

Submitted to Oxford Local Plan 2045 Submission Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation
Submitted on 2026-03-04 16:55:44

Contact Information

1 Name

Name:
Nick Eyre

2 Email Address

Email:
[REDACTED]

3 Postal Address

postal address:
[REDACTED]

4 Postcode

postcode:
[REDACTED]

5 Organisation Name (if applicable)

Organisation:
Scientific Advisor on Climate Change to Oxford City Council

6 In what capacity are you responding to this consultation?

Other

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 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?, 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.

I am not sure

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 G2: Enhancement and provision of new Green and Blue features

123 Do you consider that policy G2 is sound?

No

124 If you do NOT consider policy G2 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

g2 comments:

The NPPF (para 165) requires that "To help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat, plans should: a...provide a positive strategy for energy from these sources, that maximises the potential for suitable development".

Policy G2 does not do that because, although point e) mentions climate change, it does not explicitly include the scope for blue infrastructure to supply renewable energy or improve energy efficiency. Water source heat pumps can potentially supply a large fraction of the city's heat very efficiently, but that potential is restricted to the blue infrastructure, where green belt policy is currently a constraint on the development of a sustainable heat sources.

125 Do you consider that policy G2 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider policy G2 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

g2 legal compliance comments:

The NPPF (para 165) requires that "To help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat, plans should: a...provide a positive strategy for energy from these sources, that maximises the potential for suitable development".

Policy G2 does not do that because, although point e) mentions climate change, it does not explicitly include the scope for blue infrastructure to supply renewable energy or improve energy efficiency. Water source heat pumps can potentially supply a large fraction of the city's heat very efficiently, but that potential is restricted to the blue infrastructure, where green belt policy is currently a constraint on the development of a sustainable heat sources.

126 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 g2 sound:

The policy should be amended so that point e) reads "Addressing climate change (including the provision of renewable energy and ambient heat..."

Policy R1: Net Zero buildings in operation

160 Do you consider that policy R1 is sound?

No

161 If you do NOT consider policy R1 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

r1 comments:

The NPPF (para 161) requires that the planning system should "shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions....and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure".

Policy R1 does not do that because it proposes an energy hierarchy that is outdated with respect to the City's own policy and the Government's recent Warm Homes Plan, both of which recognise that building heating needs to be very largely decarbonised on the timescales of this plan. This requires that elimination of fossil fuel use is the over-arching priority. The Policy as drafted also fails to recognise that electricity will soon be largely decarbonised and therefore that electrification and heat networks will play a key role in dense developments where provision of 100% of energy via onsite renewables is not feasible. And the reference to offsetting is unclear and potentially misleading.

162 Do you consider that policy R1 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider policy R1 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

r1 legal compliance comments:

The NPPF (para 161) requires that the planning system should "shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions....and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure".

Policy R1 does not do that because it proposes an energy hierarchy that is outdated with respect to the City's own policy and the Government's recent Warm Homes Plan, both of which recognise that building heating needs to be very largely decarbonised on the timescales of this plan. This requires that elimination of fossil fuel use is the over-arching priority. The Policy as drafted also fails to recognise that electricity will soon be largely decarbonised and therefore that electrification and heat networks will play a key role in dense developments where provision of 100% of energy via onsite renewables is not feasible. And the reference to offsetting is unclear and potentially misleading.

163 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 r1 sound:

A formulation of paragraph a) more consistent with 'radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions' would read: "new buildings should be designed to be net zero carbon in operation, by eliminating the direct use of fossil fuels, and ensuring that all energy demands are met by the use of renewable energy (including efficient use of energy from grid electricity and low-carbon heat networks). Developments should use highly efficient fabric and energy service systems, and maximise the use of onsite renewable energy with the remaining energy from low-carbon sources, including the electricity grid and low-carbon heat networks. Net energy imports should be matched by support for offsite local renewable energy projects."

Policy R3: Retro-fitting existing buildings

168 Do you consider that policy R3 is sound?

No

169 If you do NOT consider policy R3 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

170 Do you consider that policy R3 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider policy R3 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

r3 legal compliance:

The NPPF (para 161) requires that the planning system should "shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions....and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure".

Policy R1 does not do that because it proposes an energy hierarchy that is outdated with respect to the City's own policy and the Government's recent Warm Homes Plan, both of which recognise that building heating needs to be very largely decarbonised on the timescales of this plan. This requires that elimination of fossil fuel use is the over-arching priority. The Policy as drafted also fails to recognise that electricity will soon be largely decarbonised and therefore that electrification and heat networks will play a key role in dense developments where provision of 100% of energy via onsite renewables is not feasible. And the reference to offsetting is unclear and potentially misleading.

171 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 r3 sound:

A formulation of paragraph a) more consistent with 'radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions' would read: "new buildings should be designed to be net zero carbon in operation, by eliminating the direct use of fossil fuels, and ensuring that all energy demands are met by the use of renewable energy (including efficient use of energy from grid electricity and low-carbon heat networks). Developments should use highly efficient fabric and energy service systems, and maximise the use of onsite renewable energy with the remaining energy from low-carbon sources, including the electricity grid and low-carbon heat networks. Net energy imports should be matched by support for offsite local renewable energy projects."

The 'Policy Context' first paragraph should be amended accordingly.

Policy C6: Transport Assessments, Travel Plans and Service and Delivery Plans

270 Do you consider that Policy C6 is sound?

No

271 If you do NOT consider policy C6 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

c6 comments:

The NPPF (para 161) requires that the planning system should "shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions....and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure". As written, the policy does not adequately recognise the importance of transport emissions to the radical reductions required by the NPPF, the national targets in the Climate Change Act and the City's own targets. These will require almost complete elimination of direct use of fossil fuels in transport within the city on the timescales of the plan.

272 Do you consider that Policy C6 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider policy C6 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

c6 legal compliance comments:

The NPPF (para 161) requires that the planning system should “shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions....and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure”. As written, the policy does not adequately recognise the importance of transport emissions to the radical reductions required by the NPPF, the national targets in the Climate Change Act and the City's own targets. These will require almost complete elimination of direct use of fossil fuels in transport within the city on the timescales of the plan.

273 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 c6 sound:

In the policy context there should be new point: 'national policy and the City Council's climate goal can only be delivered if transport in the city is almost completely electrified on the timescales of this plan.' The policy itself should be amended by adding at the end of point h) the words “at a level consistent with the goal of complete decarbonisation of transport within Oxford city by 2040”

Sustainability Appraisal

537 Do you wish to comment on a specific part(s) of the Sustainability Appraisal? Please state the relevant section or paragraph reference(s):

references for further comment chap 1:

538 Do you consider the Sustainability Appraisal to be sound?

Not Answered

539 Do you consider the Sustainability Appraisal to be legally compliant?

Not Answered

540 Do you consider the Sustainability Appraisal to comply with the duty to cooperate?

Not Answered

541 Please give details, as precisely as possible, of why you consider that the stated part(s) of the Sustainability Appraisal is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

reasons chapter reference is sound or unsound:

542 Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the stated part(s) of the Sustainability Appraisal legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above (please note: non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). 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. Please be as precise as possible.

suggested changes to make chapter sound: