ltd (157), Dr David Anthony (Tony) Eaude (30), Independent Oxford Alliance (47), Garsington Parish Council (52), South Oxfordshire District Council (60), Vale of White Horse District Council (58), Beckley and Stowood Parish Council (69), Network Rail (88), Christ Church (159), Headington Heritage (138).

City Council Response: The CBL re-opening would bring significant additional social, environmental or economic benefits in addition to the mitigation or wider benefits delivered by the traditional infrastructure categories. This is why it has been categorised as transformational infrastructure in the IDP. The specifics around developer contributions will be determined at planning application stage when considering the merits of each case. Developer contributions are not just limited to CIL. Section 106/Section 278 contributions also play an important role in delivering much needed infrastructure in the city. Policy S3 sets out the framework for seeking developer contributions towards known infrastructure projects (as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan).

Plan Viability

There was some support for the plan's approach to viability. There were comments about the relationship between viability and other material considerations including carbon reduction,

heritage, Biodiversity Net Gain. The key concern was that the list of requirements set out in the plan as a whole would be burdensome and impact detrimentally on the viability of developments. Also, concerns that affordable housing wasn't being prioritised.

Comments made by: JPPC on behalf of Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies (the Centre) (106), Dr David Anthony (Tony) Eade (30), Alistair Wilson (43), Independent Oxford Alliance (47), Dominic Woodfield (56),

City Council Response: The policies in the plan do not undermine its viability. The policy requirements in LP2045 have been informed by the Viability Assessment and the cumulative impacts have also been tested for policies which may have cost implications. The Viability Assessment uses proportionate and reasonable assumptions for the appropriate level of assessment to support a local plan. Policy S4 seeks to prioritise delivery of affordable housing over and above other policy requirements, because of the significant unaffordability of homes to many people in Oxford. The intention of the cascade approach is that if a site is not viable to deliver the full contributions, that other elements be adjusted in the first instance, only compromising on affordable housing delivery as a last resort. Delivering affordable housing is key priority of the City Council and the Local Plan.

3.4. Chapter 4

Green Infrastructure (Policy G1)

Concerns with the Core Network policy wording as there is no flexibility for the scale of green or blue infrastructure, scale of existing and proposed development, exceptional circumstances, or the possible wider re-provision or enhancement of the infrastructure. There is disagreement that Core spaces cannot be moved/re-provided sufficiently without compromising the overall character and function of the Network. Other concerns relate to the criteria for classifying sites as they are neither objectively measured nor measurable. For example, with respect to intensity, there is no indication of how intensity of use would be qualified and in terms of local value, it is not clear how adequate and proportionate evidence could be collected to determine whether a site is delivering insufficient local value.

Comments made by: Gregory Thomas (7.1), Elizabeth Robbins (36.1), Natural England (90.1), Canal & River Trust (49.2), CPRE (57.4), Oxford Green Councillors (59.8), Save Bertie Park Campaign (65.1), Beckley and Stowood Parish Council (69.1), Sport England (85.3), Oxfordshire County Council (89.8), Headington Heritage (138.9), Oxford Preservation Trust (139.21), Christ Church (159.9) and Ridge, Partners LLP on behalf of Worcester College (160.4).

City Council response: Core spaces are designated because they are considered to provide a range of important benefits including some which are tied to their existing location, the loss of which is considered unfeasible to be able to be mitigated through re-provision elsewhere. It is considered important that they are appropriately protected to a degree that reflects their identified value as part of the wider green infrastructure network (see Background Paper 005a). However, having further reviewed the approach, a potential modification could be made to the wording in relation to the approach to protecting core spaces. This would provide some flexibility to allow compatible uses to come forward, whilst still seeking to set a strong level of protection that corresponds with the identified value of these spaces and also retaining particular identified benefits in situ. Background Paper 005a also explains the methodology for arriving at the criteria for categorising individual spaces in the Green Infrastructure hierarchy.

Urban Greening Factor (Policy G3)

Applying this policy universally could create an unnecessary technical burden, particularly for greenfield sites. It is considered ineffective as it repeats parts of policies G1 and G4 but lacks the flexibility of the latter which allows off-site mitigation and seems to duplicate the biodiversity net gain (BGN) requirement, albeit using a simpler metric.

Comments made by: Savills on behalf of Cowley Property Investment Ltd (107.5), Twenty5 Planning Ltd on behalf of Ruskin College and Welbeck Land (120.8), Oxfordshire

County Council (89.11), Thomas White Oxford Ltd and Oxford North Ventures Ltd (157.9), CBRE Ltd. on behalf of ORVIL (136.7), Savills on behalf of The Oxford Science Park Partners Ltd (130.6), Christ Church (159.1), Headington Heritage (138.2).

City Council response: The scores contained in the policy are intended to be a minimum. The required score has been set at the level it has, to encourage as much as possible the achievability of application for constrained sites with limited developable areas. It has been set lower than the recommended minimum in the Natural England Green Infrastructure Framework based upon informal testing on a range of sites across the city to see what was achievable across the Oxford City context. The intention behind the policy is to localise as much as possible the benefits that arise from the presence of natural features in development, which will be difficult to achieve if offsetting is allowed. The UGF is a tool intended to ensure new developments incorporate a good level of greening, which has a variety of positive impacts. The measures proposed to achieve this requirement may overlap with requirements for protection and BNG, but for example, even where BNG is off-site there should still be green infrastructure on the site.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) (Policy G4)

Concerns that the policy just repeats what is a statutory requirement and that the policy contains an off-site BNG delivery hierarchy which isn't specified in national guidance. Comments also flagged that the Council should be going further including seeking 20% BNG.

