

Submitted to Oxford Local Plan 2045 Submission Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation
Submitted on 2026-03-13 16:09:48

Contact Information

1 Name

Name:
Professor Sir David Warrell

[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.

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 justified, policy is NOT consistent with national policy

spe14 comments:

The policy of allowing residential development on this site is unsound because it contradicts S1 c) no opportunities for sustainable travel links; S1 f) this "new use location" in the Old Headington Conservation Area (OHCA) damages amenities of existing neighbouring; S1 g) it is a greenfield location where development will damage green infrastructure; S1 h) ignores local historical and heritage significance of OHCA; S1 i) The requirement that strategic policies should make sufficient provision is made for conservation and enhancement of the environment in contradiction of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, para 20.d); S1 j) the environmental damage done by this building (NPPF para 11.b.ii) will not be exceeded by alleged benefits;

S1c: despite promise of improved bus services to the site, car parking requirements implied by this build, and access for deliveries, will produce an impossible and dangerous burden on already-congested Foxwell Drive, Copse Lane, Dunstan Road, St Andrews Road, and Saxon Way; Policy S1 f, h, i: Ruskin Field is part of the Old Headington Conservation Area. The new residential area will destroy the continuity of green belt essential for wild life and obstructs the intentions of Oxford Preservation Trust in purchasing ground at the apex of Larkins Lane. All this in the face of massive developments and destruction of green environment North of the bypass.

Ruskin Field development was been rejected by the City Council in the 1930s, 1990s, and in 2011-12; S1g: Green Infrastructure. Ruskin Field is greenfield land, the development of which SA Objective 3 requires to be minimised. Ruskin field and the eastern end of Foxwell Drive were designated Supporting Green Spaces in the Oxford Green Infrastructure Network, providing a continuous green corridor from Dunstan Park to the Barton Triangle for wildlife access routes (see above). Dunstan Field likely hosts unusual plant and animal life that must be professionally investigated before irreversible destruction is allowed; S1j: I cannot comprehend how the alleged benefits of building 28 houses, poorly accessed by planned and existing roads, could possibly compensate for the environmental and human benefits provided by this existing area of agricultural land.

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

Not Answered

spe14 legal compliance comments:

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:

Without having the legal knowledge, or professional qualifications to judge the position of SPE14, I can only state my sincere opinion to urge that Ruskin Field should never have been available for consideration of building development, in view of its position (as part of the Old Headington Conservation area) and the rewards it currently offers to the environment and wildlife.