www.oxford.gov.uk

OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

Oxford Local Plan 2045

Submission Draft

COMMENT FORM

Part A

You only need to fill Part A in once

Your name: Environment Agency

Organisation (if applicable): Environment Agency

Address: [redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Date: 13 March 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.

- [x] 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.

	Yes	No
Do you wish to speak at the examination hearings? (Please note that the Inspector will decide who to invite to speak)	☒	☐
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 use a new Part B for each point you are commenting on. Attach all completed forms to Part A.

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.

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	POLICY CBLAOF	Sustainability Appraisal	

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.

POLICY CBLAOF - 474 Cowley Road (516)
29% (0.12ha) of site covered within fluvial flood extents, no proposed number of dwellings offered currently so unable to confirm general allocation suitability regarding floodplain compensation concerns. We have concerns with safe access/egress routes having to travel within FZ3a and flashy catchment and as mentioned within Level 2 SFRA a more detailed review of access/egress to the site will need to be undertaken within a SFRA. Updated modelling will also be required to confirm site suitability.

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.

Safe access/egress routes should be provided and avoid FZ3a. We understand a more detaile d review of access/egress to the site will need to be undertaken within a Level 2 SFRA. Updated modelling will also be required to confirm site suitability. To overcome points b and d the justification for this policy in flood risk terms will need to be stated in relation to paragraph 171 of the NPPF which states that an SFRA should manage risk from all sources and paragraphs 170 and 174 which steers development away from high flood risk areas. Additionally paragraph 181 (part e) of the NPPF states that safe access and egress routes must be included for development within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Currently it is not clear how a safe access and escape route will be achieved. Specifically regarding soundness point b, the evidence in the SFRA is not adequate. The data showing the risk of flooding shows that the site cannot be safe in flood risk terms as currently presented. The LPA must make revisions and provide further information to address these soundness points.

Please use an extra sheet if completing a paper copy.

This is the end of the comment form

DETAILS OF YOUR COMMENT

Part B

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

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.

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	Policy SPCW11	Sustainability Appraisal	

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.

Policy SPCW11 - Osney Warehouse and St Thomas School House (616)
Site is 0.41ha with 10 dwellings proposed (0.17ha). With 92% of the site being inundated during the design flood event, there is limited space on site outside of design flood event for suitable development/compensatory storage. It is very unlikely that without substantial re-development that suitable floodplain compensation will be possible on this site, and without this, the site would be undevelopable.

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.

The development would need to not increase the footprint compared to the existing built footprint on site and this should be explicitly stated within the policy to ensure it is sound. Flood storage compensation should be provided on a level for level basis and this requires land outside the design flood event for it to be achievable. Without adequate flood storage compensation the site would be contrary to paragraph 181 of the NPPF which states that within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, additionally that development must not increase flood risk elsewhere.

Please use an extra sheet if completing a paper copy.

This is the end of the comment form

DETAILS OF YOUR COMMENT

Part B

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

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.

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	Policy SPS13	Sustainability Appraisal	

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.

Policy SPS13: Ozone Leisure Park and Minchery Farmhouse (28c)
Further information is needed regarding proposed number of dwellings before confirming soundness. Large amount of space on site outside of fluvial flood extents, so expectation is that the sequential approach would have to be taken.

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.

There is a large amount of space on the site outside of the fluvial flood extents so we consider than a sequential approach can be taken, in line with paragraphs 173 and 181 of the NPPF, depending on the number of proposed dwellings. In order to address soundness points b and d, the number of dwellings must be confirmed and the LPA should set out that a sequential approach must be taken to site layout and ensure that development is outside the fluvial flood events.

Please use an extra sheet if completing a paper copy.

This is the end of the comment form

DETAILS OF YOUR COMMENT

Part B

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

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.

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	Policy SPCW7	Sustainability Appraisal	

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.

site is 0.26ha with 59 dwellings (0.98ha) proposed for the site. Currently this would far e

policy SPCW7 – Island Site, Park End Street/Hythe Bridge Street (70)
We have concerns that there will not be sufficient space available on this site for develop development area and we have no confirmation this would be the case. 85% (0.55ha) of the site falls within the design flood event extents, so it is very likely that level for leve compensation will be required for any new developments within this area. Considering the scale of the works proposed (as mentioned in section 5.2 of the Level 2 SFRA) it appears difficult to accommodate all the development without the loss of floodplain storage area. In turn this development as proposed is likely to cause an increase in flood risk to the surrounding areas. We would need to see the scale reduced

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.

Land South of Frideswide Square (624)
The site wholly lies within the design flood event and the current proposal for 59 dwellings exceeds the available space on site. There would be no space available on site for flood storage compensation. The LPA need to ensure the number of dwellings proposed can be built on the existing footprint of the site because flood storage compensation for any increase in built footprint is not feasible on this site. The site is currently contrary to paragraph 181 of the NPPF which states that within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, additionally that development must not increase flood risk elsewhere.

Island Site, Park End Street/Hythe Bridge Street (70)
This development as proposed is likely to cause an increase in flood risk to the surrounding areas, contrary to paragraph 181 of the NPPF. We would need to see the scale reduced significantly and for compensation to be undertaken/possible before this site before we would consider it deliverable and compliant with national policy.

Please use an extra sheet if completing a paper copy.

This is the end of the comment form

DETAILS OF YOUR COMMENT

Part B

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

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.

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	Policy SPS7	Sustainability Appraisal	

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.

Policy SPS7 - Kassam Stadium and Ozone Leisure Complex (28a)
Updated modelling would be required to fully confirm suitability as we stated in our previous comments made on the level 2 SFRA.

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.

Soundness points b and d may be overcome by providing updated modelling and reflecting this in a Level 2 SFRA.

Please use an extra sheet if completing a paper copy.

This is the end of the comment form

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	Policy SPS12	Sustainability Appraisal	

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.

ALREADY MARKED UP

Policy SPS12 - Oxford Science Park (Whole Site) (588)
We need confirmation regarding future use of land and modelling before we can confirm suitability. Available space on site for proposed allocation, but further information needed.

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.

104.8 Policy SPS12: suggested changes

The LPA must confirm the appropriate 'complementary uses' of the land and provide updated modelling to confirm the site's suitability for additional development to overcome the soundness issues. This is to ensure the development is located in appropriate areas and provides the necessary flood storage compensation if required, in line with paragraphs 170 and 174 of the NPPF which steers development away from high flood risk areas. Additionally, paragraph 181 of the NPPF.

Please use an extra sheet if completing a paper copy.

This is the end of the comment form

DETAILS OF YOUR COMMENT

Part B

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

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.

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	POLICY SPCW3	Sustainability Appraisal	

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.

POLICY SPCW3 - Canalside Land, Jericho (11)
We are concerned with this site that there is insufficient space to deliver the proposed allocation without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The site is 0.5ha, with 0.3ha proposed to be used for development (dwellings). During the 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) plus 41% allowance for climate change flood event, 78.3% of the site is inundated (0.39ha). In turn there would be an extremely limited amount of space available outside of the design flood event (0.11ha) to propose suitable level for level compensation that would mitigate the floodplain storage space lost by the new development. As it appears very unlikely to offer enough space on site to offer suitable compensation, we would object to this proposal at the planning stage, unless the size of the proposed developed areas was reduced significantly to make suitable compensation possible.

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.

104.9 Policy SPCW3: suggested changes

To address the soundness issues with this policy, the area of the site proposed for redevelopment would need to be reduced. Alternatively, the existing footprint used. In this case the space available for flood storage compensation for any increase in footprint is limited and we have soundness concerns for the sites deliverability in accordance with paragraph 181 of the NPPF.

Additionally, the correct climate change allowance of 41% should be used to assess the finished floor levels and a minimum 300mm freeboard imposed in addition to the design flood level (using 41% climate change allowance).

Please use an extra sheet if completing a paper copy.

This is the end of the comment form

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	Policy SPS4	Sustainability Appraisal	

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.

Policy SPS4 - Cowley Marsh Depot, Marsh Lane
We are concerned that the development proposed would be inappropriate at the current scale proposed. The site is 1.7ha, with an estimated 83 dwellings (1.4ha) proposed within it. 30% of the site (0.51ha) falls within FZ3b, and in turn it is very likely that some of this area would be required to be used for the dwellings at the current scales proposed. More vulnerable development within FZ3b would be considered inappropriate and we would object at the planning stage in accordance with Table 2 of the PPG.

