

Oxford Local Plan 2045 Submission Draft COMMENT FORM

Part A

You only need to
fill Part A in once

Your name:

Katrina Gaye Robinson

Organisation (if applicable):

Address:

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Email:

[Redacted]

Date:

16/03/2026

Data protection:

Please note that your response will be made available for inspection by the public in paper form at the Council's offices, or other locations as appropriate for the purpose of facilitating public access.

Your personal details will be properly safeguarded and processed in accordance with the requirements of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) 2018. Your information will be used for The Oxford Local Plan 2045 Proposed Submission Consultation only, and we will only store your data until the Oxford Local Plan 2045 is accepted. Information you give in this form could be shared with the Independent Examiner at the examination stage of the Local Plan process.

We cannot accept anonymous comments.

☒ If you are happy for us to state your name and the first line of your address and postcode when publishing your response(s), please tick this box.

☐ If you would rather all personal details except your name and a non-specific address (e.g. Oxford) to be obscured, please tick this box.

Do you wish to speak at the examination hearings?

(Please note that the Inspector will decide who to invite to speak)

Yes No
☒ ☒

Do you wish to be notified when:

the Council submit the Oxford Local Plan 2045 to the Government?

☒ ☐

the Inspector's Report is published?

☒ ☐

the Oxford Local Plan 2045 is adopted by the Council?

☒ ☐

GENERAL ADVICE

For advice on making a comment, please see the accompanying notes page. It is also available at www.oxford.gov.uk/oxford-local-plan-2045

When completing the form,

- You only need to complete Part A once
- Use Part B to make your specific comments. You may complete Part B multiple times to comment on different parts of the Oxford Local Plan 2045.
- Cover concisely all the information and evidence you feel supports or justifies your view, as this will normally be your only opportunity to tell us about it.
- Be as precise as possible.

HOW TO SUBMIT YOUR COMMENTS

Please submit completed forms by email or post to:

planningpolicy@oxford.gov.uk

Planning Policy Team

Oxford City Council
Town Hall
St Aldate's
Oxford
OX1 1BX

If you have any questions please feel free to get in touch with the Planning Policy Team

T: 01865 252847

planningpolicy@oxford.gov.uk

www.oxford.gov.uk/localplan2040

Please ensure your comments reach us by **4.00pm on Friday 13th March 2026.**

Thank you for participating.

DETAILS OF YOUR COMMENT

Part B

Please read the accompanying notes before completing Part B. The notes explain what we mean by soundness and legal compliance. These are questions that we are expected to ask consultees.

Please use a new Part B for each point you are commenting on. Attach all completed forms to Part A.

Q1. Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number)

Paragraph		Policies Map	
Policy Number	SPS8	Sustainability Appraisal	nd at Meadow Lane

Q2. Do you consider that the document:

(a) is legally compliant?	☐ Yes	☒ No
(b) is sound?	☐ Yes	☒ No
	☐	☐

Q3. Do you consider that the document is **unsound** because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

(a) positively prepared?	☒	(c) effective?	☒
(b) justified?	☒	(d) consistent with national policy?	☒

Q4. Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound or not legally compliant. If you do believe the document is sound or legally compliant, or complies you may use the box to explain why.

Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation Policy SPS8 - Land at Meadow Lane - Oxford City Council
Citizen Space
I wish to submit my comments below in response to this consultation.

In answer to Q 355. I consider that Policy SPS8 is NOT sound

The reasons are below in response to Q. 356.

Policy is NOT positively prepared. This is because it disregards and misinterprets clear evidence that has emerged that this site ('Land ant Meadow Lane' is unsuitable for sustainable

Please use an extra sheet if completing a paper copy.

Q5. What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

Q. 358. In order to be legally compliant and sound, I think the following changes to the Policy are necessary..

Any development at Land at Meadow Lane SPS8 would be unsustainable and cannot be delivered in a viable fashion in accordance with local and national policy. This makes the allocation unsound, and site SPS8 should be DELETED from LP 2045.

In addition I would like to say that Iffley has taken many waves of infill to the extent that these fields are the last 2.5 acres remaining. This ancient and rare Thames-side meadow is thus of irreplaceable heritage and ecological value and provides the setting for the rural Iffley Conservation Area. The site is an intact ecosystem that more than qualifies as a City Wildlife Site and is designated on the County Council's Local Nature Recovery Strategy.

In addition to Policy issues above, overwhelming evidence shows that this site is wholly unsuitable for housing and any development is unsustainable. Its new allocation (with the highest number of constraints - 15 - of any site) is unsound and irrational.

