

Submitted to Oxford Local Plan 2045 Submission Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation  
Submitted on 2026-03-09 20:08:46

## Contact Information

### 1 Name

Name:  
Zoe Traill

### 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:

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.

Not Answered

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:

The policy is not sound because it contravenes Policies S1c,f,g,h,i and j.

1. S1c. The access to the development on Ruskin Fields would have to be on to Foxwell Drive and would inevitably lead to a large increase in traffic in Northway and Old Headington. The Old Headington conservation area appraisal of 2011 clearly identified the vulnerability of the area to increases in traffic, and there has been a relentless increase in rat-running through the village since then. There is already far too much traffic on St Andrews Road, with daily risks to pedestrians and cyclists due to cars mounting the pavements as they try to negotiate a narrow carriageway not designed for the needs of modern transport. There has also been significant damage to the listed cobblestones outside the White Hart. The council has a statutory duty to "pay attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area" and should therefore be reducing traffic in Old Headington, not allowing developments which will significantly increase it .
2. S1 f, h and i.. This proposal is in direct conflict with the council's remit for conservation, specifically the requirement to protect and enhance the character of the conservation area. The status of Ruskin Fields in providing the rural setting for the conservation area and in allowing and enhancing views from and into it, was stated in the CA appraisal and confirmed by the inspector when the previous application for development was turned down in 2011/12. The inspector stated that allocation of the Fields for housing would be "inappropriate and unjustified and therefore unsound". Nothing has changed since this judgment other than the financial arrangement with Ruskin that the council have made for access which should not and must not affect any decision about allocation of the site.
3. S1g. There is no justification for the use of a greenfield site for housing given the numbers of houses that have already been built at Barton Park and those planned for the land north of Bayswater Brook. Those developments make the Ruskin Fields green spaces even more valuable. Headington already has a paucity of green space according to national guidelines. The fields are a haven for wildlife, essential to the local ecology.
4. S1j. The adverse effects of granting permission for this development would clearly significantly outweigh the benefits.

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 policy can only be made sound by removing Ruskin Fields from the list of sites which could be allowed to be used for residential development