

Response ID ANON-M2Q4-48QD-5

Submitted to Oxford Local Plan 2045 Submission Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation
Submitted on 2026-03-13 21:25:43

Contact Information

1 Name

Name:
Samantha Poyser

2 Email Address

Email:
[REDACTED]

3 Postal Address

postal address:
[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 do NOT want my address and postcode to be published with my response.

9 Do you wish to be notified when:

None of the above

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:

Access roads are sufficient to service this amount of new builds. Old High street in particular is far too heavily trafficked. It's chaotic and quite disruptive already. Marston would not be enough to service over 28 dwellings. Emergency vehicles in particular are hindered by the flow of heavy traffic here and it's very noisy for residents too.

This is The John Ruskin Site and as such there needs to be some attention paid to the heritage of the legacy of this part of our local history (The work and history of John Ruskin) and also the corridor of nature that spreads across the land at the bottom of Ruskin field which is rich in wildlife and environmental importance. Now more than ever the work of John Ruskin is relevant. And in fact if anything were to be built, a visitor arts, heritage and education centre would be a more appropriate addition to the area.

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:

The only way to make policy SPE14 sound, in my view, is to delete it from the list of sites for which planning permission will be granted for residential development.