Comments made by: Oxford Green Councillors (59.9), Natural England (90.3), Home Builders Federation (112.6), Oxfordshire County Council (89.12), Headington Heritage (138.21).

City Council response: It is considered important to embed the requirement in the Local Plan because it enables us to set out some locally-specific considerations about how it is implemented. Whilst it is acknowledged that the metric's spatial risk multiplier incentivises local delivery to some degree, it is important for the Local Plan to clearly communicate the preference for offsite BNG to be delivered as close to the development site as possible. Applicants are directed towards looking for opportunities as close to the development as possible before looking for options further afield, this additional local guidance is considered helpful in guiding proposals to secure the greatest local benefits for habitats and species as well as residents.

Delivering onsite ecological enhancements (Policy G5)

Concerns that the policy is too prescriptive and onerous and exceeds the statutory requirements of Policy G4.

Comments made by: Salisbury & Wilton Swifts and North Wiltshire Swifts (5.1), Quod on behalf of Sackville UK Property Select III (GP) No.2 Limited (40.5), Swifts Local Network (46.1), Rocke Associates Ltd on behalf of Oxford Westgate Alliance (78.5), Home Builders Federation (112.7), Oxfordshire County Council (89.13), Headington Heritage(138.22).

City Council response: The Statutory BNG metric primarily focuses on delivery of habitat as a way to support species. However, there are other important features that support important wildlife in the city which are not recognised/ incentivised by it and relying on the statutory BNG requirement to deliver for them alone would be insufficient.

The approach to protecting designated sites - including Lye Valley (Policy G6)

Objections were received in relation to the approach of the Local Plan to the protection of the Lye Valley SSSI, these were expressing concern that the Local Plan was not going far enough in its protection of this particular SSSI, and that the protections set out in the plan are ineffective. Sport England meanwhile were concerned more generally about potential conflicts with the protection for designated sites more generally and how these could impact sports provision. Natural England and

Oxfordshire County Council made some comments about the requirements for buffers around designated sites and also the relationship with the LNRS.

Comments made by: Sport England (85.6) Oxfordshire County Council (89.14); Natural England (90.4); Headington Heritage (138.23).

City Council response: The City Council is confident that the policy sets out a strong framework of protection for the hierarchy of designated sites in the city, alongside other elements of the Local Plan including specific wording in site allocations in proximity to sites (including the Lye Valley). This includes having regard for the LNRS and for the need for buffers during construction.

3.5. Chapter 5

A range of comments were received on the policies in Chapter 5, with policies R1 (Net Zero Buildings in Operation) and R2 (Embodied Carbon) receiving the greatest number of representations. Some of the issues raised most often across the chapter are:

Setting energy standards that go beyond national regulations (Policy R1)

There were objections over the requirements of the policy exceeding what is in current and/or future building regulations (i.e. the Future Homes Standard), and a perception that the approach is in conflict with the 2023 Written Ministerial Statement and/or the recent draft NPPF consultation (Policy PM13).

Respondents who raised these points: Nick Eyre (12.2); Dawn Brodie on behalf of Royal London Mutual Insurance Society (86.6); Home Builders Federation (112.8); Savills on behalf of The Oxford Science Park Partners Ltd (130.7); Ridge and Partners LLP on behalf of Ellison Oxford Limited (137.2).

City Council response: National legislation such as the Climate Change Act, as well as the city's local net zero target of 2040 requires strong and immediate action in delivering net zero carbon buildings now. Relying on national standards alone will not be sufficient as they do not deliver truly net zero buildings in operation. The proposed approach is in line and consistent with industry recommendations and with a growing number of Local Plans that have been found sound at examination across the country. It is also important for other reasons including addressing fuel poverty and energy security.

Performance targets for net zero carbon buildings (Policy R1)

Objections were raised in relation to the feasibility of specific targets/requirements within the policy for certain types of non-residential development, including the Energy Use Intensity and Space Heating targets (criteria b and c). Also, concern over criterion e and the expectation that the building's total energy use needs to be matched by renewable energy generation, particularly the feasibility of delivering sufficient renewables onsite, disagreement over how efficient this is, and doubts about the ability to find offsite options in light of the city's constraints. Some felt more flexibility was generally needed.

Respondents who raised these points: Nick Eyre (12.2); David Lock Associates on behalf of BMW Group (51.3); Dawn Brodie on behalf of Royal London Mutual Insurance Society (86.6); Tor&Co on behalf of Logisor (117.6); Savills on behalf of The Oxford Science Park Partners Ltd (130.7); Savills on behalf of Oxford Growth Group (Oxford University, Brasenose, Christ Church, Lincoln, Magdalen, Merton, New and St John's Colleges) (133.5); Thomas White Oxford Ltd and Oxford North Ventures Ltd (157.11); Christ Church (159.11).

City Council response: We have incorporated a range of mechanisms in the policy to deal with the variety of development types and applications that will come forward over the lifetime of the plan whilst also ensuring a strong framework of targets for applicants to aim towards. Flexibility is incorporated in various ways including allowing non-resi uses with high operational energy demands

to justify higher performance standards, and an allowance for paying into the energy offsetting fund where net zero carbon onsite is infeasible. Further modification is not considered justified or necessary.

More clarity needed with the energy offsetting mechanism (Policy R1)

Linked with the above point, concerns were raised by several respondents in relation to the proposed allowance for utilising the energy offsetting fund as a last resort. The concerns were generally around clarity of what this will entail and it was felt that more detail was needed as to what the costs would be (in order to understand viability impact), how the City Council would manage such a fund, and what projects it would be spent on. Another rep (ID:47.12) felt that the viability cascade of Policy S4 undermines the offsetting mechanism of Policy R1.

Respondents who raised these points: Nick Eyre (12.2); Independent Oxford Alliance (47.12); Dawn Brodie on behalf of Royal London Mutual Insurance Society (86.6); DP9 on behalf of Oxford University Development Ltd (OUD) (87.6); Savills on behalf of The Oxford Science Park Partners Ltd (130.7); Thomas White Oxford Ltd and Oxford North Ventures Ltd (157.11); Christ Church (159.11).

City Council response: Details of how the energy offsetting mechanism would work, including the approach to costing, is further explained in the carbon reduction and climate resilient design background paper (BGP.008). However, the process for managing and implementing the fund is an important but separate process to developing the Local Plan itself and will be further developed as the Local Plan proceeds towards adoption. The mechanism is intended to be used as a last resort where proposals find it technically infeasible to meet the policy requirements around matching energy demand through renewables and forms part of the flexibility/pragmatic approach considered to be important for the policy.

Exploring re-use of buildings before resorting to demolition (Policy R2)

A number of respondents had objections to the wording of Policy R2's criterion a), the general theme of these comments was that sometimes demolition is necessary and desirable and that there needed to be greater acknowledgement of the various benefits for demolition and replacement of buildings which can outweigh embodied carbon impacts. Meanwhile, another rep (Rep ID: 139.8) raised that demolition should actually explicitly be identified as a last resort.

Respondents who raised these points: Quod on behalf of Sackville UK Property Select III (GP) No.2 Limited (Sackville UK) (40.7); Dawn Brodie on behalf of Royal London Mutual Insurance Society (86.7); DP9 on behalf of Oxford University Development Ltd (OUD) (87.7); Bidwells LLP on behalf of Pioneer Group (114.6); Savills on behalf of The Oxford Science Park Partners Ltd (130.8); Oxford Preservation Trust (139.8); Thomas White Oxford Ltd and Oxford North Ventures Ltd (157.12).

City Council response: There appeared to be some perception that the policy was requiring re-use of buildings, which is not the case, it simply required that applicants demonstrate that they have at least given re-use appropriate consideration in the interests of limiting carbon impacts. The policy already acknowledges that there could be good reasons for replacement of existing buildings, nevertheless, a potential modification to criterion a) has been identified in response to the reps that could further clarify expectations if considered necessary.

Requirements for Whole Life Cycle Carbon Assessment (Policy R2)

There was some concern expressed relating to Whole Life Cycle Carbon Assessment and that there will be an additional burden on developers where this is required through the policy, but not nationally, as these assessments can be onerous and subject to inconsistencies in how they are undertaken. Others (e.g. Rep ID: 139.8) expressed that Whole Life Cycle Carbon Assessment is required on all applications.

Respondents who raised these points: Home Builders Federation (112.9); Oxford Preservation Trust (139.8).

City Council response: It is important that we take actions to reduce embodied carbon in the construction process where possible. The additional resource demand for applicants undertaking WLCCA is acknowledged, as is the continually evolving nature of guidance and understanding around the topic. The threshold for undertaking WLCCA is therefore set so as to prioritise the largest scale developments that could come forward in the city and focus on those proposals that could have the most significant carbon impacts.

Not going far enough on addressing impacts on water (resources and quality) (Policy R5)

There were comments that the water resources and quality policy is not going far enough to protect the water environment and should be stronger including making use of measures like planning conditions to ensure development doesn't impact the water environment, including through impacts on wastewater. The opinion was also expressed that the Council is placing too much trust in Thames Water to undertake the required upgrades to the Sewage Treatment Works. Thames Water meanwhile supported the policy but had various suggested additions, as did the EA with one suggested addition.

Respondents who raised these points: CPRE (57.1); Environment Agency (104.16); Windrush Against Sewage Pollution (WASP) (119.1); Thames Water Utilities Limited (140.4).

City Council response: Protection of the water environment is a shared responsibility across multiple stakeholders including developers, landowners, the EA, Thames Water and the City Council. Having this policy in the plan reflects that the City Council considers protection of water resources and quality to be an important issue and one that applicants need to consider in the design of their development. We feel the requirements of the policy go as far as they can in terms of what can reasonably be controlled at application stage.

Practicalities of implementing particular elements of other policies (e.g. Policy R6, Policy R8)

There were a limited number of issues raised across some of the other policies in the chapter.

Typically, these related to the justification for specific elements of the policies which could impact their implementation such as the type of evidence applicants are asked to submit to respond to the requirements of the policies, or the level of detail of what is being asked for. There were also some objections to the wording of specific requirements within the policies.

Respondents who raised these points: Policy R6 - Twenty5 Planning Ltd on behalf of Ruskin College and Welbeck Land (120.9); Headington Heritage (138.29); Policy R8 – Sport England (85.6); Thomas White Oxford Ltd and Oxford North Ventures Ltd (157.13).

City Council response: These policies need to cover a broad range of potential development types and site contexts. We are comfortable that they cover the right range of locally relevant issues in the city and provide more specific responses to the particular points raised in the detailed summaries.

3.6. Chapter 6

Higher Density Development

Some respondents thought that the policy requiring efficient use of land appropriate within the city context and supported the higher density approach. Objections were received stating that the policies did not go far enough in requiring increased density on sites, particularly as there are extensive areas of the city that are suitable for higher density. It was also mentioned that the policy should require that outside the Conservation Areas any new development should be a minimum of three storeys and any development along the arterial roads should be a minimum of four storeys. There was a concern that policy HD2 would conflict with policy HD6 (Views and Building Heights).

Comments made by: Prior & Partners on behalf of Firoka (129.7), Savills on behalf Thomas White Oxford Ltd and Oxford North Ventures Ltd (157.2), Savills on behalf of Christ Church (159.25), Stephen Dance (15.3), CPRE (57.11), Elena Butterworth on behalf of

OUN (87.8), Headington Heritage (138.31), Independent Oxford Alliance (47.13), Adrian James Architects (77.3), Bidwells on behalf of Pioneer Group (114.7).

City Council response: Density figures in the plan, unless otherwise indicated, are considered as indicative and minimum levels. The plan supports maximising the efficient use of land but allows for a site specific approach to be taken depending on the specific features and constraints of each development. Development proposals can make efficient use of land and comply with Policy HD6 (Building Heights and Views), as such there is no conflict between these policies in principle.

Views and building heights

The approach set out in the plan was supported by Historic England. Respondents with objections raised concerns that the approach is not justified or consistent with national policy because the policy treats any level of harm - regardless of scale, context, or mitigation - as automatically unacceptable without consideration of the harm verses public benefits assessment set out in the NPPF.

Comments made by: Historic England (81.7), Quod on behalf of Sackville UK (40.8), Bidwells on behalf of Pioneer Group (114.8), Bidwells on behalf of University of Oxford and Oxford Brookes University (105.5), CBRE Ltd on behalf of Nuffield College (134.7), Headington Heritage (138.35), Oxford Preservation Trust (139.13), DP9 on behalf of OUN (87.9), Twenty5 Planning Ltd on behalf of Ruskin College and Wellbeck Land (120.7), Savills on behalf of Thomas White Oxford Ltd and Oxford North Ventures Ltd (157.21), Savills on behalf of Christ Church (159.26).

City Council response: The policy sets out guidance to inform design decisions about heights and to enable an understanding and detailed assessment of the impact of heights. It does not conflict with, or supersede, the tests set out in the NPPF.

Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets

General support was given for policies HD3 (Designated Heritage Assets) and HD4 (Non-Designated Heritage Assets). In terms of objections, a number of responses were received requesting amendments to specific wording to provide greater clarity to how the policy applied to both designated and non-designated assets, some of which have been captured in the Statement of Common Ground with Historic England. Some comments thought the policy wording should be stronger in protecting heritage assets while others wanted wording removed to be more permissive. A number of respondents raised comments citing consistency with the NPPF and the heritage balance tests between harm and public benefits.

Comments made by: Stephen Dance (15.4), Oxford Preservation Trust (139.1) (139.11), CPRE (57.12), Historic England (81.4) (81.5), CBRE Ltd on behalf of Nuffield College (134.6), Headington Heritage (138.32), New Marston South Residents Association (98.7), Twenty5 Planning Ltd on behalf of Ruskin College and Welbeck Land (120.5), Savills on behalf of Christ Church (159.12).

City Council response: The Statement of Common Ground with Historic England includes suggestions for how the wording could be amended for clarity and consistency with the NPPF terminology, however it is considered that there is no conflict with the NPPF approach and that of the Local Plan policies. Proposals are to be considered on a case by case basis, and consideration criteria are set out in the policy.

3.7. Chapter 7

Defined centres and retail hierarchy (Policies C1 and C2)

Several respondents suggested changes to the retail hierarchy and defined centres or their boundaries. Comments include that there is not enough opportunity for decentralised economic development in otherwise sustainable, accessible locations, especially if suitable sites in centres are not available. Others were concerned that accessibility to centres is poor and that other areas with better access by private car therefore have a competitive advantage and higher public benefits are needed. There was concern the use of thresholds for Class E may not facilitate a rapid response to changing circumstances or was not appropriate in particular locations.

[Those objecting to the policy: 138.37 (Headington Heritage), 89.18 (Oxfordshire County Council), 114.9 (Bidwells for Pioneer), 78.1 (Rocke Associates for Oxford Westgate Alliance), 30.12 (Dr David Anthony Eade), 47.14 Independent Oxford Alliance, 78.2 (Rocke Associates Ltd for Oxford Westgate Alliance), 89.19 (Oxfordshire County Council), 134.12 (CBRE Ltd for Nuffield College), 136.5 (Elizabeth Robbins)]

City Council response

Centres have been identified in line with the NPPF definition and also allow for application of the sequential test in line with the NPPF approach. The approach to employment is set out in E1 and does focus on sites in centre and sites in existing lawful use, e.g for Class E uses. This approach allows sufficient growth of employment without it dominating when other uses that are also needed would be more appropriate. Policy C1 ensures impacts on the road network are mitigated if out-of-centre locations can be justified. The thresholds of Use Class E are set above current levels and provide significant flexibility, not least because of the wide range of uses within Use Class E.

Vehicle parking standards (Policy C8)

A number of respondents consider Policy C8 to be inconsistent with national policy and to be too ineffective. Some respondents thought it was too prescriptive, not accounting for difference in transport access requirements from the development and with concern that restricting parking too much could impact development viability. Others thought the policy should go further to encourage low traffic neighbourhoods and car-free and low car developments, and requiring provision and maintenance of car clubs.

[Those objecting to the policy: 43.10&11 (Alistair Wilson), 47.5 (Independent Oxford Alliance), 59.11 (Oxford Green Councillors), 78.3 (Rocke Associates Ltd for Oxford Westgate Alliance), 89.23 (Network Rail Ltd), 138.4 (Headington Heritage)]

City Council response

Policy C8 is intended help achieve the aim of promoting a shift towards more sustainable travel. It is not considered to be unnecessarily prescriptive. Furthermore, whole plan viability has been carefully tested and the viability assessment includes consideration of the impacts of low car schemes. If there are bespoke viability issues with a particular housing scheme then the viability cascade in Policy S4 applies.

3.8. Chapter 8

Digital Infrastructure

Responders considered that the focus of this policy was too limited to broadband and data centres rather than the full range of digital infrastructure requirements and where suitable locations for these may be.

Comments made by: Rocke Associates Ltd on behalf of Oxford Westgate Alliance (78.4)

City Council response: The policy covers digital infrastructure in general and, when taken in combination with the other policies in the plan, effectively ensures that installations are not sited in inappropriate locations or have unacceptable impacts.

Site Allocations and Areas of Focus

All of the site allocation policies and Areas of Focus policies have received some representations. The majority of the proposed site allocations are existing allocations within the Oxford Local Plan 2036 with the exception of SPS1 (474 Cowley Road), SPCW2 (Botley Road), SPS2 (East Oxford Bowls Club), SPN2 (Elsfield Hall), SPCW5 (Jowett Walk South), SPCW7 (Nuffield Sites), SPS9 (Littlemore Mental Health Centre), SPS13 (Ozone Leisure Park), SPE12 (Rectory Centre), SPE14 Ruskin Field), SPCW11 (St Thomas School and Osney Warehouse).

The site allocations which have been most contentious have typically been those which are green field sites, particularly those with ecological and/or heritage constraints, and also if they have some recreational use, regardless of the current OLP2036 allocations. These include, for example, SPS8 (Meadow Lane), SPE14 (Ruskin Field) and SPS3 (Bertie Place Recreation Ground).

Generally, comments tend to relate to whether the site should be allocated, whether the allocation is for the correct uses (e.g. more/less housing or more/less employment) and whether mitigation of any detrimental impacts arising from development can be achieved.

Statutory consultees comments are understandably related to their area of interest.

Comments made by:

Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd on behalf of East West Rail Co (135), Adrian Williams (11), Alexander Braddell (17), Alistair Wilson (43), Amanda Phillips (33), Anna Harries (4), Arc Planning Associates on behalf of Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust (111), Bidwells LLP on behalf of University of Oxford and Oxford Brookes University(105), Caroline M. Pond-Janzen (83), Catherine Tranmer (141), Cathy Burleigh (75), CBRE Ltd on behalf of Nuffield College (134), Cecilia McCabe (95), Ceri Sullivan (97), Chadwick Town Planning Limited on behalf of Lincoln College (102), Chantal De Mey Guillard (96), Cherwell District Council (92), Claire Castell (32), Clare Crombie(142), CPRE Oxfordshire (136), DP9 on behalf of Oxford University Development Limited (87), David Broughton (143), David Lock Associates on behalf of BMW Group (51), David Lock Associates Limited on behalf of Hallam Land (101), David McKean (76), David John Morris (99), David Wiles (100), Dawn Brodie on behalf of Royal London Mutual Insurance Society (RLMIS), Divinity Road Area Residents' Association (DRARA) (82), Dominic Woodfield (56), Dr David Anthony (Tony) Eade (30), Dr Hilary Walker (2), Dr Judith Webb (103), Dr Michael Dawson (41), Elizabeth Robbins (36), Ellan O. Derow (146), Environment Agency (104), Evelyn Sanderson (61)(66) (70), Fisher German LLP on behalf of National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) (132), Friends of Iffley Village (53), Friends of the Fields Iffley (61), Gregory Thomas (7), Guy Hudson (38), Headington Heritage (138), Heather Lumsden (28), Historic England (81), Hugh William Ellicombe Ferris (9), Hugh Protherough (21), Ian Simmons (26), Iffley Fields Residents' Association (27), Iku Nishikawa (37), Independent Oxford Alliance (47), James Malcolmson (44), Jennifer Butler (8), Jericho Wharf Trust (79), John Cole (10), John Kelly MBE (1), Jonathan Loake (34), JPPC on behalf of No2 New High Street (Headington Shark House) (128), JPPC on behalf of Oriel College (91), JPPC on behalf of Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies (the Centre) (106), Julie Harrod (20), Katharine Owen (158), Katrina Gaye Robinson (147), Keith Willett (18), Laurence Leahy (25), Laurent Gigou (72), Martin Reed (53), Marina Jirotko (148), Martin Pevsner (162), Mary Warrell (55), Michael Tappin (149), Natural England (90), NatureSpace Partnership (93), Network Rail Ltd (88), Newmark on behalf of Merton College (123), New Marston (South) Residents' Association (98), NHS Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West Integrated Care Board (115), Nicola Creed (35), Nicholas Ringshall (151), Neville Creed (150), Occasionally Ltd (144), Oxford Green Councillors (59), Oxford Preservation Trust (139), Oxfordshire County Council (89), Oxenford Cricket Club (71), Oxfordshire Cricket (126), Paul Allen (62), Paul Castell (31), Paul Futch (116), Peter McCarter (39), Peter Shaw, Prior + Partners on behalf of Firoka (129), Professor Sir David Warrell (68), Quod on behalf of Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Oxford (the Warneford Park Partners) (108), Quod on behalf of Sackville UK (40), Quod on behalf of University of West London (156), Rachel Falconer (14), Rebecca Dean (3), Ridge and Partners LLP on behalf of Ellison Oxford Limited (137), Robert Grimley (73), Robert Pearson (6), Rocke Associates Ltd on behalf of Oxford Westgate Alliance (78), Rose Hill and Iffley Low Carbon Group (145), Rosemary