In addition to the inappropriate development, there appears to be very limited space on site outside of the design flood event which covers 58% (0.99ha) to undertake an appropriate amount of level for level compensation that would be required for any new developments within this area. In turn there would be a significant amount of floodplain capacity lost at this site and

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.

104.10 Policy SPS4: suggested changes

The first soundness issue to be addressed is to clarify that there will be no development within Flood Zone 3b - Functional Floodplain. This would be contrary to Table 2 of the PPG and paragraphs 170, 172, 173, 174 and 175 of the NPPF.

The second soundness issue to be addressed is the area on site suitable for level for level flood storage compensation. The lack of space for compensation could result in an increase in flood risk elsewhere, contrary to paragraph 181 of the NPPF.

The third soundness issue to be addresses is for the correct modelling to be used.

The final soundness issue to be addressed is to ensure safe access and egress from the site. Paragraph 181 (part e) of the NPPF states that safe access and egress routes must be included for development within Flood Zones 2 and 3.

Please use an extra sheet if completing a paper copy.

This is the end of the comment form

DETAILS OF YOUR COMMENT

Part B

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

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.

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	Policy SPCW8	Sustainability Appraisal	

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.

ALREADY MARKED UP

Policy SPCW8 - 586 - Osney Mead (Whole Site)
We have concerns regarding this site because at the current scale the development would be considered inappropriate due to the presence of FZ3b. The site is 17.8ha with 39% of the site falling within FZ3b (6.94ha) and 86% of the site within the design flood event (15.31ha). Currently we have only been given the number of dwellings that are proposed within the site at 247 (4.12ha) while the development also includes mixed less vulnerable uses as well (scale n/a). Considering the high portion of the site that falls within FZ3b, we have concerns that any proposed development within this area would be considered inappropriate (both less and more vulnerable) and would therefore be objected to at the planning stage. However, we appreciate that a sequential approach will be undertaken and within the Level 2 SFRA no development other than open space and/or water compatible development will be undertaken within FZ3b. Confirmation on the total scale of the development at this stage is required.

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.

104.11 Policy SPCW8: suggested changes

Confirmation on the total scale of the development at this stage is required to confirm that no development will be within FZ3b and that development can be appropriately compensated for. As currently proposed, unless there is a significant reduction in the scale of development at this site, we will object to the proposal at the planning stage in line with paragraph 181 of the NPPF.

Please use an extra sheet if completing a paper copy.

This is the end of the comment form

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		Sustainability Appraisal	

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.

613 - Sites adjacent to Osney Bridge (Level 2 SFRA)

For the sites adjacent Osney Bridge, we have concerns that there will not be enough space on site to deliver the proposed allocation without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The sites combined are 0.3ha in size and 20 dwellings are proposed across them at 0.33ha of space. Currently this would only leave 0.01ha available for flood waters/compensation. It is discussed within the Level 2 SFRA that most of the proposed development would be undertaken using the re-development of existing development and any new developments would be located within the areas of lowest flood risk. However, no final confirmation on how this will be split. 48% (0.16ha) of the site falls within the design flood event (of which is using the 26% when the 41% should be used for more vulnerable developments). The scale of development would therefore exceed the available space available on site outside of the design flood

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.

As currently proposed, it appears unlikely that this site will have suitable space to carry out the required amount of level for level compensation and would be objected at the planning stage, in accordance with paragraph 181 of the NPPF. We would in turn require the confirmation of most of the site being re-developed with appropriate FFLs, and in turn a reduction in the scale of development with the design flood event for this site to be acceptable at the planning stage.

Please use an extra sheet if completing a paper copy.

This is the end of the comment form

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		Sustainability Appraisal	

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.

when completing their FRAs. The following bullet points cover more specific sections of concern.

Freeboards/Finished Floor Levels (FFLs) – there is no section proposed to cover the requirements for FFLs/Freeboards within proposed developments. We are looking for minimum recommendations of suitable finished floor levels against the appropriate design flood event levels, i.e. expectation of 600mm above design flood event, with 300mm as the minimum recommendation. This is important to ensure future developments are safe for their lifetime.

Floodplain compensation/storage – voids – there are no sections covering floodplain

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.

The changes as listed above. This is required to make the environmental evidence base - Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 fit for purpose and be in line with the requirements of NPPF Framework 14.

Please use an extra sheet if completing a paper copy.

This is the end of the comment form

creating a better place

Environment Agency

Oxford City Council
Planning Control and Conservation
St Aldate's Chambers 109-113 St Aldate's
Oxford
Oxfordshire
OX1 1DS

Our ref: WA/2006/000013/PO-06/SB1-L01
Your ref: Oxford Local Plan 2045

Date: 13 March 2026

Dear Sir/Madam

Submission Draft Oxford Local Plan 2045

Thank you for consulting us on the Draft Oxford Local Plan 2045.

We would like to thank Oxford City Council for incorporating most of the concerns we raised previously which we considered important to make the plan sound. Our comments currently are to address issues of soundness in the plan which are still outstanding.

Following a review of the local plan we confirm that the key issues which should still be addressed in the local plan to make it sound relate to, *Assessing the suitability of a number of the local plan site allocations against the evidence of flood risk.*

We have also raised other issues which are to make the plan clear (points of clarity and accuracy) as well as strengthen the policies in the local plan. Please note these have not been raised as soundness points.

Our aim is to assist you in preparing and implementing a sound, robust and effective plan that is reflective of national policy and your local evidence base so that it will deliver sustainable development in Oxford City.

Please refer to our comments below.

Yours faithfully

Miss Judith Montford
Planning Specialist

Direct dial [redacted]
E-mail [redacted]

Cont/d..

Environment Agency comments on the Oxford Local Plan 2045

Points of soundness

Chapter 8 - INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT
Currently we do not consider a number of sites allocated in the plan to be deliverable. **Therefore, due to these sites being undeliverable in relation to flood risk, we consider the plan unsound.** The reason is the allocated sites with the proposal for development do not align with the flood risk evidence available. Developing these sites as presented would be contrary to NPPF Framework 14 and the Flood risk section of the Planning Practice Guidance and unjustified.

We would like to highlight that we are pleased with the updated Policy G7 - 'Flood Risk and Flood Risk Assessments'. We note the previous two comments we asked to be included/updated have now been introduced. Previous comments regarding point e and point n have now been addressed via point k and point u. It is important for the allocated sites to be supported by Policy G7.

We have listed these sites below. For some of these sites to be suitable for development in Oxford city further assessment is required. We have therefore provided further comments in relation to the sites as they are in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) level 2 and Chapter 8.

- 474 Cowley Road (516)
- Osney Warehouse and St Thomas School House (616)
- Ozone Leisure Complex & Mincherry Farm Buildings (28c)
- Land South of Frideswide Square (624)
- Kassam Stadium and Ozone Leisure Complex (28a)
- Oxford Science Park (Whole Site) (588)
- Canalside Land, Jericho (11):
- Cowley Marsh Depot, Marsh Lane
- Island Site, Park End Street/Hythe Bridge Street
- Osney Mead (Whole Site)
- Sites adjacent to Osney Bridge
- Land rear of Harolde close
- Myers Briggs
- Oxford stadium

As there are quite a number of these sites where we have flood risk concerns, we consider it necessary and are happy to work with Oxford City Council to identify solutions to ensure flood risk is adequately planned for.

Level 2 SFRA / (also as listed in Chapter 8 - Chapter 8 - Infrastructure and New Development -Allocated Sites)
We have provided you with detailed comments on the sites (listed above) below apart from: Land rear of Harolde Close, Myers Briggs and Oxford stadium as they were not assessed in the level 2 SFRA. Our overall thoughts and comments regarding the allocated sites can also be found in the REG 19 - EA Comments on Oxford Local Plan 2042 excel spreadsheet, which has been updated to include updated findings from the Level 2 SFRAs.

We found that no updates have been made to the Level 2 SFRAs in their current versions compared to those we reviewed in November/December therefore most of our previous comments still apply. Further details provided for sites we find unsound in Chapter 8 -allocated sites section is below.

474 Cowley Road (516) – 29% (0.12ha) of site covered within fluvial flood extents, no proposed number of dwellings offered currently so unable to confirm general allocation suitability regarding floodplain compensation concerns. We have concerns with safe access/egress routes having to travel within FZ3a and flashy catchment and as mentioned within Level 2 SFRA a more detailed review of access/egress to the site will need to be undertaken within a SFRA. Updated modelling will also be required to confirm site suitability.

104.3 Policy SPS1: unsound; b. not justified and d. not consistent with NPPF

Osney Warehouse and St Thomas School House (616) – Site is 0.41ha with 10 dwellings proposed (0.17ha). With 92% of the site being inundated during the design flood event, there is limited space on site outside of design flood event for suitable development/compensatory storage. It is very unlikely that without substantial re-development that suitable floodplain compensation will be possible on this site, and without this, the site would be undevelopable.

Ozone Leisure Complex & Mincherry Farm Buildings (28c) - Further information is needed regarding proposed number of dwellings before confirming soundness. Large amount of space on site outside of fluvial flood extents, so expectation is that the sequential approach would have to be taken.
Land South of Frideswide Square (624) – Site is 0.26ha with 59 dwellings (0.98ha) proposed for the site. Currently this would far exceed the site for available space. 100% of the site falls within the design flood event levels, so there would be no room available for floodplain compensation as currently proposed. There is no confirmation of this approach being undertaken so far.

Kassam Stadium and Ozone Leisure Complex (28a) - Updated modelling would be required to fully confirm suitability as we stated in our previous comments made on the level 2 SFRA.

Oxford Science Park (Whole Site) (588) - Would need confirmation regarding future use of land and modelling before we can confirm suitability. Available space on site for proposed allocation, bur further information needed.

Canalside Land, Jericho (11) We are concerned with this site that there is insufficient space to deliver the proposed allocation without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The site is 0.5ha, with 0.3ha proposed to be used for development (dwellings). During the 1%+41% CC AEP design flood event, 78.3% of the site is inundated (0.39ha). In turn there would be an extremely limited amount of space available outside of the design flood event (0.11ha) to propose suitable level for level compensation that would mitigate the floodplain storage space lost by the new development. As it appears very unlikely to offer enough space on site to offer suitable compensation, we would object to this at the planning stage, unless the size of the proposed developed areas was reduced significantly to make suitable compensation possible.
The Level 2 SFRA discusses the use of the sequential approach to avoid placing new developments within FZ3b and ideally into areas of lowest flood risk in the first instance. We do appreciate this, as any new dwellings/developments within FZ3b would be considered inappropriate and unsound. However, as mentioned above, considering the significant percentage of the site falls within the design flood event and even FZ2/3a, a significant amount of the development would still be considered to fall within the floodplain and would require floodplain compensation and site mitigation methods. The Level 2 SFRA mentions using a freeboard of 300mm above the 26% CC AEP event (57.6mAOD) to mitigate flood risk to the development, however, we would have expected the 41% CC AEP design flood event level of 57.75mAOD to have been used instead (so a minimum proposed level of 58.05m AOD). We also have concerns regarding access and egress to the site. The site and surrounding area are heavily inundated during the design flood events, and safe access to and from the site appears to be limited.
Overall, with the limited capacity on site for suitable level for level compensation to be undertaken, it is unlikely that this allocation would be deliverable. We would also likely object to this site as currently proposed at the planning stage.

16 - Cowley Marsh Depot, Marsh Lane- We are concerned that the development proposed would be inappropriate at the current scale proposed. The site is 1.7ha, with an estimated 83 dwellings (1.4ha) proposed within it. 30% of the site (0.51ha) falls within FZ3b, and in turn it is very likely that some of this area would be required to be used for the dwellings at the current scales proposed. More vulnerable development within FZ3b would be considered inappropriate and would be objected to at the planning stage.
In addition to the inappropriate development, there appears to be very limited space on site outside of the design flood event which covers 58% (0.99ha) to undertake an appropriate amount of level for level compensation that would be required for any new developments within this area. In turn there would be a significant amount of floodplain capacity lost at this site and would be considered to increase flood risk to the surrounding areas. As it appears unlikely that there will be enough space on site to offer suitable compensation, we would likely object to this at the planning stage, unless the size of the proposed developed areas was reduced significantly to make suitable compensation possible.
We also have a couple of other concerns, regarding the requirement for updated modelling as the current assessment is based of New National Model (NNM) informed

data, which is suitable for high level use but not for site-specific FRAs where the risk is so high. In addition, we also have concerns regarding access and egress to the site, as the surrounding area is heavily inundated.
Overall, unless the development proposed is heavily reduced in scale and suitable modelling is undertaken, it is very unlikely that this development would be considered acceptable at the planning stage.

70 - Island Site, Park End Street/Hythe Bridge Street- We have concerns that there will not be sufficient space available on this site for development and not increase flood risk elsewhere. This site is 0.65ha in size and currently 59 dwellings (0.98ha) are proposed to be built. The Level 2 SFRA discusses a primary focus on re-developing the existing footprint to avoid the need for additional buildings. However, it appears unlikely considering the 59 new dwellings plus other mixed uses, would fall within the re-development area and we have no confirmation this would be the case. 85% (0.55ha) of the site falls within the design flood event extents, so it is very likely that level for level compensation will be required for any new developments within this area. Considering the scale of the works proposed (as mentioned in section 5.2 of the Level 2 SFRA) it appears difficult to accommodate all the development without the loss of floodplain storage area. In turn this development as proposed is likely to cause an increase in flood risk to the surrounding areas. We would need to see the scale reduced significantly and for compensation to be undertaken/possible before this site would be deliverable.

586 - Osney Mead (Whole Site) - We have concerns regarding this site that at the current scale the development would be considered inappropriate due to the presence of FZ3b. The site is 17.8ha with 39% of the site falling within FZ3b (6.94ha) and 86% of the site within the design flood event (15.31ha). Currently we have only been given the number of dwellings that are proposed within the site at 247 (4.12ha) while the development also includes mixed less vulnerable uses as well (scale n/a). Considering the high portion of the site that falls within FZ3b, we have concerns that any proposed development within this area would be considered inappropriate (both less and more vulnerable) and would therefore be objected to at the planning stage. However, we appreciate that a sequential approach will be undertaken and within the Level 2 SFRA no development other than open space and/or water compatible development will be undertaken within FZ3b. Confirmation on the total scale of the development at this stage is required.
As stated previously, 86% of the site (15.31ha) also falls within the design flood event. The proposed dwellings alone would exceed the remaining space available outside of this extent (4.12ha) and therefore there does not appear to be suitable space available on site to provide level for level compensation at the scale required to avoid a reduction in flood storage capacity. This would be considered to increase flood risk to the surrounding areas and therefore unacceptable at the planning stage (also does not consider the mixed use less vulnerable developments in that scale). Ground level raising may also be required to raise the development above the required design flood event finished floor level, which would again increase the amount of compensation required.

Therefore, unless there is a significant reduction in the scale of development at this site, as currently proposed, we will object to the proposal at the planning stage.

613 - Sites adjacent to Osney Bridge - For the sites adjacent Osney Bridge, we have concerns that there will not be enough space on site to deliver the proposed allocation without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The sites combined are 0.3ha in size and 20 dwellings are proposed across them at 0.33ha of space. Currently this would only leave 0.01ha available for flood waters/compensation. It is discussed within the Level 2 SFRA that most of the proposed development would be undertaken using the re-development of existing development and any new developments would be located within the areas of lowest flood risk. However, no final confirmation on how this will be split. 48% (0.16ha) of the site falls within the design flood event (of which is using the 26% when the 41% should be used for more vulnerable developments). The scale of development would therefore exceed the available space available on site outside of the design flood event and would not have suitable space to undertake appropriate level for level compensation to avoid increasing the flood risk to the surrounding areas. Re-developments and new developments would also need to accommodate an appropriate Finished Floor Level (FFL) level above the design flood event. In turn, as currently proposed, it appears unlikely that this site will have suitable space to carry out the required amount of level for level compensation and would be objected at the planning stage. We would in turn require the confirmation of most of the site being re-developed with appropriate FFLs, and in turn a reduction in the scale of development with the design flood event for this site to be acceptable at the planning stage.

Environmental Evidence Base information/documents to support the plan - STRATEGIC FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT (SFRA)

Level 1 and 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA):
In the most recent versions of the Level 1 and 2 SFRAs we note that no updates were made following our previous comments made on 5 December 2025. Therefore, many of our previous comments regarding the sites and general SFRA wording remains. We have therefore reattached these comments and have also provided further information for each SFRA below:

Level 1 SFRA:
We do still have some concerns with the Level 1 SFRA as currently proposed. We have provided additional comments for the sections we are concerned with and have also provided additional wording that could be used to inform and overcome our concerns.

