

Response ID ANON-M2Q4-48JV-G

Submitted to Oxford Local Plan 2045 Submission Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation
Submitted on 2026-03-12 16:46:36

Contact Information

1 Name

Name:
Dr Michael Dawson

2 Email Address

Email:
[REDACTED]

3 Postal Address

postal address:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

4 Postcode

postcode:
[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 am happy for the first line of 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?

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:

I believe the inclusion of Ruskin Fields SPE14 is unsound because it is contrary to Policy S1 f, h, i:

S1 f) Ruskin Fields lies within the Old Headington Conservation Area (OHCA). The Regulation 18 Assessment has been carried out on the wrong basis. The measure of impact of development should be on the 'character and appearance' of the Conservation Area as stated in the 1990 Act:

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Sec 72 (1) special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

it is not: Decision-making criteria: Is the development of the site likely to affect the significance (including the setting) of one or more heritage assets, including any associated historic, archaeological, artistic and/or architectural features?

S1 h - see above

S1 i - The proposed inclusion does not take sufficient account of the NPPF Para 20 (d):

20. Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision 12 for:

(d) conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment,

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:

Policy SPE14 is not compliant and should be removed from the plan. As the site analysis states 'green space must be strategically retained':

"Analysis and urban design implications

- The field is one of the few vestiges of the rural character of the conservation area and contributes to its setting and understanding its history. Green space must be strategically retained in order to conserve this character. "