Belton (54), Sally Richards (45), Sarah Lane Smith (19), Samantha Poyser (74), Save Bertie Park Campaign (65), Savills on behalf of Cowley Property Investment Ltd (107), Savills on behalf of Christ Church (159), Savills on behalf of The Oxford Science Park Partners Ltd (130), Simon King (153), Sophia Smith (127), Sport England (85), Steve Brazier (80), Susan Biddle (16), Susan Leahy (24), Tamasin Went (22), Thames Water Utilities Limited (140), The Canal and River Trust (49), The Friends of Old Headington (109), Thomas White Oxford Ltd and Oxford North Ventures Ltd (157), TM Wells (23), tor&co on behalf of Logicor (117), Twenty5 Planning Ltd on behalf of Ruskin College and Welbeck Land (120), Walsingham Planning on behalf of Lucy Developments Ltd (42), Wendy Webber (121), William Beaver (152), Zoe Traill (29).

City Council response: All comments have been responded to in the Regulation 19 representations analysis summary tables. Comments from Statutory consultees have been addressed in their respective Statement of Common Ground documents.

4. Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Consultation Statement

This section of the consultation statement identifies how Oxford City Council has complied with Regulation 13² of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes ²with regard to the consultation on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) report (incorporating the requirements of Strategic Environmental Assessment) and process for the Oxford Local Plan 2045. The section addresses the consultations that took place on the early draft Sustainability Appraisal scoping work with the environmental bodies, the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report, which accompanied the Preferred Options document (as part of the Regulation 18 consultation) and the full Reg 19 Sustainability Appraisal Report which accompanied the Proposed Submission document (as part of the Regulation 19 consultation).

4.1. Early draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

Once the need for a Sustainability Appraisal has been established, the first step that is often undertaken is the production of a 'Scoping Report'. The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (hereafter the 'SEA Regs') does not specifically require a Scoping Report to be prepared, however where one is produced, SEA Regs set out that the relevant 'consultation bodies' shall be consulted for a minimum period of five weeks.

In advance of the Preferred Options consultation, an early draft of the scoping report, alongside the suite of supporting background papers, was made available to the consultation bodies for six weeks between January 17th 2025 and February 28th 2025. This was to help ensure the right scope and level of detail for the Sustainability Appraisal work.

Natural England had no specific comments to make at the Scoping Stage., However, the Environment Agency and Historic England provided feedback in relation to certain specific aspects of the work. Responses received included comments relating to gaps in the analysis of existing contextual

² The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes 2004

information, key sustainability issues identified; certain specific details in some of the related background papers; and on the scope of the decision-making criteria to be used as part of the SA assessment framework for site allocations.

A summary of the comments received and how the Council subsequently responded, including where amendments were incorporated into the subsequent version of the scoping work, was included in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal report published as part of the Reg 18 Preferred Options consultation (discussed next). They were also included for reference in Appendix A of the Reg 19 Sustainability Appraisal report.

4.2. Interim Sustainability Appraisal of the Preferred Options Document

An Interim Sustainability Appraisal report that assessed the preferred options and alternatives for the emerging Oxford Local Plan 2045 was published alongside the Preferred Options documents as part of the Regulation 18 Preferred Options consultation between 27th June 2025 and 8th August 2025. Alongside a non-technical summary, this Interim Sustainability Appraisal report included a couple of distinct parts:

- Part one – Scoping report: This incorporated the early feedback from the consultation bodies discussed earlier.
- Part two – Options appraisal: This included an interim appraisal of the emerging Local Plan including alternatives for the overarching growth strategy; a selection of options sets for policies which had been determined to have potential for likely significant effects; as well as a limited Whole Plan appraisal (because parts of the Local Plan were more developed than others at Reg 18 stage, for example, there were not yet site allocation policies).

The Interim Sustainability Appraisal was supported by a suite of background papers, published alongside it on the website as part of the consultation. These background papers expanded upon the scoping work featured in the main report, focusing on a number of particular topics (e.g. housing, employment, green infrastructure and biodiversity, infrastructure etc.). These background papers included options sets for every policy included in the Reg 18 Local Plan alongside a high-level ‘sustainability screening’ of them, which helped to inform which sets of policy options were screened in for detailed appraisal in the main Sustainability Appraisal report. Additionally, interim Sustainability Appraisal site assessments were also published for the potential allocations identified in the Reg 18 consultation.

Amongst those invited to comment on the interim Sustainability Appraisal report, and the broader consultation materials, were the following:

- Environment Agency
- Natural England
- Historic England
- National Highways
- Oxfordshire County Council
- Cherwell District Council
- South Oxfordshire District Council
- Vale of White Horse District Council
- West Oxfordshire District Council

The Reg 18 consultation summary report details the comments made on the Interim Sustainability Appraisal, as well as a variety of wider topics across the Reg 18 consultation such as the preferred options, the potential site allocations identified, and the draft policies. The report highlights where changes were identified by officers to be incorporated into the Reg 19 Local Plan.

In relation to the specific comments received on the Interim Sustainability Appraisal report itself, these were varied and touched on various elements of the report including: the appraisal of the policy options for setting the Local Plan housing requirement; omission of green belt as a consideration as part of the SA objectives; perceived duplication of considerations between SA objectives; as well as a number of comments expressing the need for more serious consideration of sustainability throughout, particularly in relation to environmental and/or social issues. In addition to being summarised in the Reg 18 consultation summary report, these comments are also summarised directly within the subsequent full Reg 19 Sustainability Appraisal report alongside the Council's responses

4.3. Sustainability Appraisal of the Proposed Submission Document

The full Reg 19 Sustainability Appraisal Report was published alongside the proposed submission document and other consultation materials as part of the Reg 19 consultation, which ran for 6 weeks between 30th January 2026 and 13th March 2026.

Alongside a non-technical summary, this included updated versions of the scoping work and options appraisal that were consulted on as part of the Reg 18 consultation, as well as the additional elements expected of a full Sustainability Appraisal, such as an appraisal of the impacts of the plan, details of mitigation measures to address potential impacts on sustainability arising from the plan, and a proposed monitoring framework. Updated versions of the supporting Background Papers were also published as well as SA site assessments for each of the proposed allocations.

There were 8 respondents who raised issues in their specific comments on the Reg 19 Sustainability Appraisal report itself. The comments generally related to a few topics, including: the way the Council had scored the potential impacts of the new Local Plan against the SA objectives; the preferred approaches to the growth strategy and/or housing requirement; and the way the Council had scored particular site allocations. A full summary of the comments with responses from the Council is included in the Appendix 3 (see '*Supporting documents and miscellaneous comments*'), however, the comments can be briefly summarised as follows:

- The SA is not justified in its lack of adequate evidence base, is not positively prepared in proposing that the Local Plan is capable of achieving sustainable development and will not be effective, thus inconsistent with NPPF.
- The SA has grossly underestimated the societal, environmental and economic impacts of the Local Plan and does not provide evidence to justify scoring of impacts throughout the assessment.
- Alternative suggested scores for the Local Plan's impacts against the various SA objectives have been provided, which typically identify more negative/significant negatives.
- The monitoring framework provided will be ineffective.
- The SA site assessment for SPS8 Land at Meadow Lane plays down the impacts of development across many different topics in how they have been scored, and is based on incomplete analysis.

- In relation to the overarching growth strategy and/or housing requirement policy options, the SA should have given more regard to the option of setting a housing requirement higher than the standard method, to allow for stronger support for economic growth or affordable housing need, whilst recognising the necessity for this growth to be supported by the surrounding areas.
- The County Council made comments on the approach to scoring of site allocations against SA objective 10 (biodiversity) including taking into account potential for legally protected species, priority and irreplaceable habitat, and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS). They also made comments on several particular SA site assessments. These comments have been responded to through the Statement of Common Ground with them, and are duplicated in the '*Statements of Common Ground tables of comments/responses*' section.

The planning policy team has reviewed the Sustainability Appraisal assessment and conclusions in light of the comments made through the Reg 19 consultation. Whilst detailed responses are included in the Appendix 3 to each of the issues raised by the comments, on balance, it is not considered that the objections would have fundamentally altered the assessment made, or the way the Sustainability Appraisal has informed the approaches and the specific policies of the local plan.

5. Preferred Options Consultation Process

5.1. Who was consulted?

The City Council carried out its Preferred Options consultation (Regulation.18) on the Oxford Local Plan 2045 for six weeks, running from 27 June to 8 August 2025, using the First Draft Oxford Local Plan 2042 as the main document. This stage sought views on the draft policies identified as preferred options - those considered most likely to deliver the best outcomes compared with alternatives outlined in the Background Papers.