Flood Zone 3b – the definition provided has been updated to use the 3.3% AEP event from any detailed modelling, and then when this is not possible to undertake applicant modelling. We consider this acceptable. However, we previously requested that additional wording in the form of a definition is added to include a definition to cover the scenario where local detailed modelling is not available and needs to be undertaken. A precautionary approach would then need to be applied by using the FZ3 from the Flood Map for Planning (FmFP) as a proxy for FZ3b where local modelling is not available/feasible.

Cumulative impacts – there is no section currently proposed to cover cumulative impacts apart from a brief coverage, within section 4.1. We were looking for a section to cover the potential cumulative impact of developments within Oxford City, particularly as many of the proposed sites include works within the floodplain. This can include potential mitigation methods and approaches to offering floodplain compensation. We would emphasise the need for level for level compensation, as the main method of flood storage compensation. Cumulative impacts of voids could lead to significant losses in floodplain storage across Oxford City should these voids become blocked/silted and from impedance of flows from the supporting structures.

Site Specific FRA – Guidance – There is lack of information to support applicants when completing their FRAs. The following bullet points cover more specific sections of concern.

Freeboards/Finished Floor Levels (FFLs) – there is no section proposed to cover the requirements for FFLs/Freeboards within proposed developments. We are looking for minimum recommendations of suitable finished floor levels against the appropriate design flood event levels, i.e. expectation of 600mm above design flood event, with 300mm as the minimum recommendation. This is important to ensure future developments are safe for their lifetime.

Floodplain compensation/storage – voids – there are no sections covering floodplain compensation/storage requirements and the appropriate methods of providing floodplain compensation. We would recommend providing some wording regarding avoiding building new developments within the floodplain, but where this is not possible, that floodplain compensation is undertaken to ensure available flood storage capacity is not lost. The compensation method should be level for level. Voids should be avoided, with additional wording to confirm this. Floodplain compensation/storage is another section that should be included as it will have a direct impact on the safety of not just the development but the surrounding area in terms of flood risk. We understand that this is site dependent, and in turn acknowledge the wording being shaped around the scale of the development. However, it is important to have a section which discusses this and should be included as it will be directly checked in consultation reviews.

Safe access/egress and emergency planning – there is no direct section covering the issue of safe access and egress to and from proposed development sites and the information that should be used to support it. We would recommend in turn including a section that covers not just emergency planning (4.4) and flood warnings (2.4) but an additional section that includes the use of hazard ratings for sites where detailed modelling is available (or proxy alternates) to best inform the most suitable access/egress routes to and from the site. This again is another SFRA section that is covered during review and would be expected to at least be considered.

Level 2 SFRA
Please refer to the comments made regarding the various sites above. These should be addressed to make the Level 2 SFRA adequate.

Points of Clarity and Accuracy

The points below have been recommended to strengthen the policies in the plan to adhere to the requirements of NPPF framework 14 and 15.

Chapter 4- A GREEN BIODIVERSE CITY THAT IS RESILIENT TO CLIMATE CHANGE

POLICY G2: ENHANCEMENT AND PROVISION OF NEW GREEN AND BLUE FEATURES

In the policy G2 justification notes on Page 7 bullet point 2 under 'Policy implementation' please change embankments to bank tops as embankment suggests a manmade raised bank top and is likely to cause confusion. Also replacing embankments is likely to have implications for flood risk especially if this constitutes land raising.
"The policy sets out requirements for incorporating ecological buffer zones along watercourses and seeks to facilitate opportunities to re-naturalise spaces near watercourses. This could mean thinking about ways to reinstate ~~embankments~~ bank tops by removing artificial materials and 'rewilding them' which can create new spaces for nature and for people as well as other benefits like helping to mitigate flood risk."

In Box 4.1 'Using local context to help inform design of green infrastructure onsite' and on Page 8 the paragraph below focusses on access to rivers missing an opportunity to strengthen the ecological connectivity provided by rivers. We suggest adding the following to the paragraph.
"Strengthening linkages between areas to enhance network connectivity *– by incorporating linear features like lines of trees/hedges, creating new pockets of green space that can form 'stepping stones' between larger spaces, or taking opportunities to ecologically enhance river corridors and open up and enhance access to rivers and streams including their banks. Improving linkages across the network can be particularly beneficial for supporting biodiversity helping species to move across the city (particularly where these improve connectivity between ecological sites), but also in supporting active and sustainable transport for people."*

Within POLICY G2 (box): we suggest that the wording of the policy should be strengthened by including the following:
Opportunities for de-culverting to protect and enhance the ecological value of rivers and streams. We appreciate the fact that Policy G7 'Flood Risk and Flood Risk Assessments' contains a statement on culverts however this is undoubtedly in the context of and for the benefit of flood risk and therefore we believe that there is a very real risk of it not being seen as a requirement for the benefit of ecology within the watercourse environment. We therefore request that the following should be added to and amended in policy G2.
"Planning permission will only be granted for proposals which do not involve the culverting of watercourses, and which do not prejudice future opportunities for de-culverting. Opportunities for de-culverting of watercourses should be actively pursued as a valuable enhancement to rivers and streams."

"d) Where there is an opportunity to strengthen links between green spaces, particularly ecological sites, creating linkages with surrounding green infrastructure (e.g. by including lines of trees/hedges and river corridors to support linkages);"

"Opportunities to protect and enhance blue corridors
For proposals on sites incorporating or located adjacent to watercourses, opportunities should be sought through careful design and landscaping to re-naturalise the water courses where possible, including restoration of the bankside and instream habitats. An ecological buffer zone of at least 10 metres (measured from the top of bank) with should be retained, or if it is not already in place it should be reinstated where possible."

POLICY G8: SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEMS (SUDS)
We consider the policy wording to be generally adequate however we would suggest the policy wording is amended to include the following to strengthen the policy.
"Where a site has potential for contamination, SuDS that rely on infiltration will be discouraged and other suitable methods should be adopted to protect the water environment unless it can be demonstrated that there will be no pathway of contamination. Infiltration SuDS measures would not be encouraged in areas that have shallow groundwater as these measures would not be suitable. Deep infiltration features/soakaways are generally not endorsed and not considered to be SuDs"

Chapter 5 - A CITY THAT UTILISES ITS RESOURCES WITH CARE, PROTECTS THE AIR, WATER AND SOIL AND AIMS FOR NET ZERO CARBON

Policy R5- WATER RESOURCES AND QUALITY
We are generally satisfied with this policy; however, the policy wording could be improved. Oxford City was the second place in the country to have a river bathing water at Wolvercote Mill Stream. It is currently failing to achieve sufficient status. Work is happening between the Environment Agency and Thames Water and Environmental Bodies to investigate and improve the bathing water. Given this designation was encouraged by the City Council, it would be good to see commitment in the local plan to improve and maintaining the status.

We would also like to see the policy strengthened to show that new developments will not use non mains drainage where connection to the public sewer is considered reasonable. We suggest the following wording to be included within Policy R5.

'The use of private sewage disposal facilities within publicly sewered areas will only be acceptable if the applicant can demonstrate that the additional cost of connecting to the sewer would be unreasonable, connection is not practically feasible, or the proposed private sewerage system would provide additional environmental benefits that would outweigh the potential environmental risks.'

Chapter 8 - INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT

POLICY I2 SAFEGUARDING LAND FOR INFRASTRUCTURE - Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme -OFAS
We are very pleased to see that Oxford City Council have taken our advice and have included a safeguarding policy in relation to OFAS. We note the inclusion of Policy I2

Safeguarding Land for Infrastructure in Chapter 8 Infrastructure and New Development and the policies map which acknowledge the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme regarding site allocations. 104.17 Policy I2: sound

About the allocations listed below, we advise that the site policies are updated to include OFAS to highlight to the developers that they will need to take OFAS into account when designing their site for development proposals.

Botley Road Retail and **Osney Mead** - these sites are adjacent to OFAS. As indicated in our previous representation it would be of benefit for OFAS to be mentioned/acknowledged in the site policies for these sites. We advise that the LPA consider this.

Redbridge Paddock – the OFAS redline boundary runs along the western boundary of this allocation site and therefore it would be beneficial for OFAS to be mentioned in site Policy.

Environmental Evidence Base information/documents to support the plan - WATER CYCLE STUDY

Water Cycle Study
We have reviewed Oxford City Water Cycle Study Scoping Report & Oxford City Council Water Cycle Addendum both dated January 2026. For the Water Quality sections, the document highlights that there may be Dry Weather Flow headroom capacity issues as early as 2026, when all flows expected to come to Oxford Sewage Treatment Works are considered. Thames Water have committed to completing their delayed improvements to the Oxford Sewage Treatment Works by 2031, however this project is focused on improving the ammonia discharge and increase Flow to Full Treatment. **We strongly advice that Oxford City Council continue to liaise with Thames Water to receive confirmation and assurances around ensuring enough discharge capacity will be available at the site in the short to medium term.**

Other advice

Chapter 1- INTRODUCTION AND STRATEGY
Oxford to Cambridge Growth Corridor
Oxford City Council is located within the Oxford to Cambridge growth corridor, an area highlighted for its transformative economic and innovation opportunity. Following the government's recommitment to the geography in January 2025 a growth unit has established to deliver coordinated action to drive investment and unleash growth. There is a long history of collaboration across the growth corridor and strong ambition to embed the environment at the heart of spatial planning, reflecting the aspirations of the 25 Year Environment Plan. This has generated close cooperation between local authority leaders, Local Enterprise Partnerships, Local Nature Partnerships, and academic institutions. It provides a unique forum for joint working to maximise opportunities for the environment, manage flood risk and coastal change, water resources and quality, and manage waste and minerals at a strategic scale.

The Environment Agency is a key stakeholder within the Oxford to Cambridge geography, working closely with central government to ensure that policy and growth decisions are made based on best evidence, and hosting key strategic projects like the Integrated Water Management programme and Local Natural Capital Plan. If you are unfamiliar with these projects, or the type of evidence we hold and how it can be used to support your local plan, please do get in touch via ox.cam@environment-agency.gov.uk

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
1 Pullens Lane	Housing site	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use appears to be a single dwelling with allotment gardens (MV) Proposed is for a housing site (MV) So no change seemingly		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound) LLFA to explore other forms of risk
2 Harberton Mead	Currently student accommodation in a conversion Landowner propose site for resi- general resi or intensification of student accommodation	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use is for student accomidation (MV) Proposed for other residental uses or further student accomidation (MV)		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound) LLFA to explore other forms of risk
474 Cowley Road	Expired permission for residential care home	FZ2+3 and climate change extent	N/A (Superseded Boundary Brook found south) (Flood zones based off NNM)		No	Yes - Included within updated Level 2 SFRAs 0 12ha/29% of site covered within fluvial flood extents including climate change, and no proposed number of dwellings offered currently Safe access concerns, no access route to/from site outside of inundated flood zones (FZ3a), within flashy catchment Updated modelling may also be required to confirm confidence	Yes	Site is mainly FZ1, with an area of FZ2 Minor area of FZ3 in northeast corner This is FZ3a according to Reeg18 OC sites document (3 3% AEP Extent) Small parts of Dwelling seemingly located in this area Continued use would rely on appropriate FRA, including suitable FFL levels and safe access/egress consideration This would demonstrate that the development is safe for its lifetime and wouldnt increase flood risk elsewhere Exisiting use of land already established Is included within 2023 Level 2 SFRA		No - Included within updated Level 2 SFRAs, but further information required before confirming soundness (unsound)
ARC Oxford	Employment site	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use of site as a buisness park/retail park Proposed continued use of site for employment (LV) FZ1		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound) Other sources of risk, LPA to discuss further
Banbury Road University Site	Housing (Student)	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely within FZ1, with no main rivers located nearby Proposed use of land is for student housing Existing use appears to be for dwellings (MV)		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound) Other sources of risk, LPA to discuss further
Bayards Hill Primary School Playing Field	Housing site	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use of land is as a playing field for School (Open space WC) Proposed is for Housing/Dwelling (MV)		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound) Other sources of risk, LPA to discuss further

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
Bertie Place Recreation Ground	Housing site	Mostly FZ2 and climate change extent but some FZ3 on site Within ~ 10m of main river	Thames (Eynsham to Sandford) 2018 + 2022(CC data)	Yes	No	Yes - Allocation appears sound Appears to be enough available space on site provided outside of the design flood event to accommodate development without compensation being required	Yes	Site is predominately FZ1 Area of FZ2 on west boundary and very minor areas of FZ3 Current site is used for a sports facility and open playing field (LV/WC) Proposed use for housing (MV) MV development within FZ3b would be inappropriate development Developments within design flood extents would need to provide floodplain compensation for loss of storage FFLs would also need to be appropriate against the design flood level with 300mm freeboard space		Yes - Included within Level 2 SFRA With further information, this allocation appears suitable now
Canalside Land, Jericho	Housing-led development	Adjacent to main river, partially FZ2+3 and cc extent	Thames (Eynsham to Sandford) 2018+2022	?	No	Yes - Limited space on site outside of the design flood event extent (0 3ha required within 0 5ha site) with FZ3b also present on site Limited room for required floodplain compensation as well Further evidence/information will be required to confirm appropriateness of allocation and no increase to flood risk elsewhere will occur	No	Site falls within FZ2, FZ3a and FZ3b Current land seemingly used as a boat yard/parking, so either WC or LV Proposed is for housing (MV) Would need to offer floodplain compensation for flood storage lost from development within design flood extents FFLs would need to be raised to a minimum of 300mm above design flood levels Safe access and egress would need to be considred, though site is of a low/very low hazard rating Discussed within 2023 Level 2 SFRA as keeping vulnerable developments outside of FZ3a and 3b, however areas of FZ2 still found and they would fall within design flood extents		No - Included within the updated Level 2 SFRA Very limted space on site for proposed allocation and compensatory storage

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
Churchill Hostpital	Suitable for a wide range of uses, although the principal use will remain as hospital use	Culverted ordinary watercourse through site, >10m to main river and flood zones	None, unmodelled watercourse		unsure	Yes - Appendix 2 Ordinary watercourse discussion	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Small area of FZ2/3 on edge of northwest corner of site, but not within Current use of land for Hospital (MV) Proposed use for continued medial usage with other mixed use (MV) No increase in vulnerability OW running through northeast corner of the site, appears unmodelled and could be considered to carry fluivial flood risk Works within 8m of Boundary Brook may be subject to FRAP		Included within appendix 2 of Level 2 SFRA Using EA surface water mapping to assess flood risk to site Very small amount of FZ2 in northwest corner, plenty of avalaible space on site outside of flood extents
Clarendon Centre	Planning permission for mix of uses (retail, offices, R&D, and student accommodation) suitable for the city centre location	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is FZ1 Current use for dwellings/retail currently Proposed use for retail, offices, R&D and student accomodiation So site vulnerability should remain the same MV		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound) Other sources of risk, LPA to discuss further
Cowley Centre, Templars Square	Suitable for a mix of uses, including retail, residential, community and commercial uses	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current site is used as a shopping centre (shops - LV) Proposed use includes residential (MV) Increase in vulnerability		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound) Other sources of risk, LPA to discuss further

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
Cowley Marsh depot	Housing Site	FZ3, main river along boundary	No Local Modelling reachest the site (Superseded Boundary Brook found south) (Flood zones based off NNM)		No	Yes - New National Modelling used to inform Level 2 SFRA as local model has been superseded Okay for high level use, local detailed modelling will be required to inform the site-specific FRA Large portion of site is FZ3b and more vulnerable development would be considered not acceptable in principle No proposed set scale of development is offered; expectation is 83 dwellings (around 1 4ha) with total site being 1 7ha 30% of site falls within FZ3b and 58% with design flood event Very limited space left for safe development of construction and compensatory storage Limited safe access and egress as well Overall, site would be considered unsound	No	Recent FmFP update has led to a large increase in FZ2/3 on site Areas of FZ3b (3 3% AEP) found on site as well Existing use of site is as depot Proposed is as a housing site (MV) So increase in vulnerbaility, that could be considered within FZ3b (inappropriate development) Would need to demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime (FFL, Safe access and egress) and not increase flood risk elsewhere (floodplain compensation/obstruction of flows)		No - Included within updated Level 2 SFRA Will require updated modelling Limited space on site outside of design flood event, for allocation and compensatory storage
Crescent Hall, Crescent Road	Housing site	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use of site is for dwellings (halls of residence) (MV) Proposed use as a housing site (MV) No increase in vulnerability		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound) Other sources of risk, LPA to discuss further
Diamond Place and Ewet House	Suitable for a mix of uses, including retail, residential, community and commercial uses	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1, with no main river located nearby Current building/land used for educational establishments (MV)		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound) Other sources of risk, LPA to discuss further
East Oxford Bowls Club	Landowner has proposed for residential development	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use of land is as a sports ground (outdoor sports - WC) Proposed use for residental development (MV) Increase in vulnerability		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound) Other sources of risk, LPA to discuss further

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
Edge of the Playing Fields, Oxford Academy	Housing site	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use of site as open space/playing fields (WC) Proposed use for housing site (MV)		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound) Other sources of risk, LPA to discuss further
Faculty of Music, St Aldates	Housing (student)	climate change extent and ordinary watercourse along easten boundary	Thames (Eynsham to Sandford) 2018+2022		N/A	Yes - Included within appendix 2	Yes	Current site is used for educational/amenity use (LV) and proposed use is for student housing (MV) Increase in site vulnerability from LV to MV Site is predominately FZ1 with a small corner of FZ2 Design flood level extents (CC) do cover the entire site, could pose flood risk to development Unmodelled watercourse running adjacent the height as well		Very small amount of FZ2 in southestern corner Suitable space outside of flood extents exepcted
Former Iffley Mead Playing Field	Housing site	N/A	No Local Modelling reachest the site (Superseded Boundary Brook found south) (Nearby Flood zones based off NNM)		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 FZ2 along roads east and west, but nothing reaches the site Current use of land is as green space/playing field (WC) Proposed development is as a housing site (MV) Increase in vulnerability		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound)
Government Buildings and Harcourt House	Residential-led (student) development with replacement employment use)	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use for government building and car park (LV) Proposed for student dwellings and employment use (MV/LV)		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound) Other sources of risk, LPA to discuss further

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
Island Site, Park End Street	Suitable for a mix of uses, including retail, residential, community and commercial uses	FZ2+3 and climate change extent and adjacent to main river	Thames (Eynsham to Sandford) 2018+2022		N/A	Yes - Redevelopment of existing land with new development proposed outside of design flood event, however very limited space on site (0 65ha) to complete 59 dwellings (0 98 ha expected space) Majority of site (85%) falls within the design flood event extents also, so again there is very limited space on site to undertake proposed development and suitable compensatory storage Site would be considered unsound	Yes	Site is a mix of FZ1, FZ2 and FZ3 Site falls within area of FZ3b on the eastern side Majoirty is FZ2 Use of site already established, so wouldn't object in principle However, development is still within areas of FZ2/3 + CC extents so would still need to be assessed appropriately Would need developments to be raised to appropriate FFL levels against the design flood extents Safe access/egress considered If any addtional developments, they are within area of lowest flood risk and compensation offered Mentioned within 2018 Level 2 SFRA, but not within 2023 version		No - Included within updated Level 2 SFRA Very limited space on site for number of dwellings and majority of site is within design flood event
Jesus College Sports Ground	Housing site	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use of land is as a sports ground (outdoor sports - WC) Proposed use for housing (MV) Increase in vulnerability		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound)
John Radcliffe Hostpital	Suitable for a wide range of uses, although the principal use will remain as hospital use	Ordinary watercourse along western boundary	None, unmodelled watercourse		unsure	Yes - Appendix 2 Ordinary watercourse discussion	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use is for non-residental use - health services (MV) Proposed use for mixed use (MV) OW running adjacent and through west sections of the site Appear to be unmodelled and could pose a fluivial flood risk		Included within appendix 2 of Level 2 SFRA Using EA surface water mapping to assess flood risk to site
Jowett Walk (South)	Proposed by landowner for student accommodation	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entierly FZ1 Current site used for garages, parking and dwellings (LV/MV) Proposed use is for Student housing (MV) So no increase in vulnerability		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound)

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
Kassam Staduim and Ozone Leisure Complex	Suitable for a mix of uses, including retail, residential, community and commercial uses	FZ2+3 partially on site and main river along northern boundary Historic landfill immediately east of site	Northfield & Littlemore Brooks 2011 reaches the site		No	Yes - Largely happy with this proposed development Lots of available space outside of fluvial and design flood extents for proposed development (21% of site within design flood event) 290 dwellings proposed (4 8ha expected) within a total of 6 50ha site Expectation to have suitable space for proposed dwellings and compensatory storage if required However, currently using New National Modelling based data which is suitable for high level use Site specific FRA would likely require updated modelling	No	Site is predominantly FZ1, with a small area of FZ2 in the northwest corner and FZ3 along the northern site boundary Current site used as a stadium (LV/WC) Proposed use of site includes residential use (MV) Would increase the site vulnerability and could be considered to reduce floodplain storage if new developments built within floodplain area Is discussed within 2023 Level 2 SFRA, with development proposed outside of design flood event		No - Included within Level 2 SFRA Updated modelling would likely be required to fully confirm suitability, but overall expectations that the site should be appropriate
Land at Meadow Lane	Housing site	FZ2+3, adjacent to ordinary watercourse and historic landfill Meadow Lane	Thames (Eynsham to Sandford) 2018+2022 reaches the site		No	Yes - 29 dwellings proposed (0 48ha) within 1 57ha total site area 23 5% of the site is within the design flood event (0 37ha), so there is available space for dwellings outside of design flood event Allocation would appear sound	No	Majority of site is FZ1, with west boundary covered by FZ2 and small area of FZ3(b) in southwest corner Existing use as greenspace (WC) Proposed use of land for housing/dwelling (MV) Large increase in vulnerability Would need to demonstrate that the development would be located within the areas of lowest flood risk, that floodplain storage is not lost, or is compensated for Development within design flood level have appropriate FFL levels with 300mm space		Yes - Included within updated Level 2 SFRA With presented information, suitable space avaliable outside of design flood event

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
Land North of St Clements Church	Housing site	Main river adjacent to western boundary and site partially within FZ2+3	Thames (Eynsham to Sandford) 2018+2022		No	Yes - Site is 2 31ha with 45 dwellings proposed (0 75ha) 8 5% of site falls within pluvial design flood event and 4 7% of site within fluvial flood risk (0 1%) In turn suitable space on site proposed outside of flood extents is available	No	Site mainly FZ1, with small areas of FZ2 and strip of FZ3(b) along west boundary Current use of land for open space and pavillon buildings seemingly (WC/LV) Proposed use for dwellings (MV), increase in vulnerability for site Majority of site including existing buildigns within FZ1 If dwellings proposed within FZ3b they would be considered inappropriate development Would need to demonstrate dwellings are located outside of FZ3b and wouldnt remove floodplain storage from the site		Yes - Included within Level 2 SFRA Minimal amount of site falls within flood risk extents
Land Off Manor Place	Housing (student)	FZ2+3 and main river adjacent	Thames (Eynsham to Sandford) 2018 + 2022(CC data)		No	Yes - 43 dwellings proposed (0 72ha) but proposed as flats, so lower then standard medium density within 1 24ha site 8 9% of site falls within the design flood event Suitable space available on site outside floodplain, so allocation appears sound	Yes	Site is predominately FZ1 with small area of FZ2/3 found towards the northeast boundary Proposed use for housing (MV) Would need to demonstrate development is outside of vulnerable areas, or compensation and appropriate safety measures required to prove it will be safe for its lifetime		Yes - Included within updated Level 2 SFRA Dwellings proposed as flats, while suitable space outside of design flood event already present

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
Land South of Frideswide Square	Suitable for a mix of uses including retail, community and commercial uses	FZ2 and climate change extents	Thames (Eynsham to Sandford) 2018+2022		No	Yes - Site is 0 26ha with 59 dwellings proposed on site This amount of dwellings would be expected to take up 0 98ha of space for medium sized dwellings, so unlikely to have available space on site to match 100% of site falls within design flood event, so floodplain compensation will be required Unlikely with limited space available Level 2 SFRA section 5 2 notes that development is already present at this site which takes up the floodplain storage and would be better suited in turn to small scale development Current development would not be considered sound	Yes	Site is entirely FZ2 and with CC extents of local modelling Current use of site is for dwellings Proposed is for mix use, including commercial and community use Potential reduction from MV to LV if so Development is still within FZ2 + CC and design flood extent, so should be assessed to ensure no loss of floodplain storage etc Otherwise LV development within FZ2 - FRSA	Might be reducing the site vulnerability from MV to LV	No - Included within the updated Level 2 SFRA Very limited space on site avaliable for proposed allocation and required compensation
Land to the rear of Harolde Close	Landowner proposed for housing	Ordinary watercourse adjacent to western boundary	None, unmodelled watercourse		unsure	No	Yes	Site is entierly FZ1, Current use is green space Proposed is for housing/dwellings (MV) Increase in vulnerbaility OW runs adjacent to the site on the northen boundary, appears to be unmodelled Could pose a fluival risk to the site		No - Not included within Level 2 SFRA So previous comments remain Unmodelled OW running adjacent to the site Could pose fluivial risk, despite FZ1 rating (Unsound)
Lincoln College Sports Grounnd	Housing site	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use of land is as a sports ground (outdoor sports - WC) Proposed use for housing (MV) Increase in vulnerability		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound)