There have been repeated objections from the Environment Agency re local flooding and



Please use an extra sheet if completing a paper copy.

This is the end of the comment form

147.1 - SPS8 – Unsound – a, b, c, d (Appears to be copied from Citizen Space response – Check for duplicate)

Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation Policy SPS8 - Land at Meadow Lane - Oxford City Council Citizen Space

I wish to submit my comments below in response to this consultation.

In answer to Q 355. I consider that Policy SPS8 is NOT sound

The reasons are below in response to Q. 356.

Policy is NOT positively prepared. This is because it disregards and misinterprets clear evidence that has emerged that this site ('Land at Meadow Lane' is unsuitable for sustainable development, and appears to seek to rely on a flawed assumption that because it was in Local Plan 2036 (on the basis of incorrect and missing information in the Site Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal) that is adequate justification.

Any development here is unsustainable. causing harms to land and river ecology, and Iffley's rural conservation area. Access is difficult and would endanger users of the Principal Quiet Route for Active Travel along Meadow Lane and Church Way. The site is partly in Flood Zone 3 and there is an ongoing objection from the Environment Agency and clear evidence that it will increase sewage pollution of the river downstream of the site (exacerbating releases from Littlemore Pumping Station) and by 'forever chemical' surface run-off and toxic aquatic content discharged via the watercourse on its western boundary, polluting the river and Iffley Meadows SSSI Nature Reserve, which is opposite and downstream.

Policy is NOT justified. The site has no minimum housing allocation (i.e. a 'zero' allocation). The Council is therefore accepting that the site is so constrained that it may be impossible to deliver any development in a sustainable and/or policy compliant manner. It is therefore unjustifiable to allocate it.

There is new evidence from the Council's own surveys since the Horse Fields was allocated to the current Local Plan. This shows how sensitive this site is: 15 constraints have been identified - the highest number of any site on the new Local Plan I think it is irrational to continue to consider the policy justified in the face of this evidence.

Reasonable alternatives for housing in Oxford are clearly on the brownfield sites currently designated for employment. A new employment policy makes it possible for landowners to deliver housing alongside employment on these sites. It would be even more effective to redesignate them for housing, particularly as there have been so many 'windfall' sites for new tech companies in redundant retail and offices e.g. Clarendon Centre, Botley Road.

Policy is NOT effective

Again, a zero allocation cannot be effective because it makes no guaranteed or reliable contribution to meeting housing needs.

Oxford City Council has been unable to deliver housing on the 'Horse Fields' (Land at Meadow Lane) in the 5 year period of the current Local Plan. Council has now learnt about just how sensitive the site is, in particular for ecology, catchment and riverine issues, conservation area and access and has reduced the number of houses on the allocation from 32 to no idea if they can deliver any at all. This is clearly not an effective policy.

Q. 357. I do NOT consider Policy SPS8 to be legally compliant.

The Policy cannot meet the tests of soundness or legal compliance because it is not positively prepared, effective or justified.

Q. 358. In order to be legally compliant and sound, I think the following changes to the Policy are necessary..

Any development at Land at Meadow Lane SPS8 would be unsustainable and cannot be delivered in a viable fashion in accordance with local and national policy. This makes the allocation unsound, and site SPS8 should be DELETED from LP 2045.

In addition I would like to say that Iffley has taken many waves of infill to the extent that these fields are the last 2.5 acres remaining. This ancient and rare Thames-side meadow is thus of irreplaceable heritage and ecological value and provides the setting for the rural Iffley Conservation Area. The site is an intact ecosystem that more than qualifies as a City Wildlife Site and is designated on the County Council's Local Nature Recovery Strategy.

In addition to Policy issues above, overwhelming evidence shows that this site is wholly unsuitable for housing and any development is unsustainable. Its new allocation (with the highest number of constraints - 15 - of any site) is unsound and irrational.

There have been repeated objections from the Environment Agency re local flooding and increased flood risk to 12 neighbours to the south, plus issues of watercourse management, water quality, and inadequate SUDS proposals. Construction will have severe consequences in the climate change scenario as it will seriously impact this sloping field's function as catchment drainage. - a very dangerous situation for the future. .

The 5-year campaign to save this ancient meadow has been very successful, with City-wide and organisational support. The alternative initiative for much-needed local outdoor education, addressing inequitable access to green space in East is well-structured and meets many key equality needs, This publicly-owned site needs to be removed from Local Plan 2045

Many thanks for your time and consideration,