

Submitted to Oxford Local Plan 2045 Submission Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation
Submitted on 2026-03-12 10:53:09

Contact Information

1 Name

Name:
Guy Hudson

2 Email Address

Email:
[REDACTED]

3 Postal Address

postal address:

[REDACTED]
[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 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.

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

spe14 comments:

I believe that inclusion of this site (SPE14) for residential development is against Policy S1, F,G,H and I.

F) - it will constitute a new use of land, within the Old Headington Conservation Area, that would harm the amenity of existing neighbouring uses.

G) - it would be a new development on a green field site, that will have a negative impact on the local natural environment and existing green network connections and wildlife corridors

H) inclusion will negate the local historical context of the village of Old Headington and its setting amongst surviving agricultural fields in the Conservation Area. The fields are still leased to a tenant farmer who takes a hay cut once a year - this will be lost.

I) The National Planning Policy Framework requires that policies must make provision for conservation and enhancement of the natural landscape and green infrastructure, and that the protection of heritage assets like the Conservation Area are an irreplaceable asset, and should be preserved - these policies provide adequate reasons to refuse the inclusion for development, as all of the above will be harmed by the loss of the fields.

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: