

Response ID ANON-M2Q4-48VB-8

Submitted to Oxford Local Plan 2045 Submission Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation
Submitted on 2026-02-13 17:07:24

Contact Information

1 Name

Name:
Robert Pearson

2 Email Address

Email:
[REDACTED]

3 Postal Address

postal address:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

4 Postcode

postcode:
[REDACTED]

5 Organisation Name (if applicable)

Organisation:

6 In what capacity are you responding to this consultation?

Individual/Member of the public

7 If you are commenting on behalf of someone else, please state their name here. If you are representing more than one person or group we suggest making a separate submission for each.

acting as agent?:

Data Protection Notice and Notification Options

8 Are you happy for the first line of your address and postcode to be published with your response(s)?

I am happy for the first line of my address and postcode to be published with my response.

9 Do you wish to be notified when:

the Council submits the Oxford Local Plan 2045 to the Government?, the Inspector's report is published?, the Oxford Local Plan 2045 is adopted?

10 If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)? Please note: while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.

No

11 If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please tell us why you consider this to be necessary. Please note: the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

reason to attend hearings:

Policy SPE14: Ruskin Field

451 Do you consider that Policy SPE14 is sound?

No

452 If you do NOT consider policy SPE14 to be sound, please select your reasons why from the choices below. Please give precise details for your reasons in the box below - if you wish to support the soundness of the policy please also use this box to set out your comments.

policy is NOT consistent with national policy

spe14 comments:

Allocation of this site would be contrary to the NPPF

Specifically it would cause damage to:-

a) The historic environment which is the Old Headington Conservation Area

whereas the NPPF has many policies under the heading "Concerning and Enhancing the Historic Environment" which seek to protect such Conservation Areas. A previous planning inspector has stated "Ruskin Fields create an important open setting to the tightly knit historic core of the Conservation Area that is fundamental to its intrinsic character"

b) The identified and valuable Nature and Green Corridors whereas the NPPF has many policies under the heading "Concerning and Enhancing the Natural Environment" and "Habitats and Biodiversity" which seek to safe guard components of local wildlife, rich habitats and wider ecological networks. (Anecdotally, I have experienced foxes, roe deer, small mammals and a huge variety of birds other than garden birds)

c) the aim to reduce car-based travel whereas the NPPF has many policies under the heading "Promoting Sustainable Transport" and "Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change" With an area of 3.51 hectares and a possible 10% left natural, the developable are would be 3.16 hectares. In order to comply with "Making Effective Use of Land" a density of 25-30 dwellings per hectare can be expected. This would generate close to 100 dwellings. This in turn would generate around 200-250 traffic movements per day. With no close employment or retail centres this could be a conservative estimate. Not only would this cause short-term pollution (until electric vehicles are mandatory) but also it would cause large traffic issue in an already over-subscribed infrastructure.

453 Do you consider that Policy SPE14 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider policy SPE14 to be legally compliant, please give precise details for your reasons in the box below - if you wish to support the legal compliance of the policy please also use this box to set out your comments

No

spe14 legal compliance comments:

From a position in the past in which the Council was NOT promoting this land for development to the current proposal to positively include it for development is due entirely to the fact that the Council will financially benefit from the sale of Council-owned land for access. On a Stokes v Cambridge basis they will gain by a minimum of £750,000. In effect it is seeking to grant itself planning permission, and the greater the number of houses, the greater the financial benefit. There is the potential for the Council to ignore an increasing amount of damage to the natural and historic environment in order to further the gain.

At least, this is a flagrant conflict of interest and at worst, it is total misuse of power, bordering on the illegal.

454 Please set out, as precisely as possible, what change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above. You will need to say why the suggested change will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.

suggested changes to make SPE14 sound:

Removal of this site from the list of allocated development sites.