The Preferred Options consultation aimed to involve residents, workers, employers, students and visitors to Oxford as well as stakeholders and service providers. An extension of time was provided for responses until late August 2025 to mitigate an issue with the postal delivery of some of the questionnaires.

The Preferred Options consultation aimed to involve the whole city by delivering a questionnaire door-to-door across the city (approximately 46 000 properties). Letters were sent to various organisations and individuals, which included the statutory stakeholders and a wide range of interest groups, developers and agents.

Direct contact with the following individuals or organisations was made either by email or letter:

- All residential addresses in the post code sectors covering Oxford (door-to-door delivery of questionnaires to approximately 46 000 households)
- Statutory consultees and Duty-to-Cooperate bodies (see Appendix 1 for list of consultees)
- Additional local groups and organisations who were likely to be interested (see Appendix 2 for list of consultees)
- Respondents from the Early Engagement Survey who wished to be kept informed of further stages in the Local Plan process (180 persons)
- All contacts on the Planning policy contact list, made up of persons and organisations signed up for updates on the Local Plan and related matters (400+ contacts)

5.2. Consultation Materials

At this stage in the Local Plan, the material that was published was focussed on presenting the preferred policy options, and providing the evidence base that had led to the development of the policy options and to the preferences for those options. The consultation focussed on asking consultees whether they agreed with the Council's preferences for the policy options. In order to make this information accessible and to engage with a wide range of parties/people and levels of interest a range of materials were produced with different audiences in mind:

For people with 5-10 minutes to get involved:

- Leaflet (equivalent 2 sides of A3) with a freepost reply with basic information, a simple 'Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree' questionnaire and some space for additional written comments
- Online questionnaire based on the 5 main topics contained in the leaflet survey

For stakeholders and those with more interest/time:

- First Draft Oxford Local Plan 2042 Consultation Document
- Draft Sustainability Appraisal
- Background Papers
- Structured online questionnaire (on the Council's Consultation Portal) to comment on Preferred Options Consultation Document (in addition to the option of submitting written feedback on the council website, by email, or by post)

The materials described above were available:

- On the Council's website
- In 7 local libraries and the central library
- As hard copies on request

4.3. Consultation Methods

4.3.1. Promotion and Publicity of the Preferred Options Consultation Period

The Preferred Options Consultation was publicised through the following channels:

- Publication of an updated Local Development Scheme (LDS)
- Notifying those on the City Council's online consultation database (all those interested in planning or other relevant topics- 400+).
- Notifying statutory consultees and Duty to Cooperate bodies.
- Notifying residents groups and amenity groups.
- Notifying all primary and secondary schools within the Oxford City administrative boundary (and surrounding areas including Botley, Kennington and Kidlington).
- Publishing information on our webpage and dedicated consultation webpage.
- The City Council's social media channels
- A press release
- Briefing to Local members.

- All libraries having hard copies of the Evidence Base, draft Sustainability Appraisal, and Background Papers

4.3.2. Preferred Options Consultation Events and Meetings

The Preferred Options Consultation was publicised through the following channels:

- Publication of an updated Local Development Scheme (LDS) in XX
- Notifying those on the City Council's online consultation database (all those interested in planning or other relevant topics- 400+).
- Notifying statutory consultees and Duty to Cooperate bodies.
- Notifying residents groups and amenity groups.
- Notifying all primary and secondary schools within the Oxford City administrative boundary (and surrounding areas including Botley, Kennington and Kidlington).
- Publishing information on our webpage (including introductory videos).
- The City Council's social media channels
- A press release
- Briefing to Local members.
- All libraries having hard copies of the Evidence Base, draft Sustainability Appraisal, and Background Papers.

We organised a number of face-to-face sessions – including in person 'drop in' sessions at various locations across the city, attended by officers of the Planning Policy team, and a number of online sessions that were subject and topic based for which there was a sign up/booking process for members of the public. These were widely advertised through all social media channels, all libraries, and on our website. The events were scheduled as follows:

Table 1 – Details of Drop-in Events for the Preferred Options Consultation

<u>Date & Time</u>	<u>Location</u>
Saturday 5 th July, 12:00-15:00	The Leys Festival
Saturday 5 th July, 14:30-16:30	Afternoon tea at Littlemore Village Hall
Monday 7 th July, 16.30-18.00	ONLINE
Tuesday 8 th July, 10:00-14:00	Barton Community Centre
Wednesday 16 th July 11:00-13:00	North Oxford Association
Thursday 17 th July, 11-12.30	ONLINE
Sunday 20 th July, 9:15-12:00	South Oxford Farmers Market
Wednesday 23 rd July, 10:45-14:15	Town Hall, Long Room
Saturday 26 th July, 10:00-14:00	Wolvercote Mill Community Café
Tuesday 19 th July, 17.00-18.30	ONLINE

5.4. Responses to Preferred Options Questionnaire

5.4.1. Responses to Consultation Questionnaire and Emailed Responses

The postal leaflets and online questionnaire are both based on the same set of questions, and so both sets of responses have been collated and analysed together. Additionally, any emailed or written responses were summarised, collated and analysed with the questionnaire responses. A total of 1382 combined responses were received over the consultation period.

5.4.2. Graphs of Responses

Please see Appendix 4, to view all responses and officer responses.