

1 Name

Age Group	Should Take Action	Should Not Take Action
18-29	85%	15%
30-49	85%	15%
50-69	85%	15%
70+	85%	15%

Organisation:
Beckley and Stowood Parish Council

Organisation, Local Authority

acting as agent?:
N/A

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.

the Council submits the Oxford Local Plan 2045 to the Government?, the Inspector's report is published?, the Oxford Local Plan 2045 is adopted?

Yes

reason to attend hearings:

To put forward the concern of Beckley and Stowood Parish on behalf of our parishioners about the Oxford City Local Plan and how it affects our parish and parishioners.

The Plan is not sound, legal or effective and fails in its current duty to co-operate and will adversely affect our parishioners.

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

12 Do you consider that policy S1 is sound?

No

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.

policy is NOT justified, policy is NOT effective

reasons for unsoundness S1:

These policies are in conflict with one other and are thus unsound -

a) ensure the continued strength and vibrancy district and local centres so they continue to attract people and support a range of facilities that meet people's immediate needs conveniently within their local area;

b) ensure new development is focussed on areas with opportunities for sustainable travel links;

So solely confined to along the railway lines

c) ensure activities that attract large numbers of people are centrally located in the city centre and district centres, so they are easy to reach by walking, cycling and public transport;

This assumes that the large numbers of people attracted to these activities do not travel from or live outside Oxford City, since public transport from the north and east of Oxford is almost non-existent.

d) focus new employment development that supports Oxford's national and international role in research and development on existing sites already in that use, prioritising housing elsewhere;

This is in conflict with policies a), b), c) and e) New employment development should be developed with housing to reduce commuting. Prioritising housing elsewhere will cause traffic congestion, pollution and prolonged travel time.

e) ensure new uses are in locations where they will not harm the amenity of existing neighbouring uses; and

f) prevent new development in locations where it would damage important blue and green infrastructure networks, public open space, and flood plain
This must include Green Belt countryside both within Oxford City and the surrounding districts.

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.

No

S1 legal compliance comments:

See above - these policies are in conflict with one other and are thus unsound and not legally compliant.

The policies focus on developing employment premises, disregarding the need for housing and relies on the duty to co-operate to force surrounding Districts, communities to take their manufactured 'unmet housing need'. This despite the fact that the Government is abolishing the duty to co-operate. As discussed above development of much needed houses 'elsewhere' i.e. not in Oxford creates the need for even larger numbers of employees to commute into Oxford, with no improvement in access, lengthened journey times, more congestion and more pollution. This is not consistent as development will not be solely confined to along the railway lines and conflicts with b above.

Without the duty to co-operate this Plan falls flat with deliberately insufficient provision for housing need ,preferring to increase jobs in the centre of Oxford, without houses nearby for people to walk or cycle to work.

It deliberately ignores climate change and will not increase biodiversity and will further deplete nature significantly in the country that is already the most nature depleted in the world. The Plan will deliberately destroy Green Belt countryside both within Oxford City and the surrounding districts and the communities that live in it such as our parishioners in Beckley and Stowood. .

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:

The target of 30% of all jobs in Oxfordshire being and remaining in future within the City of Oxford is unrealistic and unachievable. It is also highly undesirable. Fewer employment premises should be build in favour of more homes, so Oxford can meet its own housing need in Oxford. There should be more mixed development employment on the ground floor and housing above so people can walk to work.

It is ridiculous to see recent development proposed in Headington High Street where a large grocery store / supermarket is replaced with laboratories with no housing. Laboratories may contain biohazards which should not be near populated areas and need specialist separate waste product disposal. This is very poor planning without proper consideration for people's safety.

Oxford City fails in its duty to co-operate and without the ability to export its manufactured 'unmet' housing need this Plan is completely unsound and not legally complaint.

Policy S2: High Quality Design

16 Do you consider that policy S2 is sound?

No

17 If you do NOT consider policy S2 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

s2 comments:

The local housing need is not served by the design code nor is reducing carbon emissions to reduce climate change

18 Do you consider that policy S2 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider policy S2 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

s2 legal compliance comments:

19 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 s2 sound:

Oxford City needs more housing and so mix of housing and employment premises should be within the design code.

To reduce carbon emissions which contribute to climate change buildings should be repurposed rather than demolished and rebuilt.

New or refurbished housing and all development should require the highest insulation standards.

New development should focus on housing within the City rather than employment premises - reversing current and proposed policies to reduce commuting and the need to travel to work by providing housing near work for those working in Oxford.

Policy S3: Infrastructure Delivery in New Development

20 Do you consider that policy S3 is sound?

No

21 If you do NOT consider policy S3 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

s3 comments:

There are two major infrastructure needs - transport and sewage/water provision which will not be met and there is no plan to do so. There are also many important infrastructure requirements - schools, GP surgeries, other health provision etc which are also not addressed.

The policy of trying to export Oxford City's manufactured 'unmet' housing need to other Districts in the Green Belt countryside on the edge of Oxford means that traffic congestion will be increased significantly on roads. The only sustainable way to increase housing without an increase in road traffic is to build along railway lines, but this is not a policy.

Oxford City plans significant development with the need for a considerable increase in the provision of water and removal in sewage while it is widely known that Thames Water cannot meet either requirements within the foreseeable future.

22 Do you consider that policy S3 is legally compliant? If you do NOT think policy S3 is 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

s3 legal compliance comments:

23 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.

proposed changes to make policy s3 sound:

Oxford City Council should meet its own housing need within Oxford in preference to developing employment premises and exporting its housing need. Building on the edge of Oxford increases road traffic and congestion on local roads and national trunk roads like the A40.

While the County County has an objective to reduce road traffic there are actually no effective policies in place to achieve this and it will fail. There has been no attempt to build segregated cycle paths out into the Oxfordshire countryside to help alleviate increases in traffic from developments on the edge of Oxford. The bus services beyond Oxford are completely inadequate for commuters. Taxis are extortionately expensive outside Oxford City.

There needs to be a comprehensive deliverable plan involving more housing in Oxford, so less commuting and alternatives to the car.

Thames water cannot be relied upon to deliver the water and sewage processing infrastructure required for such a scale of development and Plan must be written and developed on the basis of what is achievable.

Policy S4: Plan Viability

24 Do you consider that policy S4 is sound?

No

25 If you do NOT consider policy S4 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 effective, policy is NOT consistent with national policy

s4 comments:

This policy has considered viability only in terms of cost and profitability for the developer. Viability must also include other aspects of any development such as flooding, climate change and much wider aspects of the Plan itself.

When considering viability of a development inflation both in materials and market price must be fully considered.

26 Do you consider that policy S4 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider policy S4 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

s4 legal compliance comments:

27 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.

proposed changes to make policy s4 sound:

There should be more thorough and in depth scrutiny of the financial viability of the development in the first place and greater provision for increases in cost, reduction in market price etc.

There should also be much greater scrutiny in major external factors that affect the viability of a development - flooding - this was not properly considered in the Barton Park development and has caused increased flooding in the neighbouring housing estate. Sewage - another issue affecting viability.

Chapter 1: Vision and Strategy (whole chapter)

28 Do you wish to comment on any other part(s) of Chapter 1? Please state the relevant section or paragraph reference(s):

references for further comment chap 1:

1. General Comment on Whole Plan

2. Objectives and strategy

See answer 23.

29 Do you consider that the parts of Chapter 1 mentioned above are sound?

No

30 If you do NOT consider the parts of chapter 1 mentioned above 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 effective

31 Do you consider that Chapter 1 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider the chapter 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

chapter 1 legal compliance:

see comment below

32 Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the stated part(s) of the chapter 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 c1 sound:

1. General Comment on Whole Plan

In their previous/current Local Plan, Oxford City Council designated most development land within Oxford City for employment not housing. They exported their inflated 'unmet' housing need to surrounding district councils and insisted under the 'duty to co-operate' that new houses should be built on the edge of Oxford in the Green Belt. In their 'duty to co-operate' surrounding district councils made provision of housing to meet Oxford's 'unmet' need in the Green Belt all around in Oxford. In the case of SODC, which has the longest border with Oxford City Council this resulted in the loss of nearly 2,000 acres of Green Belt land and countryside given up for developments including around the ring road Land north of Bayswater Brook, Northfields and Grenoble Road – over 7,000 houses and cars. Nearly 700 acres of Green Belt have been destroyed in Cherwell to make way for development to help meet Oxford City's 'unmet housing need'.

2. Objectives and strategy –

It is not sound, positively prepared or effective.

It discusses providing homes for all without assessing housing need and failed to use approved Government methodology previously. It now claims that the correct methodology has been used, but the figures are very similar to previous ones and cannot be scrutinised. Development land for employment takes priority and the assessed need is not evidence based and evidence apparently used is not available to the public.

CPRE has carried out research on the previous iteration of the Plan to show that Oxford City Council plans to create over 14,000 new jobs but provide only 714 new homes . It plans to export its deliberately created 'unmet' housing need to surrounding councils as before without any proper evidence or assessment of need.

Oxford City Council has not solved the problem of how the current commuters can travel into Oxford City to work, yet wants to exacerbate the problem but creating 14,000 additional jobs within Oxford City while exporting more housing outside Oxford for people to fill these jobs. The transport problem, resulting pollution etc will be greatly exacerbated by this and the County Council's proposed 'Traffic Filter' scheme which offers no alternative public transport or new cycleways for those commuting into Oxford from villages with no or little public transport.

It would be preferable to create new jobs outside the City centre. There are still a number of sites for employment that have not been fully developed on the edge of the City, which are more accessible. e.g. Oxford Business Park has been in development for over 20 years and is still not fully developed, yet is not available for housing. The Botley Road should be mixed developments of housing and commercial, but the south side is primarily commercial.

Policy H1: Housing Requirement

33 Do you consider that policy H1 is sound?

No

34 If you do NOT consider policy H1 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

h1 comments:

"Delivery of housing is a priority for the City Council, and the Local Plan's strategy is to maximise housing delivery while balancing protection of other important assets such as biodiversity, open space and functional floodplain. " - this statement is untrue. Oxford City Council's priority is to development employment and increase jobs at the expense of delivering houses. By adopting this policy they continue to 'empire build' and will never have enough housing as their policy is to deliberately increase jobs and not homes.

In the previous version of this Plan Oxford City Council did not use the standard method to calculate housing need as it did not give a sufficiently large figure. This time they claim to have used the standard method, but come up with a very similar figure to the last iteration of the Plan and still claim they cannot meet it from within the City Of Oxford. So they again want to export it to surrounding Districts to develop more Green Belt countryside on the

edge of Oxford and harm local communities, including those in our parish.

The Plan carefully does not reveal how the figures were calculated or what background figures were used so it must be assumed they used the same ones as before. Therefore comments are made on these assumptions as the basis was kept secret in the last iteration of this Plan so they could not be scrutinised.

Housing needs and supply" the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2014" was used to inflate housing need it in the former/current Local Plan. This SHMA was out of date for the previous Local Plan and is certainly not relevant now and should not be used. Nor should the other 2014 report quoted –"Housing Market Area (Oxfordshire)". The 2011 census data is also being used when the 2021 census data is available and should be used.

This is not only unsound but also unacceptable and completely inadequate and out of date.

Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) is also questionable. SODC states in its response – " the Employment Land Needs

The assessments are clearly very questionable and evidence opaque.

Housing requirement

"The Housing and Employment Needs Assessment ('HENA'), jointly commissioned with Cherwell District Council, objectively assessed the housing need for Oxford.

The objectivity of the report and its findings has been questioned by the other Oxfordshire District Councils.

The housing need in Oxford is now for 1,087 new dwellings per annum instead of the previous 1,322 . "This need is greater than the capacity of the city to deliver it." "The assessment of capacity (set out in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2026) is now 9,267 homes over the plan period, or 463 dwellings per annum. in the previous iteration of this Plan - "the assessment of capacity (set out in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment 2023) is 9,612 homes over the plan period, or 481 dwellings per annum."

SODC stated previously about the former version of the Plan –" Policy H1 (Housing Requirement) identifies a total housing need derived from the HENA study of 1,322 dwellings per annum (dpa) or 26,440 dwellings in total over the period 2020-2040. Policy H1 confirms the total planned provision of housing land (comprising both site allocations, completions from 2020/21-2022/23 and a windfall site development allowance) for 481 dpa or 9,612 dwellings over the period 2020-2040."

The housing need identified by the HENA is not Positively Prepared, not Justified, not Consistent with National Policy and it fails the Duty to Cooperate." SODC commented further – "The Local Plan indicates that Oxford City Council wants (see paragraphs including 2.3 and 8.7) the unmet need to be met by additional housing provision within the surrounding Oxfordshire local authorities in an Oxfordshire strategic housing market area. The total supply proposed represents some 36% of the total identified need, with the remainder they say to be considered as unmet housing need. This is not Positively Prepared because Oxford has set itself up to fail to meet a chosen high level of need, the plan then carries forward the concept of having a capacity led approach to the housing requirement, and then it does not meet those needs. It is also is not Positively Prepared because it is not informed by agreements from the authorities this impacts upon. These criticisms remain true with the new version of the Plan.

Policy H1 now states - Provision will be made for at least 9,267 new homes to be built in Oxford over the plan period 2025-2045 (average of 463 per annum)." However this is not true as Oxford City will export its deliberately inflated 'unmet' housing need to surrounding Districts with harmful effects on their communities and countryside, under the duty to co-operate The housing need figures have been inflated by the forecast increase in jobs to enlarge Oxford and empire build at the expense of local parishes surrounding Oxford.

35 Do you consider that policy H1 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider policy H1 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

h1 legal compliance comments:

This also fails the Duty to Cooperate" and while the Government is changing this requirement it has not yet done so. If this were the case Oxford City could not achieve the housing development set out in H1.

As SODC pointed out in its response to the previous iteration of this Plan "As the Council will be aware, the preparation of the Local Plan is subject to the Duty to Co-operate (DtC) as set out in section 33A of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. That provision remains in force notwithstanding the proposed reforms in Schedule 7 to the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023, which have not yet been brought into account." The Duty to Co-operate remains, although it is to change when new legislation is introduced, but this Plan fails if the Duty to Co-operate is removed.

Oxford City is again inflating the housing need by using questionable, opaque, private and out of date, information, deliberately inflating jobs and prioritising employment, further inflating housing need. It is trying again to export its inflated housing need to surrounding districts despite the fact that the Government has announced that the Duty to Co-operate Oxford City is so reliant upon will be repealed.

If the number of new jobs to be created within Oxford City were reduced to a manageable level and development sites designated for employment used for housing instead, Oxford City Council would have no problem in meeting its own housing need.

36 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.

proposed changes to make h1 sound:

Please see comments above.

Policy H2: Delivering Affordable Homes

37 Do you consider that policy H2 is sound?

No

38 If you do NOT consider policy H2 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

h2 soundness comments:

The Oxford City policies of zoning development land specifically for employment has increased the price of land for housing and made houses even more unaffordable. The questionable assessment of development land as highlighted by SODC will also result in an increase in land prices and thus housing.

39 Do you consider that policy H2 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider policy H2 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

h2 legal compliance comments:

40 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 h2 sound:

Make the new policy on allowing housing on employment land effective by making the assessment for housing suitability fair and transparent with an aim of increasing housing on land zoned for employment. .

Policy H4: Employer-linked affordable housing

45 Do you consider that policy H4 is sound?

No

46 If you do NOT consider policy H4 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 effective

h4 comments:

This policy does not seem to take into account the fact that for couples living together both partners will have careers/jobs with different employers in different locations.

47 Do you consider that policy H4 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider policy H4 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

Not Answered

h4 legal compliance comments:

48 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 h4 sound:

Policy E1: Employment Strategy

94 Do you consider that policy E1 is sound?

No

95 If you do NOT consider policy E1 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

E1 comments:

This policy excludes housing from many designated employment sites and makes it extremely difficult to include housing in the others. This creates 'unmet' housing need which could be provided within Oxford and not exported to Districts. This is totally unacceptable.

The target of 30% of employment within Oxfordshire remaining throughout the life of this Plan is unrealistic and unsustainable. New businesses will not wish to set up within Oxford City as there is insufficient housing for employees, commuting times are already far too long and will become intolerable and there are insufficient potential employees. There are at the time of writing 749 job vacancies in Oxford (/findajob.dwp.gov.uk/) a low unemployment rate of 3.4% (May 24) compared with the whole of the UK of 5.2% (Dec '25).

Any growth in businesses within Oxford City is only likely to come from organic growth within existing businesses already located in Oxford. Many larger businesses have moved out of the centre of Oxford e.g. solicitors and new larger businesses are unlikely to relocate into the centre of Oxford.

96 Do you consider that policy E1 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider policy E1 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

E1 legal compliance comments:

It deliberately creates 'unmet' housing need when there are many empty employment sites which cannot be used for much needed housing. This creates a high job vacancy rate within Oxford and an increase in traffic congestion above its current intolerable level with the increase in commuting into Oxford.

97 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 e1 sound:

Development sites should not be zoned for employment alone. It makes sense to mix housing on employment sites, which is sustainable so people can walk to work.

Oxford City Council have been very unfair to local people needing housing within the City and the Districts receiving their alleged 'unmet' housing need that Oxford City has deliberately created,

The Oxford Business Park on the site where Morris Motors (now BMW Mini works) used to be was developed as a business park in approximately 1980s and still has empty plots which have not been developed. These could and should have been used for much needed housing. The site itself is having many business premises demolished and rebuilt. This causes significant and unnecessary carbon emissions which contributes to climate change. It is a disgrace and very wasteful.

Policy G1: Protection of Green Infrastructure

119 Do you consider that policy G1 is sound?

No

120 If you do NOT consider policy G1 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 effective

g1 comments:

It is not possible to take these aspirations seriously when the development policies of Oxford City Council of prioritising development land for employment, inflating housing demand and 'unmet need' and exporting inflated 'unmet housing need' to neighbouring districts has resulted in the destruction of so much Green Belt countryside, biodiversity and habitats, which can never be rectified or enjoyed by future generations. In SODC alone nearly 2,000 acres of Green Belt countryside has been destroyed to make way for 'Oxford's unmet housing need'. All other neighbouring districts have been similarly adversely affected, with substantial losses in Green Belt countryside to feed Oxford City's empire expansion plans e.g. Cherwell lost nearly 700 acres of Green Belt.

121 Do you consider that policy G1 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider policy G1 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

g1 legal compliance comments:

122 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 policy g1 sound:

Do not rely on the duty to co-operate to export inflated housing need to neighbouring councils and do not demand any co-operation is on the edge of Oxford. Oxford City Council has pursued and continues to pursue policies which destroy the Green Belt countryside, the environment, biodiversity, habitats and promote climate change.

Policy HD7: Health Impact Assessment

221 Do you consider that policy HD7 is sound?

Not Answered

222 If you do not consider policy HD7 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.

hd7 comments:

223 Do you consider that policy HD7 is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider policy HD7 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

hd7 legal compliance comments:

224 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 hd7 sound:

Policies Map

532 Do you wish to comment on a specific part of the Policies Map? Please state the relevant section:

references for further comment policies map:

533 Do you consider that the Policies Map is sound?

Not Answered

534 If you do NOT consider the parts of the Policies Map mentioned above 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.

policies map comments:

535 Do you consider that the Policies Map is legally compliant? If you do NOT consider Policies Map to be legally compliant, please give precise details for your reasons in the box below - if you wish to support the legal compliance please also use this box to set out your comments.

Not Answered

policies map legal compliance comments:

536 Please set out, as precisely as possible, what change(s) you consider necessary to make the policies map 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 policies map sound: