

Submitted to Oxford Local Plan 2045 Submission Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation
Submitted on 2026-03-04 21:41:47

Contact Information

1 Name

Name:
Martin Reed

[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[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 do NOT want 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.

Yes

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:

Any development at Land at Meadow Lane would be unsustainable and cannot be developed in a viable fashion in accordance with local and national policy. This makes the allocation unsound, and site SPS8 should be deleted from LP 2045. Participation is necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.

Policy S1: Spatial Strategy and Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

12 Do you consider that policy S1 is sound?

Not Answered

13 If you do NOT consider policy S1 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.

reasons for unsoundness S1:

14 Do you consider that policy S1 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider policy S1 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.

Not Answered

S1 legal compliance comments:

15 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.

changes to make policy s1 sound:

Policy SPS6: Former Iffley Mead Playing Field

347 Do you consider that Policy SPS6 is sound?

Not Answered

348 If you do NOT consider policy SPS6 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.

sps6 comments:

349 Do you consider that Policy SPS6 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider policy SPS6 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

Not Answered

sps6 legal compliance comments:

350 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 sps6 sound:

Policy SPS8: Land at Meadow Lane

355 Do you consider that Policy SPS8 is sound?

No

356 If you do NOT consider policy SPS8 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 positively prepared, policy is NOT justified, policy is NOT effective, policy is NOT consistent with national policy

sps8 comments:

Policy is NOT positively prepared

It is not positively prepared as it disregards and misinterprets the clear evidence that has emerged that this site is not suitable for sustainable development, and appears to seek to rely on a flawed assumption that because it was in Local Plan 2036 that will do. Any development here is unsustainable. causing harms to the ecology, and Iffley's rural conservation area. Access is difficult and would endanger users of the Principal Quiet Route for Active Travel along Meadow Lane and Church Way. The site is partly in Flood Zone 3 and there is an ongoing objection from the Environment Agency.

Policy is NOT justified

The site has no minimum housing allocation (i.e. a 'zero' allocation). The Council is therefore accepting that the site is so constrained that it may be unable to deliver any development in a sustainable and/or policy compliant manner. It is therefore unjustifiable to allocate it.

The new evidence from the Council's own surveys since the Horse Fields was allocated to the current Local Plan shows how sensitive this site is: 15 constraints have been identified - the highest number of any site on the new Local Plan,

The reasonable alternatives for housing in Oxford are on the brownfield sites currently designated for employment. A new employment policy makes it possible for land-owners to deliver housing alongside employment on these sites. It would be even more effective to redesignate them for housing, particularly as there have been so many 'windfall' sites for new tech companies in redundant retail and offices e.g. Clarendon Centre, Botley Road.

Policy is NOT effective

Again, a zero allocation makes no guaranteed or reliable contribution to meeting housing needs and ergo cannot be effective. Oxford City Council have not been able to deliver housing on the Horse Fields in the 5 year period of the current Local Plan. They have now learnt about how sensitive the site is, in particular for ecology, conservation area and access and have reduced the number of houses on the allocation from 32 to no idea if they can deliver any at all. This is clearly not an effective policy.

357 Do you consider that Policy SPS8 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider policy SPS8 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

sps8 legal compliance comments:

The fact that the policy is not positively prepared, effective or justified means that it cannot meet the tests of soundness or legal compliance.

358 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 sps8 sound:

Any development at Land at Meadow Lane SPS8 would be unsustainable and cannot be delivered in a viable fashion in accordance with local and national policy. This makes the allocation unsound, and site SPS8 should be deleted from LP 2045.