



Oxford Local Plan 2045

Submission Draft COMMENT FORM

Part A

You only need to
fill Part A in once

Your name:

Organisation (if applicable):

Address:

Email:

Date:

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.

Comments for the Oxford Local Plan 2045 Regulation 19 Review, March 2026

SPS6: Former Iffley Mead Playing Field

Open space, nature, flood risk

c) As the site falls within the identified impact risk zone for the Iffley Meadows SSSI, new development could have impacts on the functioning of this sensitive ecological site. Planning permission will only be granted if it can be demonstrated that there would be no adverse impacts on the integrity of the Iffley Meadows SSSI. Development proposals should reduce surface water runoff in the area and should be accompanied by an assessment of groundwater and surface water.

Development proposals must incorporate sustainable drainage with an acceptable management plan.

The current site flood assessment relies on the Boundary Brook carrying runoff from Cowley and the golf course through the site and into the Thames. Given the increasing rain and runoff and the very high levels of the Thames with climate change the assumptions in the flood assessment are no longer valid and are likely to lead to flooding of the site. A updated assessment taking into account climate change over the life of the development is needed before the development can be approved.

This aspect is neither positively prepared or effective.

151.1 - SPS6 - Unsound -
a, b, c

Movement & access

f) Augustine Way offers the greatest potential for vehicular access, but this would be shared with access to the adjacent Iffley Academy school. Therefore, proposals should ensure that access to the site can be achieved without being detrimental to the school.

The site outline planning application proposes 90+ dwellings accessed through a single road with multiple right angle bends and with the site entrance situated directly in front of the Iffley Academy gates. The road is barely able to cope with current Academy traffic and does not have the capacity to cope with the daily traffic to a 90+ dwelling estate even if it is designated low car.

Oxford County Council, as the outline planning applicant, has consistently refused to consider any alternative access to the site. This includes emergency vehicle access through Cavell Road during the twice daily traffic blocks in front of the school and estate entrance when school lets in/out.

The site should either reduce the number of dwellings to get a manageable level of traffic or provide alternative access.

This aspect is neither positively prepared, justified or effective.

g) Limited vehicle movements would be beneficial and as the site is located in a CPZ, low car development would be supported.

The low car concept is a poor solution to road traffic which will give very real problems in travel to work, school or hospitals by those living on the development. Public transport does not cover those who work outside the ring road or those who work night shifts at eg the JR. It is particularly bad for the elderly or infirm who cannot walk or cycle.

In addition the outline plan as proposed by the County Council gives totally inadequate temporary and disabled parking for the number of residents and has no specification for how necessary deliveries, rubbish collection, removals and ambulances will be regulated and get access to residents' front doors.

The development should be put on hold until such time as the County Council can demonstrate that it has thought through and has adequate detailed plans for vehicle access.

This aspect is neither positively prepared or effective.

h) Opportunities to access the site for walkers, cyclists and wheelers from Cavell Road and through the adjacent recreation ground to the north should be explored.

There has been a proposal for a bike path parallel to and adjacent to the boundary of the site for 4 years, with no action apparent. This path is essential to give residents of the development safe cycle and pedestrian access to Iffley Road and Meadow Lane avoiding the often crowded Augustine Way and the road in front of the school.

The development should not be permitted to proceed until there is a plan and schedule for putting the bike path in place before the SPS6 development.

This aspect is neither positively prepared or effective.

SPS8: Land at Meadow Lane

Open space, nature, flood risk

f) Part of the site is located within Flood Zone 3 and Flood Zone 2, and a sequential approach should be taken to locating development on the site, with development prioritised first within Flood Zone 1 prior to consideration of any siting within Flood Zone 2 or 3a. A site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required and

should consider on-site routes and any infrastructure required to reach the access route (Policy G7).

151.2 - SPS8 - Unsound - a, b, c

The flood risk assessment that is the basis of the site assessment is increasingly invalid with the increased rain, runoff and high level as climate change progresses. A updated assessment taking into account climate change over the life of the development is needed before the development can be approved. This aspect is neither positively prepared or effective.

Urban design & heritage

h) Development proposals should be designed with consideration of the impact on the Conservation Area and heritage assets adjacent to the site (Policy HD3).

The top end of the site, the Memorial Field, was for many years a village amenity and when the site was purchased for development it was promised that the field would remain undeveloped as a village amenity. It would be particularly useful for a public green space, of which there are few, and for a children's play park, of which there are none.

Encroachment on the Memorial Field and blocking of public access should be forbidden in any development approval.

This aspect is not positively prepared

i) Development should be of relatively low density and height to allow for suitable plot size and spacing between buildings and integration of green infrastructure as appropriate to the semi-rural character of the Iffley Conservation Area.

The proposals to date have been for a very low density compared with similar local sites and allows retention of the character of the Iffley village area. This aspect of the development should be retained.

This aspect is positively prepared, justified and effective.

Movement & access

k) Opportunities to improve walking, cycling and wheeling links should be taken to link into existing networks.

The proposed development gives the perfect opportunity to build a path through the development and the Memorial Field from Meadow Lane to Church Way to carry bicycle and pedestrian traffic safely towards Rose Hill and Iffley Lock whilst avoiding narrow and dangerous parts of Church Way.

This should be a requirement of any development plan.

This aspect would be justified and effective.

l) The semi-rural character of surrounding streets should be maintained and the perception of these as safe for walking, cycling and wheeling not compromised. To achieve this the site should generate minimal traffic, with low parking levels.

The low car concept is a poor solution to road traffic which will give very real problems in travel to work, school or hospitals by those living on the development. Public transport does not cover those who work outside the ring road or those who work night shifts at eg the JR. It is particularly bad for the elderly or infirm who cannot walk or cycle, given the distance to the nearest public transport on Henley Avenue.

In addition the outline plan as proposed gives inadequate temporary and disabled parking for the number of dwellings.

The development should be put on hold until such time as the developer can demonstrate that it has adequate detailed plans for vehicle access to meet residents' needs.

This aspect is neither positively prepared or effective.

N W Ringshall

12 March 2026