

Response ID ANON-M2Q4-48VF-C

Submitted to Oxford Local Plan 2045 Submission Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation
Submitted on 2026-03-08 15:43:09

Contact Information

1 Name

Name:
Susan Biddle

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?:
Not applicable

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.

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:

Not applicable

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 SPS8 is NOT positively prepared

It disregards and misinterprets the clear evidence that has emerged confirming this site is not suitable for sustainable development.

It appears to rely on a flawed assumption that inclusion in the Local Plan 2036 is sufficient. Any development on this site is unsustainable with a high risk of significant harm to both the ecology (including protected species and biodiversity) and to the Iffley Conservation Area, which in both cases cannot be justified. Attempts to mitigate these harms would be expensive, and ultimately very unlikely to be effective.

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 3b and there is an ongoing objection from the Environment Agency.

A further complication and limiting factor for any complications is its potential contamination.

Policy is NOT justified

The site has no minimum housing allocation (ie 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 were allocated to the current Local Plan 2036 shows how sensitive this site is: 15 constraints have been identified – the highest number of any site on the new Local Plan.

There are reasonable alternatives for housing in Oxford, notably on the brownfield sites currently designated for employment including the many 'windfall' sites in redundant retail and office areas such as the Clarendon Centre and Botley Road. A new employment policy (Policy E1) makes it possible for land-owners to deliver housing alongside employment on these sites, and such diverse developments are more likely to succeed in providing community spirit and opportunity, and without exacerbating Oxford's already considerable traffic problems.

Policy is NOT effective

A zero allocation makes no guaranteed or reliable contribution to meeting housing needs and so cannot be effective. Oxford City Council has not been able to deliver housing on the Horse Fields over the 5 year period of the current Local Plan. The Council is now well aware of how sensitive the site is, in particular for ecology, for the conservation area, and for access, and has reduced the number of houses on the allocation from 32 to effectively zero, with no certainty of being able to deliver any housing at all. This cannot be effective policy.

Policy is NOT consistent with national policy

For the reasons outlined above, the policy would not deliver sustainable development in accordance with either the economic, or the social, or the environmental objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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:

For the reasons outlined above, the policy is not positively prepared, effective or justified, and would not deliver sustainable development consistent with the economic, or social, or environmental objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework. It therefore cannot be legally compliant.

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 (known locally as the Horse Fields) would be unsustainable and cannot be delivered in a viable fashion in accordance with local and national policy. This makes the allocation unsound and policy SPS8 illegal. Site SPS8 should be deleted from LP 2045.