

Submitted to Oxford Local Plan 2045 Submission Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation  
Submitted on 2026-03-11 19:34:57

## Contact Information

### 1 Name

Name:  
Nicola Creed

### 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?:

## 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?, 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.

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, policy is NOT consistent with national policy

spe14 comments:

I do not consider inclusion of SPE14 in the sites to be considered for planning permission to be sound because it is contrary to Policy S1 c, f, g, h, i and j S1 c. The development would not be car free. As there is no direct access from the A40 Northern Bypass, houses in this area would be accessed from roads which are already hugely over congested - both Copse Lane leading onto Headley Way and the narrow roads of Old Headington. It is naive to think that people will not use cars and the above roads are the only way in and out. There are already massive traffic jams at peak times on these roads. S1 f. Housing development would be a new use in the sensitive location of Old Headington Conservation Area, causing harm to existing neighbouring uses.

S1 g. Housing development on this greenfield location would have a hugely negative impact on the important green corridor for wildlife and the important flora and fauna living in these fields. These fields contain ancient wetland peat growing sedges and rushes. It would be against the Council's policy to build on this peat. In addition the very old blackthorn hedges provide important habitat for the rare Brownstreak butterflies. The fields are home to a wide variety of birds.

S1 h. It would negatively impact the local historical context of the Old Headington Conservation Area which is of great heritage significance.

S1 i. Inclusion of SPE14 would be against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement that strategic policies should make sufficient provision for conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and NPPF policy for the protection of significant heritage assets such as Old Headington Conservation Area which is an irreplaceable resource which needs to be conserved. These are significance factors which provide clear reasons for refusing inclusion of this site for development.

S1 j. The NPPF states that any adverse impact of granting permission should not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and when assessed by the NPPF's policies this is clearly not the case.

Policy S1 f,h,i: Old Headington Conservation Area. Previous attempts to gain Planning Permission on Ruskin Fields have all failed due to the importance of the open fields to the setting of the Conservation Area. In 2011-12 the Planning Inspector rejected the inclusion of Ruskin Fields for development stating that they created "an important open setting to the tightly knit historic core of the Conservation Area that is fundamental to its intrinsic character" and that allocation for housing "would be inappropriate and unjustified, and would therefore be unsound."

The northern two-thirds was rejected from the 2036 Local Plan and not allocated for development in the draft 2040 plan. Nothing has changed to alter this position, indeed housing developments all around increase the importance of these fields. It is important to note that the City Council now has a financially beneficial option agreement with Ruskin College for access via Foxwell Drive, which could potentially be seen as a conflict of interest and this should not influence allocation of this site for development as it contravenes Policy S1 f, h and i.

The Green Infrastructure Network: Ruskin Fields are designated Supporting Green Spaces in the Oxford Green Infrastructure Network. It is essential for wildlife to have a continuous green corridor and the loss of this land could not be mitigated to the standard required by Policy G1B. The loss of wetland peat would be contrary to the Council's policy.

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:

For all the reasons I set out above, I consider inclusion of Ruskin Fields within the Local Plan to be unsound. 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.