

Response ID ANON-M2Q4-48WD-B

Submitted to Oxford Local Plan 2045 Submission Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation
Submitted on 2026-03-09 13:06:02

Contact Information

1 Name

Name:
Susan Leahy

2 Email Address

Email:
[REDACTED]

3 Postal Address

postal address:
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

4 Postcode

postcode:
[REDACTED]

5 Organisation Name (if applicable)

Organisation:
N/A

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?:
N/A

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.

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 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:

SPE14 to be included for sites where planning permission will be granted for building home buildings is unsound as against policy s1 c, f, g, h, i,,j that is,

s1c it's not an area with opportunities for sustainable travel links. This development would not be car free. There could be around/plus 200 vehicle movements a day including deliveries. A40 Northern Bypass direct access has been consistently declined by Oxford County Council making all traffic pass through Northway estate. This would lead through Foxwell Drive, Copse Lane, Dunstan Road, St Andrews Road, Halliday Hill, Saxon Way, Westlands Drive, some are already heavy bus use routes upwards from 150 plus buses a day. Additional buses is unlikely to further reduce traffic.

f it will be a new use in Old Headington Conservation area and harm the amenity of existing neighbouring uses

g more development on a greenfield location, it will have a negative impact where there is an important green infrastructure network where we have a mating pair of deer, owls, bats etc. This is the only green strip left in this area where nature is prevalent.

h it wouldn't take account of local history and to the heritage significance of Old Headington Conservation Area

i NPPF para 20.d requires that strategic policies make provision for conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment including landscapes and green infrastructure. NPPF policy para 202 for protection of heritage assets like Old Headington that are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in the manner appropriate to their significance, providing clear reasons for refusing development on this site, Ruskin Field.

j The policy in NPPF para 11.b.ii that any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in NPPF taken as a whole, applies to this site.

S1f,h,i Old Headington Conservation Area, Ruskin Fields lie in the Conservation area designated of Oxford City Council. These fields and Dunstan Park are even more important since the development of Barton Park and Bayswater Brook to preserve the character of Old Headington. There are restrictive building covenants registered with Land Registry ON269207.

There's history of previous development attempts and all failed, 1930's, 1990's, 2011/2012, some rejections from 2036 Local Plan and not allocated in the draft 2040 plan. Yet it has appeared in the draft 2045 local plan probably as the City Council have a beneficial finance option agreement with Ruskin College for land running through this green network and leading out onto Foxwell Drive (very sharp bend end), and this does not affect allocation of this site for development contravening policy s1 f,h,i.

policy s1g green infrastructure. Ruskin Field is greenfield land. The field and east end of Foxwell Drive are designated supporting green spaces in the oxford green infrastructure network, forming a continued green corridor from Dunstan Park to the Barton Triangle, it is a highly used wildlife access route and local green views. The loss of this corridor could not be reworked to the standard required by policy G1B. There are strong indicators that this site shares the spring fed calcareous fen characteristics of the ridge, it's very likely there are historic peat deposits. Unless an independent assessment quotes otherwise, this would be contrary to policy r6.

S1 j benefits and adverse impacts. Regarding all the above comments, it's hard to see how the building of 28 houses on Ruskin Field outweighs the impacts on the neighbourhood.

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:

To make the draft local plan 2045 sound, the Ruskin Fields site should be removed from the list of sites designated to receive planning permission for housing development.