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
Littlemore Mental Health Centre	Landowner intends to keep site in existing uses (hospital and staff/student accommodation), but with potential for intensification to introduce some employer-linked housing	N/A	None, unmodelled watercourse		unsure	Yes - Appendix 2 Ordinary watercourse discussion	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use of site is for medical services and staff/student accomidation (MV) Proposed use to continue with medical services but increase residential housing (MV) OW running through the site Appears unmodelled Could pose a fluival risk to the site		Included within appendix 2 of Level 2 SFRA Using EA surface water mapping to assess flood risk to site
Manzil Resource Centre	Housing site	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use of development for elderly persons home/dwelling (MV) Proposed use for further housing (MV) No increase in vulnerability		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound)
MINI Plant Oxford	Employment site	Culverted ordinary watercourse through eastern part of the site	None, unmodelled watercourse		unsure	Yes - Appendix 2 Ordinary watercourse discussion	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use is for a general industry/storage and distribution site (mini plant - LV) Proposed use for further employment (LV)		Included within appendix 2 of Level 2 SFRA Using EA surface water mapping to assess flood risk to site
Myers Briggs	Landowner proposes site for conversion from office to residential accommodation		None, unmodelled watercourse		unsure	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use of land is for office space (LV) Proposed use of land for residental accomodation (MV) Increase in vulnerability Unmodelled OW running north adjacent the site boundary Could pose a flulvial flood risk to the site		No - Not included within Level 2 SFRA So previous comments remain Unmodelled OW running adjacent the site Could pose fluivial risk, despite FZ1 rating (Unsound)
Nothern Gateway/ Oxford North	Suitable for a mix of uses	Ordinary watercoure along norther boundary of western site	None, unmodelled watercourse		unsure	Yes - Appendix 2 Ordinary watercouse discussion	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1, with no main rivers located nearby OW runs adjacent to the site on the northen boundary, appears to be unmodelled Could pose a fluival risk to the site Current use of site is Land and buildings used for agriculture and forestry (?) (LV)		Using EA surface water mapping to demonstrate flood risk to site

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
Nuffielf Orthapedic Centre	Suitable for a wide range of uses, although the principal use will remain as hospital use	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use of land is for Non–residential uses for health services (hospital/clinic) (MV) Proposed use to continue as hospital but with other mixed use (MV)		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound)
Old road Campus	Landowner has put forward the site as having some potential for further intensification over the plan period Landownerconfirmed retaining for employment use only	Ordinary watercourse ~10m from main river and flood zones	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use is as an educational establishment (University campus) (MV) Proposed use to remain for employment use only (MV) No increase in site vulnerability		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound)
Oriel College Sports ground	Housing Site	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use of land is as a sports ground (outdoor sports - WC) Proposed use for housing (MV) Increase in vulnerability		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound)
Osney Mead	Suitable for a mix of uses including retail, community and commercial uses	Adjacent to main rivers, FZ1, 2 and 3 and climate change extents	Thames (Eynsham to Sandford) 2018 + 2022(CC data)	Yes (cost recovery)	No	Yes - Site contains FZ3b, and not demonstrated the allocation is acceptable in principle 86% of site falls within the design flood event, with 39% of site falling within FZ3b Very limited space to construct proposed 247 dwellings outside of the design flood event in turn Ground level raising may be required to complete construction and additional floodplain compensation would also be required Unsound	No	Site is predominately FZ2/3 with minor areas of FZ1 Current use of site as storage/office buildings (LV) Proposed use of site includes retail, community and commerical (LV) In addition to the 247 dwellings (MV) Developments within FZ3b could be considered as inappropraite development Developments within floodplain/design flood level could cause a loss of floodplain storage area Would need to offer appropriate compensation They would also need to be raised to appropriate FFL level with 300mm freeboard Would safe access and egress be possible for this site ?		No - Included within the updated Level 2 SFRA Majority of site falls within design flood event and large portion FZ3b Allocation is likely to remain unsound

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
Osney warehouse and St Thomas School House	Mixed use site Some heritage interest that needs further investigation before drafting a site allocation policy	FZ2 and climate change	Thames (Eynsham to Sandford) 2018+2022		No	Yes - Included within updated Level 2 SFRAs Limited space on site outside of the design flood event extent (92% of site inundated) and 10 dwellings proposed totalling 0 17ha of total site space 0 41ha No FZ3a/FZ3b located on site Compensatory storage is very likely to be required for any development on site, and with limited space this is very unlikely to be achieved	Yes	Site is FZ2 Current use is for non-residental educational establishments and buildings used for storage and distribution (MV and LV) Use of land established and FZ2 Site falls within design flood extent and would need detailled assessment to confirm no increase to surrounding area and developments would be safe for their lifetime		No - Included within updated Level 2 SFRAs Limited space on site outside of design flood event for suitable development/compensatory storage (unsound)
Overflow carpark at Kassam Stadium	Housing site	Partially FZ2+3 with main river along southern boundary	Northfield & Littlemore Brooks 2011 reaches the site		No	Yes - Only 9 3% of site falls within fluvial flood zones (including cc), with the majority of the 2 29ha site free for the proposed 100 dwellings (1 70ha) outside of the fluvial flood area Happy this development would be sound with suitable space available	No	Site is mainly FZ1, with a small area of FZ2/3 in the southwest corner of the site (3 3% so FZ3b) Current site is used as an overflow carpark (LV) Proposed use for housing (MV) Increase in vulnerability of site FZ3a on site Would need to locate development outside of area of highest risk Would need to offer floodplain compensation for any areas of lost storage FFLs above design flood level and safe access/egress route proposed		Yes - Included within updated Level 2 SFRA
Oxford Brookes Marston Road Campus	Suitable for continued academic use that may also include student accommodation, or a housing site	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use of site is for Educational use (LV) as a campus Proposed use to continue with the educational use but also student accomidation/housing site (MV) Increase in vulnerability OW found just south of the site boundary Unmodelled seemingly, and could pose a fluvival flood risk, but not adjacent to site		Yes - unmodelled OW south of site, but not adjacent - no fluivial flood risk (sound)

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
Oxford Railway Station and Becket Street Car Park	Suitable for a mix of uses, including retail, residential, community and commercial uses	FZ2 and climate change extent	Thames (Eynsham to Sandford) 2018+2022 - just reaches the site		N/A	Yes - In appendix 2	Yes	Site is predominantly FZ1, with a minor area of FZ2 along the southern border of top boundary and east line of the south boundary There is an increase in vulnerability to MV from EI/LV Provided development is focused within area of FZ1, we probably wouldn't have much concern If development was to fall within FZ2 + CC extent then it would need to be assessed		Very small amount of FZ2 across southern border Lots of space avalaible outside of flood extents for proposed development
Oxford Science Park	Employment site	FZ2+3 and main river through site	Northfield & Littlemore Brooks 2011 reaches the site	Yes	No	Yes - Of total site size (27 3ha), 10ha is proposed to be used for less vulnerable development 33% (9ha) of site lies within the fluvial flood extents including CC runs In turn large amount of space available on site outside of fluvial flood extents However, updated modelling is likely required given current use of local detailed modelling and New National Model (NNM) which is suitable for high level not site-specific necessarily (Model was updated in 2022 and showed some areas as having no flood risk on site, was agreed to be used for planning applications – if we agreed to allow that to be used again, don't think we would have concerns with this site particularly)	No	Site is mainly FZ1, but still has large areas of FZ2/3 within it (mainly towards main river) Current site used for research purposes (LV) Proposed use for further employment (LV) No increase in site vulnerability classifcation Any new developments within the floodplain/design flood level could be considered to cause floodplain storage loss New developments within floodplain/design flood level would need to be raised to appropriate FFL level with 300mm freeboard to be safe for their lifetime Ideally dry access/egresss routes for new developments as well		No - Included within Level 2 SFRA Ongoing planning permission here Would need confirmation regarding future use of land and modelling before given a final confirmation of suitability Available space on site for proposed allocation, bur further information needed
Oxford university press Sports Ground	Housing/Dwellings (Currently sports ground inc essential facilities such as changing rooms)	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely within FZ1, with no main rivers or OW located nearby No concerns from a fluival flood risk stance Site at risk from SW		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound)

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
Ozone Leisure Complex & Mancherry Farm Building	Housing site	Partially FZ2+3 with main rivers along site boundaries to north and east	Northfield & Littlemore Brooks 2011 reaches the site		No	Yes - Not currently presented with the number of dwellings or allocated space for other developments, so not able to fully confirm soundness of site However, of the 3 0ha site, only 14% falls within current fluvial flood extents (including CC) There is in turn available space on site for dwellings and other developments, so would expect it to okay upon confirmation	No	Site is mainly FZ1, with small areas of FZ2 and FZ3 along site boundaries Current site is used as a hotel/country club (MV) Proposed use as a housing site (MV) No increase in vulnerability and use of land already established New development could reduce floodplain storage capacity and would need to have FFL levels raised above design flood extents if within FZ2/3/Design flood event		No - Included within updated Level 2 SFRA Need further information regarding proposed number of dwellings before confirming soundness Large amount of space on site outside of fluvial flood extents, so expectation is it should be fine, sequential approach to be taken
Pear Tree Farm	Housing Site	Ordinary watercourse through site	None, unmodelled watercourse		unsure	Yes - Appendix 2 Ordinary watercouse discussion	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1, with no main rivers located nearby Existing use of land is for agricultre (LV) Proposed use for housing (MV) There is an ordinary watercourse found within the site, appears to be unmodelled Could pose a fluival risk to the site		Discussed within Level 2 appendix 2 regarding using EA surface water map to provide flood risk
Redbridge Paddock	Housing site	Adjacent to main river and within cc mostly with some FZ2+3 Historic Landfill Rivermead on site	Thames (Eynsham to Sandford) 2018 + 2022(CC data)		Yes	Yes - appendix 2 Covers allocated sites, not deemed to require full Level 2 SFRA Access/egress concerns covered seemingly, by elevated road south to the site	No	Site is mainly FZ1, with small areas of FZ3 on the south and northeast areas Design flood events reach site Current use as open space/green space (WC) Proposed use for dwelling/housing sites (MV) Increase in site vulnerability MV within FZ3b would be considered inappropriate development Development within areas of FZ3 would be considered to cause loss of floodplain storage area OFAS adjacent, if any area is required for OFAS, would need to remain free for use Discssued within allocated sites, to show that the site is only 3% covered by flood zones		Unsure - Inlcuded within Level 2 SFRA No full detailed review, just high level, but large amount of site avalaible on site outside of fluvival extents Access/egress discussed, and seemingly compensated for
ROQ site	Academic-led development	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely witihn FZ1, with no main rivers nearby Propsed use for educational establishments (MV)		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound)

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
Ruskin College Campus	Housing Site	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use is for educational establishment (LV) Proposed use for housing (MV) Increase in site vulnerability, but FZ1 No concerns		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound)
Ruskin Field	Housing Site	Ordinary watercourse through centre of site	None, unmodelled watercourse		unsure	Yes - Appendix 2 Ordinary watercourse discussion	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use is open space Proposed for dwelling site (MV) Increase in vulnerability OW runs through the site, appears to be unmodelled Could pose a fluival risk to the site		Included within appendix 2 of Level 2 SFRA Using EA surface water mapping to assess flood risk to site
Sandy Lane Recreation Groun	Housing site	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 FZ2/3 found just southeast of the site boundary Current use of land is as a recreation ground/amenity space (WC) Proposed use for housing/dwelling (MV) Increase in vulnerability Unmodelled OW found east of the site, could pose fluvial risk but not adjacent		Yes - unmodelled OW east of site, but not adjacent - no fluivial flood risk (sound)
Sites adjacent to Osney Bridge	Landowner has proposed for residential with potentially retail at ground level	Adjacent to Thames, FZ1, 2 and 3	Thames (Eynsham to Sandford) 2018+2022		No	Yes - Total site space of both sites is 0 34ha with 20 dwellings proposed 0 33ha space Developments are proposed to re-use sections of land already in use Would need to confirm there is suitable space on site for the new dwellings following re-development 48% of site falls within the design flood event and minimum space will be available for compensatory storage to ensure no increase in flood risk to the site In turn without further confirmation site would be considered unsound	No	Site is a mix of FZ1, FZ2 and FZ3 FZ3 boundary falls along west boundary (FZ3b) Site includes FZ3b Current use of site as a hotel (MV) Proposed use for residental use and retail at ground levels (MV) No increase in vulnerability, but new developments in FZ3b would be inappropriate and rest of site within FZ2/CC extents would require site assessments to confirm suitability		No - Included within the Level 2 SFRA Very limited space on site for proposed development and further information required before confirming suitability of site

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
Slade House	Housing Site	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use for health services/dwellings (MV) Proposed use as a housing site (MV) No increase in vulnerability		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound)
The Oxford Stadium	Housing-led development	culverted ordinary watercourse through site	None, unmodelled watercourse		unsure	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 FZ2/3 just outside site boundary southwest Current use of land as a stadium for sports (WC) Proposed use for housing/dwellings (MV) OW running through and adjacent the site Appears unmodelled Could pose a fluvial flood risk to site		No - Not included within Level 2 SFRA So previous comments remain Unmodelled OW running through and adjacent the site Could pose fluivial risk, despite FZ1 rating (Unsound)
The Rectory Centre	The landowner has put forward for residential development, subject to consolidating health use onto alternative sites	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Proposed use for dwelling/residental development (MV)		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound)
Thornhill Park, Lond Road	Suitable for residential and replacement commercial uses	N/A	None, unmodelled watercourse		N/A	Yes - Appendix 2 Ordinary watercourse discussion	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use of site for car park/general storage (WC) Proposed for residental and replacement commerical use (LV/MV)		Included within appendix 2 of Level 2 SFRA Using EA surface water mapping to assess flood risk to site

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
Uni of Oxford Science Area & Keble Road	Employment site	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entierly FZ1, with no main rivers nearby	Site is entirely within FZ1, with cloesest main river being over 200m to the east Current use is as a building for educational estalishments (MV) Proposed is potentially for Buildings used for shops; financial, professional and other services; (LV) so potentially a reduction in site vulnerability	Yes - No fluivial risk (sound) Could provide a reduction in site vulnerabillity classifcation also
Union Street CP and 159-161 Cowley Road	Housing site	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use of land for Car Park and retail use (LV) Proposed use for housing/dwelling (MV) Increase in vulnerability		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound)
Unipart Group	N/A	Culverted ordinary watercourse through part of site	None, unmodelled watercourse Closest model is Northfield & Littlemore Brooks 2011 just southeast of the site		unsure	Yes - Appendix 2 Ordinary watercourse discussion	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 No information provided regarding proposed use Unmodelled OW running through and adjacent the site Could pose a fluvial flood risk		Included within appendix 2 of Level 2 SFRA Using EA surface water mapping to assess flood risk to site
Warneford Hostpital	Suitable for a mix of uses according to landowner intention to redevelop the hospital, increase research and development provision on the site and provide residential accommodation	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely FZ1 Current use of land for Hospital/Clinic (MV) Proposed use for continued medial usage in addition to residental accomidation (MV) No increase in vulnerability		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound)

Site name	Proposed uses	Site constraints (Flood Zones and Main River and ordinary watercourses)	Flood Modelling available	Planning History	Exception Test passed (if required)?	In Level 2 SFRA? (Fluvial only)	Acceptable in principle?	Flood risk concerns	Flood risk benefits	Is this allocation SOUND (fluvial flood risk perpective only)?
West Wellington Square	Housing (Student)	N/A	N/A		N/A	No	Yes	Site is entirely within FZ1, with no main rviers nearby Exisiting use appears to be for dwellings Proposed use is student halls of residence (both MV) No change in site vulnerability seemingly		Yes - No fluivial risk (sound)
Worcester Street Car Park	Housing site	FZ2+3 partially on site and climate change extent, adjacent to main river	Thames (Eynsham to Sandford) 2018+2022		No	Yes - Majority of site is FZ1, with only 7 1% of total site falling with the fluvial flood extents No proposed number of dwellings currently but expected to have enough space on site to construct dwellings outside of fluvial flood extents Allocation would be sound	No	Increase in site vulnerability from LV to MV Majority of the site is FZ1, with a small band of FZ3b along western border Current use of site is for car parking Proposed site is for housing (dwellings) so increase from LV to MV for site vulnerability) Would need to demonstrate that the development area is solely within FZ1 area If within FZ3b it would be considered inappropriate development		Yes - Included within Level 2 SFRA No proposed development numbers yet, but considering small amount of site within fluvial flood extents, should be sound