

Response ID ANON-M2Q4-48VG-D

Submitted to Oxford Local Plan 2045 Submission Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation
Submitted on 2026-02-16 12:38:01

Contact Information

1 Name

Name:
Jennifer Butler

2 Email Address

Email:

[REDACTED]

3 Postal Address

postal address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

4 Postcode

postcode:

[REDACTED]

5 Organisation Name (if applicable)

Organisation:
none

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?:
none

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 do NOT want my address and postcode to be published with my response.

9 Do you wish to be notified when:

the Inspector's report is published?

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:

No need for me to participate

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 justified, policy is NOT consistent with national policy

spe14 comments:

Throughout the policy wording, the emphasis focuses on the environmental considerations, the unique character of the 'green corridor' in Old Headington, the species within and plant life of Ruskin Field, etc etc - yet DESPITE all that, the policy seems ultimately to advocate development. This is a travesty, and no justification whatsoever that holds water. There are huge housing developments over at Bayswater and Barton that can happily satisfy the housing need in this part of Oxford.

The proposal for housing development does not adequately reflect the requirement to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area of Old Headington and retain the 'green corridor'. The effect on traffic in the area and particularly for our neighbours in Foxwell Drive would be tremendous, and impact on Dunstan Park and the children's play area in terms of noise, pollution and air quality.

Any allocation of land for development at Ruskin Fields would be inappropriate and unjustified, and would therefore be unsound.

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:

Oxford City Council have agreed to sell the access land as part of development planning, to the owners of Ruskin Field for £750,000.

Oxford City Council will, if the Local Plan is passed (including policy SPE14 Ruskin Field) also be in a position to grant planning permission to the owners of Ruskin Field.

Thus making £750,000 for said Oxford City Council.

No matter that these are supposedly different departments - there is a clear conflict of interest on behalf of Oxford City Council and so is both morally and legally unsound in my opinion - and would be subject to judicial review if it goes ahead.

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:

Remove the conflict of interest by rescinding the offer to sell the access land to the owners of Ruskin Field.